

Appendix B:**Bramshott and Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan – Comments received at Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Consultation and proposed responses from the Steering Group**

CONTENT	Page
Representatives and groups taking part in consultation	1 - 2
Consultation feedback with proposed NDP changes for SG to consider	3 - 108

Representatives & Groups Taking Part in Reg 14 Consultation**Table 1:** Feedback has been received by representatives and groups labelled 1-14

No.	Representative or Group taking part
1	East Hampshire District Council & EHDC Ecologist
2	South Downs National Park Authority
3	Thames Water
4	Surrey County Council Minerals and Waste: <i>Feedback was no comment.</i>
5	NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB
6	Natural England: <i>Feedback was no comment.</i>
7	National Highways: <i>Feedback was no comment.</i>
8	Liss Parish Council: <i>Feedback was no comment.</i>
9	Developers DEV_9.1 (interest in Westlands Park) DEV_9.2 (interest in Stonehouse Rd) DEV_9.3 (interest in Penally Farm) DEV_9.4 (interest in Chiltley Farm) DEV_9.5 (interested in Headley Rd) DEV_9.6 (interested in Devils Lane)
10	Residents' Groups and Community Groups

11	Businesses
12	Residents (If a resident's number has been added e.g. RES_2, RES_3, this is because they gave lengthy feedback and it is therefore helpful to connect to other points)
13	Responses from owners of Non- Designated Heritage Assets
14	Responses from Local Green Space owners

Consultation feedback with proposed NDP changes for SG to consider

Table 2: Feedback and proposed changes to the plan are organized in a series of tables as follows. Typos within feedback have not been corrected.

Summary feedback from	Feedback on vision and policies	Table	Page
EHDC		3	3 - 18
SDNP		4	18 - 40
All other response	Introduction	5a	41 - 46
	1. Sustainable development & housing	5b	47 - 64
	2. Biodiverse environment & green space	5c	64 - 74
	3. Safe and active travel	5d	74 - 83
	4. Preserved Heritage	5e	83 - 90
	5. Connected and supported communities	5f	90 - 95
	6. Enhanced and circular economy	5g	95 - 99
Overall comments		6	99 - 108

Table 3: EHDC Comments – note that comments from the ecologist were track changed into the document and can be found in the Feedback folder.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
1.	General	Given the scale and nature of Liphook the emerging LP will be allocating a new housing requirement and allocating sites accordingly. The NP reads as though no more new development will be occurring and this is not the case, albeit this will be a function of the LP not the NP. The LP will be expressing a new housing requirement for Liphook in due course and accordingly identifying and allocating sites to meet that requirement. Therefore, messaging on this matter needs to be expressed with care to ensure the local community is not led to believe there will not be any further development in Liphook, which is not the case.	Chapter 4 sets out the quantum of development likely to be required in the Parish in the emerging EHDC Local Plan – i.e. 642-646 dwellings, of which approx. 136 to 140 would be new allocations. The chapter describes that the BLNDP is not allocating sites as this will be allocated strategically in the new Local Plan. For the SNDPA the adopted Plan does not allocate sites in the parish. Make clearer in para 4.3 that the SDNPA Local Plan Review is currently at Call For Sites stage and a site

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
			may come forward in the parish that is allocated at the strategic level.
2.	Reference to Local Plan	There is a lot of confusion about the emerging local plan and previous Reg 18 consultations, the NP will be examined against the JCS given the timings of the emerging LP, so this needs to be the focus in terms of conformity and policy cross referencing.	It is noted that the BLNDP will be considered against the adopted JCS. Wording agreed at meeting with EHDC in terms of how to refer to the adopted plan.
3.	Length of document	The NP is very long, although the structure of each section flows well with purpose, justification and then policy. Some of the justification reads like the evidence base so could this be edited?, likewise there are many references to other reports and studies are these all relevant to the situation in Bramshott and Liphook?	A member of the SG has edited the document to reduce text where possible. The SG plan to have the document professionally designed in advance of the referendum.
4.	Plan scope	The NP includes some ambitious policies which is commended, however, how will these be achieved given the NP does not allocate any sites for development and proposals are likely to be small scale with a focus on redevelopment opportunities?	Whilst the BLNDP does not seek to allocate sites, it does include policies to influence development, including any sites that are allocated in the emerging Local Plans.
5.	Plan period	The NP needs to be in conformity with adopted LP's so the plan period can only accord with that so 2028 for EHDC LP and 2033 for SDNP LP.	This is not considered to be strictly correct. There are many examples of NDPs that align to the timescale as proposed in an emerging Local Plan. This was discussed with the Planning Officers and it was agreed that a 2040 timescale would be appropriate.
6.	Policy Map	Figs 27 and 28 lack clarity	Additional insets for the policy maps have been created to add clarity. Ultimately, the maps will be shared with the Local Authorities for use on their online maps, which will make them much clearer to view than when viewed on paper.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		See comments below on SPA and buffer zones – these need to be corrected.	This mapping layer has been added.
7.	Consultation statement	<p>the NP Regs require a consultation statement to be prepared under Reg 15 – the next stage, to document all consultation to date and how this has informed the NP.</p> <p>It is usual for such a document to be prepared and published at Reg 14 to demonstrate all previous engagement exercises that have taken place to inform the draft NP.</p>	<p>The Consultation Statement will be prepared to be submitted alongside the Submission Version Plan, as required by the legislation.</p> <p>It is not usual for the Consultation Statement to be published at Regulation 14.</p>
8.	General	Refs to BNLP – should this be BLNDP?	This is a typo and has been amended throughout.
9.	Para 1.5 , 1.6 – refs to emerging local plan	The NP will be examined against the strategic policies in the adopted local plan so Joint Core Strategy 2014. It is doubtful the emerging LP will have any weight by the time the NP reaches Reg 16 and examination – so whilst its good to mention the LP is being reviewed the NP does not need to go into too much detail.	The BLNDP has been written to conform to the adopted local plans. The emerging (Regulation 18) EHDC Local Plan has been published for consultation in January 2024 and the SG have been mindful to consider emerging policies.
10.	Para 1.10	Whilst other NP's are part of the development plan, the NP does not need to conform with other NP's or the detailed policies in the LP second review – edit para 1.10 to clarify.	Noted and amended.
11.	Paras 1.14 – 1.16	<p>See above – the text refers to the Reg 18 version of the LP published in 2019 – this is being completely reviewed and will be replaced by a further Reg 18 version to be published for consultation in January 2024.</p> <p>A revised LDS was published in July 2023 - East hampshire Local Development Scheme (easthants.gov.uk)</p>	This has been amended.
12.	Para 2.1	Does the diagram need labelling? – clarify the difference of the colours depicting the settlements.	The map has been replaced.
13.	Paras 4.1 – 4.7	Whilst this is useful background, this level of detail is not needed as the NP is not allocating sites	This has been included largely to satisfy the community audience for the plan.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p><i>“there is no requirement placed on the Parish Council itself by EHDC to deliver additional sites as the NPPF requirement has been fulfilled.”</i> It is only the JCS requirement that has been fulfilled,</p> <p>not the emerging LP requirements as eluded to in this paragraph.</p>	
14.	4.15	<p>ref to interim Settlement Policy Boundary Review – this is to be reviewed and updated as part of the emerging LP.</p> <p>There have been 3 LP regulation 18 consultations and a further one scheduled therefore clarify which one is being referred to. – Draft Local Plan (2019)</p>	<p>Noted and this has been referenced.</p> <p>This has been amended.</p>
15.	Policy BL1	<p>The NP will be assessed against the JCS not the emerging LP. Plan period for new LP is 2021 – 2040 not 2024 as stated</p> <p>Section C agree with the sentiment of this but the plan only identifies 2 brownfield sites and <i>opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land with financial incentives</i> – sites with these characteristics are not evident in Liphook, so delete/edit this part of the policy.</p> <p>Conformity reference (this applies to all policies) – we do not have a local plan part 1 and part 2. The current development plan comprises the JCS 2014, Housing and Employment Allocations LP 2016 and saved policies from the 2006 LP.</p> <p>In terms of strategic policies and application of the basic conditions this would be focussing on the JCS.</p>	<p>Typo corrected.</p> <p>Suggest amend as suggested.</p> <p>The EHDC website describes the JCS as LP Part 1 and the HEA as LP Part 2. Nevertheless the references to ‘Part 1’ and ‘Part 2’ have been removed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
16.	Fig 4	Delete text in brackets	Deleted.
17.	Fig 4 – 8	Check Wealden Heaths SPA buffer – this is recorded on our GIS as 400m and is not accurately portrayed on the maps. The whole of Passfield and Griggs Green fall within the 400 m buffer, as does parts of Liphook and Bramshott.	This has been replaced on the map.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
18.	Fig 9	If pink area is 10 minutes walkable – label as such	This has been labelled more prominently.
19.	4.22	Could a social rent policy be included? – this is being considered as part of the LP to help with affordability.	Following discussions with EHDC, it was agreed that Policy BL2 already includes social rent requirements (as evidenced by the HNA), therefore no need for a standalone policy.
20.	4.23	Update 2021 data : Hampshire Home Choice – Bramshott and Liphook Local Connection 1 bed - 90 2 bed - 34 3 bed - 19 4+ bed – 7 Total – 150	This has been updated.
21.	4.26 – 4.30	EHDC will be proposing a 70/30 tenure split in its local plan - A 75/25 split aligns with the SDNPA. First Homes – There is a large section on First Homes. EHDC is not pursuing First Homes through the emerging LP on the basis that this only delivers 1 and 2 beds flats at best. There is reference to discounts of 50%, however, that will cause a knock on effect which will result in viability issues. Census 2021 data is now available.	The ratios are based on the HNA prepared for the Parish. It is not considered unusual for parish-level data to diverge slightly from the district as a whole. The SG has discussed the First Homes product and agreed to amend the policy to strongly support (as opposed to requiring) products (such as First Homes) that enable greater affordability uplifts and prioritise local residents when it comes to allocating housing.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
			Noted - the HNA was prepared prior to 2021 data being available. The HNA will be updated periodically.
22.	4.46	2020 GTAA is being updated	This has been noted in the text.
23.	Policy BL2	<p>See comments above on First Homes</p> <p>No mention of G&T accommodation as referenced in paras 4.44 – 4.46?</p> <p>Given that one of the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan is ‘Connected and supported communities’, you could consider whether further supportive wording here makes that link, acknowledging the Traveller community as part of the local Liphook community. There is a particular community issue here, as the existing sites in Queens Road, Longmoor Road are constrained by proximity to the SPA, and as such, no more pitches can be provided here. However, that leaves an issue of localised housing need for one of the most socially disadvantaged communities there is. The NP acknowledges, “These are well established permitted sites from which there are considerable accommodation needs.” It’s whether you wish to make any further comment on that as the outcome from that is a more localised community issue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Examiners have previously advised the G&T is a strategic rather than neighbourhood issue. This was discussed with EHDC and it was agreed that the issue is strategic and a policy in the BLNDP is not required. The BLNDP does, however, include a section on this important demographic.</p>
24.	Para 4.58	The plan should be read as a whole – so all policies apply to all proposals	Noted – this one just has an immediate read across, so text included to help the reader.
25.	Para 4.64	Delete ref to emerging LP policy – this reference will change	Policy reference deleted.
26.	Para 4.67 Policy BL4	References to River Wey having potential to contribute to low carbon technologies – whilst this is commended – the NP should only include such references where there is some certainty that this is a realistic possibility – perhaps this needs to be expressed as a community aspiration rather than policy?	The group discuss this and consider that it should be retained, but in the supporting text, make clear that this would need support from the relevant bodies.
27.	Policy BL3	As per the NPPF and Planning Policy for Traveller sites, there is a requirement for local authorities to plan for the accommodation needs of the Traveller community. East Hampshire has a growing Traveller community, of which one of the largest, if	See ref. 23.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>not the largest, is within Bramshott and Liphook parish (primarily at Longmoor Road, Queens Road, and Devils Lane).</p> <p>These are well established permitted sites from which there are considerable accommodation needs. For inclusivity, we would expect a policy that talks about local housing needs to acknowledge this.</p> <p>Travellers generally experience worst health and social outcomes than the settled community, and having a permanent settled base plays an important part in improving those outcomes. If you need any more information on this, please see our Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2020, or contact us.</p>	
28.	Fig 11	See comments above on SPA boundary and 400m buffer	This has been amended.
29.	Para 5.41 – 5.42	<p>There is no green belt in East Hants so this reference needs to be deleted.</p> <p>Accompanying maps – some have numbers on, others don't – is land at Lowsley Farm LGS?, likewise land south Griggs Green?</p> <p>Appendix B could be a separate evidence document – rather than lengthening the NP?</p> <p>It is imperative that the owners of these parcels of land have been consulted as part of the NP process.</p>	<p>Yes, this was included as an example of where LGS is not required – but has been removed as agreed it is confusing.</p> <p>Some numbers were accidentally left off the map. These have been corrected.</p> <p>Noted. It can be extracted, but advice from Examiners in other Plans appears to be to retain in the main document.</p> <p>All LGS owners were contacted prior to the Regulation 14 document being issued for consultation.</p>
30.	Policy BL8	A number of the views seem to focus on land in SDNP – this land is broken up by small fields and paddocks with mature trees and hedgerows as distinctive	The SG discussed the views with both EHDC and SDNPA at a meeting following receipt of

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>boundaries – therefore the views are very limited in their extent and we would question are these ‘significant’?</p> <p>All views should be mapped and shown on the Policies map including those referred to in part Aii of the policy. Views 4 and 5 need to be shown on the map</p>	<p>their comments at Regulation 14. It was agreed that the current View 3 should be removed as the view is very restricted here.</p> <p>The map has been amended.</p>
31.	Para 6.2	Census 2021 data is available	This has been updated with the latest data.
32.	Para 6.11	This list could form the basis for your non policy actions	Noted and amended.
33.	Para 6.12	<p>Request that any future strategic LP allocations are located within the 10 minute walkable zone, as shown on Fig 19 – the only land available seems to be in SDNP.</p> <p>EHDC has undertaken an accessibility assessment of all its settlements and this is being used to inform which sites may be suitable for allocation through the LP.</p> <p>The emerging East Hants LP will be allocating further sites for development in Liphook.</p>	<p>SG agreed to retain the 10-minute radius (better labelled on the map) but to amend the text to make clear that this is about promoting walkable neighbourhoods, not restricting development. Where developments can connect to this ‘zone’ in a way that is accessible, attractive, safe, well-lit etc., this is the main message here. The zone is not intended to be the focus for development, rather demonstrate the desire to ensure that the settlements remain walkable and to promote active travel</p>
34.	Policy BL15	No need to reference all the LP policies	Removed.
35.	Pages 88 – 93	<p>See detailed comments below on community, education and health facilities provision</p> <p>Typo Policy BL8 on page 93 should read Policy BL18</p>	<p>See later comments.</p> <p>Amended.</p>
36.	Policy BL17	The Council has a Community Facilities Study , which is updated annually. The Study confirms what is included as a Community Facility, as referenced in the NPPF, and identifies the relevant evidence base. For most, the relevant evidence base is the Community Facilities Study itself, but for others it is the Open Space, Sports and	The SG has amended this table accordingly to capture these comments and the provisions contained in the EHDC reports. This has been moved to the Appendix and reference to the

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>Recreation Study (which is also currently being updated).</p> <p>Whilst the Community Facilities Study (2022) doesn't include education, the 2023 update will, including Education - early years provision. As such, the directory will list all early years provision and schools.</p> <p>When talking about education in the Neighbourhood Plan, please be aware this includes all ages, including early years. Therefore, do check whether Figure 9 includes early years provision. Our understanding of early years provision is – see list in detailed response.</p> <p>It's not clear why only St Mary's is mentioned in the NP. We are aware of needs and aspirations at the Church Centre, which operates with the early years provision on site too. (The early years provision received CIL funding this year). We would highly recommend speaking directly with the Church Centre and can provide a contact.</p> <p>There is a community project that could be referenced here, and which will be included in the Community Facilities Study 2023.</p> <p>Regarding the library, is the "desire to expand services" evidenced? Our recent communication with HCC has not highlighted this, and their position regarding libraries remains the same as the Community Facilities Study 2022.</p> <p>In the table, when talking about provision for under 5s, the key community facility for under 5's is nurseries and pre-schools, but not mentioned here. Given the Government budget announcement (March 2023) about increasing funded hours, there will be considerable pressure on these settings. Relevant wording and references can be seen in the Council's CIL report presented to Cabinet in July 2023. There is an opportunity to pick this up in the NP, particularly if you speak directly to the Ark Preschool who received CIL funding, and who are based at the Liphook Centre (as said, contact details can be provided).</p> <p>Re the Day Centre, we have made contact with many facilities, but we have not</p>	<p>Community Facilities Study made directly in the policy, as the document that is annually updated.</p> <p>Noted - amended map accordingly.</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>heard back from the Day Centre in terms of their specific needs. If we had, we would have reported it in the Community Facilities Study. We would be grateful to receive the evidence on which you are basing their needs.</p> <p>Concerned that policy BL17 refers back to Table 8.1, but question whether Table 8.1 is fully reflective, and justified and evidenced as a priority list. I would suggest better to be guided by up to date evidence, as the Community Facilities Study is updated annually, and the Open Space Sports and Recreation Study is currently being updated. It is better that decisions around what infrastructure is needed is based on evidence and factual information, which is then considered along side engagement with residents, rather than engagement with residents being the 'go to' as that risks 'popular' being prioritised over evidence based.</p>	
37.	BL17	<p>The Council's Community Facilities Study 2022 provides useful evidence base for this policy, but is not referenced and does not appear to inform the commentary. The Council annually updates this study, providing informative information about local community facilities. We strongly advise this document is considered, as some of the projects listed do not appear to present the full local picture. We will be updating the study in summer 2023, for publication in autumn 2023, post a decision on the allocation of CIL funding.</p> <p>We are also in the process of updating our Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy 2018, which will provide updated evidence base, and expect to have a final update published this year.</p> <p>As part of the Community Facilities Study 2022, you will see a directory which lists all facilities. This may help you consider local provision and needs. Key things to note are;</p>	As above.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>The potential need for a meeting place facility in Bramshott, <i>“It is notable that whilst Bramshott and Liphook Parish has 8 meeting places, they are located in Liphook, leaving Bramshott residents needing to travel. Should the opportunity arise, provision of a small facility in Bramshott would help to reduce the need to travel, and provide a more local meeting place. Liphook has some capacity in its existing facilities, but this assessment may need to be revisited should considerable development come forward in this area.” (p.10).</i></p> <p>The ‘new’ independent cinema in Liphook is noted as cultural infrastructure.</p> <p>Through our research, we are aware that Liphook Church Centre had intentions for refurbishment and extension.</p> <p>Policy BL17 – all I would say about this policy is to ensure it is as flexible as it may need to be. The way community facilities work and need to operate is changing considerably, to a much more modern shared style, multi use, facility. The way they are designed and their needs have come on a long way from the old style village hall. It’s important that any such policy stresses their value, but enables what might need to happen in the future to better cater for local communities. There is a chapter in the Community Facilities Study 2022 which discusses the modern approach to community facilities – it is our intention to update this further in 2023, as this is very much a moving topic.</p> <p>Health services – in a similar vein, the way health services are run and provided is changing quickly. There is no dispute that there is generally great pressure and need. There is some commentary on this in the Community Facility Study. However, there is also close working between the Council and the ICB and individual GP practices, and we would just caution against including too much information that may become dated very quickly. It may be better to refer back to the Community Facilities Study evidence base, that is updated annually – and will include more information on health in this update. We would ask that</p>	

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>Hampshire and IOW Integrated Care Board is consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Re education, are comments such as “Bramshott & Liphook parish currently has good education provision for children from aged 4 to 18” based on evidence. What is meant by ‘good’. HCC is the education authority and holds the data/forecasting for school place planning, and what any such needs would be from development. We welcome the acknowledgement of the importance of early years facilities, but these facilities aren’t noted on figure 6.1, so are they covered by the policy BL8. We consider nurseries/preschool’s to be education, and have the benefit of NPPF para 95 “great weight”, as such we would expect this policy to reflect that and their inclusion in this policy. Would it be better for such mapping to refer to evidence base, rather than the policy. For example if a new school/nursery should open, it won’t feature on map 6.1. All facilities will be mapped in the Community Facilities Study 2023, including nurseries/education, so the policy could refer to that evidence base.</p> <p>Our understanding of nursery/pre-school facilities in B&L is; Mad Hatter’s nursery school., The Ark Pre School, and Churchers College Nursery.</p> <p>Sports Facilities</p> <p>Football - A new full size 3G football pitch is being provided at Bohunt School which will have a full Community Use Agreement on it. The Wellbeing Officer (Sport & Leisure) will be working with the school to enable all local football clubs fair and equal access to the facility.</p> <p>The district council is also looking to refresh the Playing Pitch and Sports Facility Strategy this year as the original document was completed in 2018. This will give the district up to date evidence of the demand for sports pitches including grass and artificial and include pavilions. All relevant sports clubs, schools, Town and Parish Council’s and National Governing Bodies of Sports (NGBs) will be consulted.</p>	

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
		<p>The district Council and Hants FA are happy to work with and support Liphook United to progress with upgrading their pavilion if the evidence of need is identified within the PPS.</p> <p>Bowls – The district Council supported Liphook Bowls Club with a Section 106 grant in 2019/2020 for £42,182.92. This was for improvements to the bowls green, fencing, gates, and a new tractor mower.</p> <p>There would need to be evidence provided that extra works needed to be done over and above the works completed.</p> <p>Multi-sports - There is no current evidence that a swimming pool facility is needed in the Liphook and Bramshott area as there is a 25m pool at Bordon Leisure Centre. The need for extra water will be again looked at as part of the refresh of the East Hampshire Sports Facilities Strategy.</p> <p>The need for squash will also be looked at as part of the Sports Facility Strategy and we are open to having discussions with Bohunt school to look at provision.</p>	
38.	Para 9.3	Permitted development rights allow for the conversion of various commercial premises without the need for planning permission – so whilst sites can be safeguarded via policy that will not stop individual units being converted under PD.	This has been added to the supporting text.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
39.	Para 9.5	Reference to work space within residential development – is this referring to new residential development – if so where or existing?	This would be considered as part of new residential development, which is likely to come forward via strategic allocations.
40.	Fig 25 and 26	<p>The emerging local plan is currently reviewing all employment sites.</p> <p>Ajax House has a pending planning application for redevelopment to residential, if approved this will be deleted from the list of employment sites.</p>	Noted – and this is noted on the map key.
41.	Policy BL18	<p>For a comprehensive picture, in health, you may wish to note also dentists, pharmacy and optician provision. These are in the Community Facilities Study directory. There is no NHS dentist provision in Bramshott and Liphook, based on the best available information we have. 1 pharmacy and 1 optician.</p> <p>“This land is to be given free of charge within the SNDP, however, the current lack of funding means it is unlikely this development will take place” is this fully correct? Is it more complex than this; was the intention for the health facility to be part of a larger housing site. It would be helpful to have input from the ICB on this, and the SDNPA.</p> <p>Welcome the reference to early years in para 8.15. This could be added to, with reference to the Government’s intentions for increasing funded hours, and what that might mean in land use terms.</p> <p>Re Bohunt, it is our understanding that about 25% of pupils come from Waverley borough. Not a point to necessarily pick up on, but just for reference, and to check with HCC incase is relevant. If that remains the case, there is a potential responsibility for Waverley CIL to consider contributing towards any infrastructure needs for Bohunt that are linked to growth.</p> <p>Policy BL18, question the need to link to “on the sites shown on Fig24” as provision can change, e.g. a new nursery could be opened, which just quickly dates the plan when the information becomes out of date. Again, better to link to evidence in the Community Facilities Study, which is updated annually.</p>	<p>This has been referenced in the text.</p> <p>This has been checked and amended by the SG.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree and amended reference in the policy to the Community Facilities Study.</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
42.	Policy BL19	<p>The Government are currently consulting on further changes to PD rights which change the floorspace limits and marketing periods – this policy will therefore need to be reviewed to reflect current PD allowances and when the changes are in place – generally there will be greater flexibility to change from employment sites to residential without the need for planning permission, therefore such sites will not be subject to any assessment via LP or NP policies.</p> <p>The reference to provision of affordable homes seems out of place – is the intention that if an employment site is redeveloped for residential purposes then affordable housing should be provided? – this needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>Noted – suggest to keep a watching brief as the BLNDP progresses. The policy includes the wording ‘where relevant’, which would exclude PD developments.</p> <p>The intention is that should a mixed use employment site be developed, it should seek to include affordable homes.</p>
43.	Policy BL20	<p>Preparation of the NP has provided the opportunity to review the boundary of the town centre as set out in the LP but this does not appear to have been done?</p> <p>The defined town centre boundary needs to be shown on a policies map.</p> <p>Section C of the policy may have little weight given PD existing and proposed</p> <p>Section H – lists laudable proposals but how realistic are these – what scale of development is required to enable these requirements to be met.</p>	<p>This has not been considered by the SG throughout the work and the boundary remains as per the adopted version.</p> <p>This has been added to the figure.</p> <p>Noted, although at the moment, listed buildings still need to apply for pp and additional consideration does need to be given to change of use in a Conversation Area.</p> <p>These are supported by the community engagement and could be funded via CIL contributions (e.g. via any strategic allocations) or other funding that might be</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Summary of comment	Steering Group Response
			available to the parish over the course of the plan.

Table 4: SDNPA Comments

Ref	NDP Ref	SDNPA Comment	SDNPA Explanation / Reasoning	Steering Group Response
44.	General comment	The NDP tries to capture a lot of information. This is commendable but, in doing so, there are areas where the NDP either repeats itself, or simply replicates national or local policies. As it stands, the document is very long for a NDP (especially one that doesn't allocate sites). I would recommend refining some of the explanatory text and policy wording to make it more succinct and "punchy" – it's essential the main aims, points and requirements are clear and unambiguous.	For ease of reading and use, and to ensure the main aims, points, and requirements are clear and unambiguous.	The document will be edited, but it is considered that the length should not 'trump' the valuable content. Prior to referendum, the intention is to professionally design the document, which will help to reduce the length and make the individual sections more eye-catching.
45.	General comment	There are a few spelling, grammar, and wording errors throughout the NDP, please check and proof read before Reg16.	To correct any spelling, grammar and wording errors.	Noted – as above.
46.	General comment	The NDP needs to be more stimulating and interactive. Perhaps you could consider: colour coding different sections, adding in photos, and including links to supporting documents as footnotes.	For ease of reading and use.	Footnotes are generally avoided for accessibility purposes. The SG acknowledge that they could consider getting the document professionally designed nearer the end.
47.	General comment	I believe that the vision of the NDP is to create a "healthy, sustainable and thriving" parish; however, it's not clear that this is the actual vision, see further comments below.	See further comments below re Section 3 (Vision).	Noted. The SG have prepared the vision in consultation with the community and are minded to retain it as agreed.

48.	Page 2 – General comment	The parish council should <u>not</u> state that it has met its housing need. In light of national planning reforms, and the emerging East Hants and South Downs Local Plans, this statement will confuse and falsely guide residents’ expectations and understanding. The LPAs are still in the processing of understanding local housing need. Its fine if you do not wish to allocate sites for development, but at least state that the LPAs will consider development allocations given the parish’s constraints, and the potential strategic nature of potential sites.	For clarity, to manage expectations, and to avoid any future confusion/ understanding.	It is true that there are no outstanding site allocations to be delivered in the adopted Local Plans. We have amend first bullet to say this and also include the added point that Potential sites that might come forward as part of the Local Plan reviews are likely to be strategic in nature.
49.	Page 2 – General comment	Please change <i>“The important work completed towards the allocation objectives will inform the emerging Local Plan”</i> , to <i>“The work completed to date on potential development sites will be used, in conjunction with emerging evidence base documents, to inform the East Hampshire and South Downs Local Plans”</i> .	For clarity, to manage expectations, and to avoid any future confusion/ understanding.	Amended.
50.	Page 5 – General comment	Please add page numbers for the appendices to the contents page.	For ease of reading and use.	Amended.
51.	Page 12 – Paragraphs 1.17 to 1.18	<p><u>Please amend both paragraphs to:</u></p> <p>The western and south-western areas of the parish are located within the South Downs National Park (SDNP). The SDNP was designated as a National Park on 31 March 2010. As set out in Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995, all relevant authorities and decision-makers are required to have regard to the following NP Purposes and Duty:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose 1 – To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area; and • Purpose 2 – To promote opportunities for the 	The reference to the majority of the SDNP area comprising Woolmer Forest is not correct, and the constraint of the SPA is something that both EHDC and the SDNPA need to consider in their	Amended as suggested.

		<p>understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duty – To seek to foster the social and economic wellbeing of the local communities within the National Park in pursuit of the above purposes. <p>The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) became the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the SDNP on 01 April 2011, and the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) was adopted on 02 July 2019. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires policies in Local Plans to be reviewed at least once every five years. In May 2022, the SDNPA commenced its Local Plan Review (LPR). The LPR will retain the landscape-led and ecosystem service approaches, and the medium/dispersed growth development strategy. The LPR will also consider housing need and national updates relating to climate change, biodiversity net gain (BNG), and local nature recovery strategies (LNRS).</p>	<p>respective local plans. The main point here is to set the scene about the local plans and what they will broadly entail.</p>	
52.	Page 20 – Paragraph 3.1	It is stated that the vision and objectives for the parish are up to 2038, but the plan period is until 2040. Please clarify / correct.	For clarification.	The SG has chosen 2040 as that mirrors the emerging EHDC Local Plan. This has been amended throughout.
53.	Page 20 – Vision	Is a “healthy, sustainable and thriving” parish the vision? If so, this is supported, but you need to explicitly state that this is the vision and provide some background as to why this is the vision.	For clarification.	The SG has added in the words ‘Vision’ and ‘Objectives’ to make this clearer.

54.	Page 20 – 1no. Vision; and 6no. Objectives.	<p>We support the vision and objectives, but the wording, grammar, and tense needs to be worked on to make it clear, succinct, and avoid ambiguity. To summarize, the wording should be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it clear that these are the development objectives to 2040. <p>State which objectives and policies relate to one another.</p>	For ease of reading and use, and to avoid ambiguity.	<p>Every policy includes a conformity reference that sets out which objective it is delivering.</p> <p>An overarching summary leaflet will be produced to include a list all the policies and their associated objectives.</p>
55.	Pages 20 to 21 - Paragraph 3.2; and Figure 2; and Principles.	<p>This section is a little bit confusing. Would it be better to state that:</p> <p>The NDP and its evolution – incl. its vision, objectives, policies, and projects – are underlined by 4no. key principles as shown in Figure 2. Also, please ensure that the “principles” are not confused with “development principles”.</p>	It needs to be made clear how the visions, objectives, and principles all work. Normally, the objectives (and their underlying policies) support the delivery of the vision – but the principles add a new layer to the above and so clarification is required.	Noted – the text has been amended.
56.	Pages 22 to 23 – Paragraphs 4.1 to 4.9.	<p><u>Please amend to:</u></p> <p>There is a recognition that the parish will need to accommodate a certain degree of growth to ensure the ongoing needs of residents are met in terms of community facilities, employment, housing, recreation and sports facilities etc.</p> <p>The parish council undertook a “Local Call for Sites” in 2019 to</p>	These paragraphs (as currently written) are quite long and may appear confusing to residents. It is recommended that they are	This has been amended.

		<p>establish opportunities for development allocations and associated infrastructure. This exercise identified 43no. potential sites. The parish council commissioned AECOM to assess each site in terms of availability, suitability and deliverability and, in parallel, the parish council engaged with the community about the potential sites. It was concluded that the sites identified within the defined settlement boundary could be considered under existing and emerging local planning policies. As for the sites identified outside of the defined settlement boundary, these were all considered to be strategic in nature.</p> <p>The parish council has sought advice from both EHDC and the SDNPA. The NDP Steering Group voted unanimously in February 2023 to not allocate any sites in the NDP. The reasons for this decision were that: the NDP may be delayed further if site allocations are pursued; the methodology for calculating housing need has changed; the two emerging local plans are at early stages; and that strategic development sites should be considered and assessed in the emerging local plans given their nature and scale.</p>	reduced/summarized to that proposed in the left column for ease of reading and understanding.	
57.	Page 23 – Figure 3	The SDNPA Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was last updated in December 2016. It is anticipated that the new Land Availability Assessment (LAA) will be published in 2023/24.	Factual correction.	The table has been amended.

58.	Page 24 – Paragraph 4.11	<p><u>Please amend to:</u> This includes the internationally designated Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA) and Woolmer Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and the nationally designated South Downs National Park (SDNP) and the Bramshott & Ludshott Commons Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p>	Factual correction.	Amended.
59.	Pages 24 to 26 - Paragraphs 4.10 to 4.17	These paragraphs need to be summarized and reduced so that they are more succinct and “punchy”.	For ease of reading, understanding, and use.	The document has been redited.
60.	Page 26 – Policy BL1: Location of Development	<p><u>Please consider amending to:</u></p> <p>(a) The principle of development within the defined settlement policy boundary (as shown in the most recent development plan) will be supported subject to compliance with other policies in the development plan.</p> <p>(b) The principle of development outside the defined settlement policy boundary (as shown in the most recent development plan) will only be supported – subject to compliance with other policies in the development plan - if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) It does not individually or cumulatively result in the physical and/or visual coalescence of – and it enhances the separate identities of - the individual communities of Bramshott, Griggs Green, Liphook, and Passfield; (ii) It maintains and, where possible, enhances the natural 	Amendments suggested to align with Policy SD25, remove ambiguity, and for ease of reading.	Agreed that the proposed changes do not water down the policy and should be accepted.

		<p>and built appearance and character of the area;</p> <p>(iii) It is of a scale and nature appropriate to the character and function of the area;</p> <p>(iv) It makes best, efficient, and appropriate use of suitable and available previously developed land (PDL) and redundant or vacant agricultural buildings;</p> <p>(v) It is capable of connecting to the primary movement network hierarchy [see Policy BL10] to support the delivery of the 10 minute walkable neighbourhood concept;</p> <p>(vi) It improves, where appropriate, the strategic linkage from the development site to Liphook Village as appropriate; and</p> <p>(vii) It remediates any identified despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land as appropriate.</p>		
61.	Page 30 – Figure 9	I believe the red bold line is Liphook Town Centre, but please confirm and define in the key/legend.	For clarification.	This is correct and has been added to the map key.
62.	Page 31 – Paragraph 4.18	Policy SD28 of the South Downs Local Plan requires 50% of all residential developments of 11 homes or more to be affordable housing, along with smaller requirements for residential developments of 10 homes or less.	Please reference to show alignment with the SDLP.	Added to the text in para 4.10.

63.	Pages 31 to 34 – Paragraph 4.18 to 4.46	These paragraphs need to be summarized and reduced so that they are more succinct and “punchy”.	For ease of reading, understanding, and use.	Noted and the document has been edited.
64.	Page 35 – Policy BL2: Meeting Local Housing Needs	In relation to Criterion (c), how do you define “development that could reasonably be expected to meet the needs of older people (by virtue of its size and location)”? Are there certain areas (i.e., town centre or 10 minute walking neighbourhood areas) where you would expect housing to meet the needs of older people? Or do you mean that specific care home and specialist housing proposals should show how they have met the HAPPI principles? Please clarify.	For clarification.	Amended to residential development. The HAPPI principles are defined in the supporting text.
65.	Page 35 – Policy BL2: Meeting Local Housing Needs	SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD27 and SD28 need to be included in the conformity reference underneath the policy box. Please also include link to SDNP Affordable Housing SPD: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/supplementary-planning-documents/affordable-housing-spd/	Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	Added.
66.	Page 36 – Paragraphs 4.47 and 4.52	The reference to the South Downs Design Guide SPD and landscape led approach is supported.	n/a	Noted.

67.	Page 40 – Paragraph 4.58	Development should take account of both Policy BL3 and Policy BL4. The statement “where it is appropriate to do so” may open you up to Applicants trying to dismiss one policy in favour of another. A decision maker will take a view on whether one policy needs to be attributed more weight over another for individual proposals as a part of the “planning balance”.	Amendment suggested to avoid ambiguity.	
68.	Page 41 – Policy BL3: Character & Design of Development	<u>Please amend the first sentence of Criterion (a) to:</u> Development proposals should incorporate a high-quality of design which: responds and integrates well with its context and surroundings; meets the changing needs of residents; and avoids or minimises any adverse impacts on the South Downs National Park and its setting.	The criterion is supported, but amendments suggested to ensure conformity with the NPPF (2023).	Noted and amended.
69.	Page 41 – Policy BL3: Character & Design of Development	Please include a reference in Criterion (c) to the need for meaningful and characteristic landscape buffers to help ensure an appropriate transition from built development to open countryside.	The criterion is supported, but amendments suggested to strengthen the policy and ensure appropriate design and layouts are secured.	This has been added to the criterion.
70.	Page 44 – Policy BL4: Climate Change & Design	<u>Please amend Criterion (a) to:</u> Proposals which incorporate measures and standards to adapt to, and mitigate, the impacts of predicted climate change will be supported subject to compliance with other policies in this Plan.	The policy is supported, and amendments suggested to strengthen the policy wording.	This has been amended.

71.	Page 44 – Policy BL4: Climate Change & Design	There is a balance between improving energy efficiency (by retaining heat) whilst not causing occupants to overheat in the summer. Design and environmental measures / standards to reduce energy consumption will obviously be supported, but any likelihood of overheating will need to be addressed by further design / adaptation measures - i.e., appropriate shading (trees, shutters etc.), fenestration, orientation, and ventilation etc.	Amendments required to capture overheating issue.	This has been added to the supporting text and policy.
72.	Page 44 – Policy BL4: Climate Change & Design	SDNPA Local Plan Policy SD48 needs to be included in the conformity reference underneath the policy box. Please include links to SDNP SPD and TAN: SPD: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/supplementary-planning-documents/sustainable-construction-supplementary-planning-document/ TAN: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/technical-advice-notes-tans/sustainable-construction-tan/	Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	These have been added.
73.	Page 47 – Figure 11	The figure appears to include the water network / main river lines but has not referenced the above is in the key/legend.	Please amend/rectify the omission.	This has been added to the Map Key.

74.	Page 50 – Figure 12	The figure is quite hard to read. I would recommend providing one map for the two biodiversity opportunity areas (BOAs) [i.e., the Wealden Heaths BOA and the River Wey BOA] – using different colours to differentiate between them. A second map could then be added to show the Bohunt Manor Estate, Radford Park, and the identified sunken lanes. However, given that these three features reappear later in the Plan, perhaps you could include them on other maps and just reference these maps here?	For ease of reading and understanding.	Noted – review the map.
75.	Pages 45 to 51 – Paragraphs 5.1 to 5.20; and Policy BL5 Green and Blue Infrastructure and Delivering Biodiversity Net Gain.	The spirit/aim of the policy and its explanatory text is supported, but this section needs to be refined and made succinct and “punchier”. There is a lot of repetition from national and local planning policies, and some of the explanatory text reads as if its policy and vice versa.	For ease of reading and understanding.	Noted.
76.	Page 52 – Paragraph 5.21	I think what you are trying to say is that natural areas which are formally designated will be protected and, where possible, enhanced in accordance with their designation. Whilst other identified natural areas which do not benefit from formal designation should still be protected and integrated, as appropriate, into the design and layout of development. Is this correct? If so, please amend.	For ease of reading and understanding.	Amended.
77.	Page 52 – Paragraphs 5.23 to 5.25; and Policy BL6 Managing the	Should the policy be re-titled to “Landscape & Environment”? The two Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) referenced are from the East Hampshire Land Character Assessment. However, it is important to note that as per the South Downs Landscape	Please reference the South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) character types	The SG has discussed this and agreed to amend the title.

	<p>Environment Impact of Development</p>	<p>Character Assessment (LCA) [2020]: the western part of the parish is in the “Woolmer Forest / Weaver’s Down Character Area” (LCA M3) of the “Wealden Farmland and Heath Mosaic Landscape Character Type” (LCT M); and the southern part of the parish is in the “Blackdown to Petworth Greensand Hills Character Area” (LCA O1) of the “Greensand Hills Landscape Character Type” (LCT O).</p> <p>The South Downs LCA (2020) can be found on our website here: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/landscape-design-conservation/south-downs-landscape-character-assessment/south-downs-landscape-character-assessment-2020/</p> <p>Further information about nature recovery by Landscape Character Type (LCT) can be found on our website here: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/nature-recovery-information-for-delivery-partners/nature-recovery-by-landscape/</p>	<p>and character areas. It would also be helpful if these were mapped alongside the East Hampshire LCAs, with different colours used to differentiate each LCA for ease of reading and understanding.</p>	<p>This has been included in the supporting text.</p>
<p>78.</p>	<p>Page 53 – Table 4</p>	<p>Are there any National Nature Reserves (NNRs) or Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) in the parish? If so, please include in table.</p> <p>Please include the acronyms (i.e., Special Protection Area = SPA etc.), and please list the individual sites as per their designation. You also need to explain that the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA includes 7no. sites of which X number are in the parish and state which ones these are.</p> <p>Is it possible to map all the designations?</p>	<p>For ease of reading and understanding.</p>	<p>There are no NNRs or LNRs in the parish. The nearest are Lynchmere Commons LNR and Deadwater Valley LNR, but these are out of parish.</p>

79.	Page 57 – Paragraph 5.41	I do not think East Hampshire has a green belt?	Factual correction.	Amended with an alternative example.
80.	Page 57 – Paragraph 5.42	You do not need to list the LGS designations in the explanatory text if they are already listed in the policy wording.	To remove repetition and make the text more succinct.	Removed text.
81.	Page 59 – Policy BL7 (LGS)	SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD47 and SD48 need to be included in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.	Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	Added.
82.	Page 61 – Figure 15 (Liphook LGS); and Appendix C	There are two areas highlighted as LGS but with no numbers, and not included on the LGS list. The one in the far west, is partly within the SDNP. Please can you confirm if this is proposed for LGS designation and, if so, how this has been determined/assessed?	For clarification.	This has been corrected. All justifications are provided in the Appendix.
83.	Page 64 – Policy BL8 Protection of Locally Significant Views; Figure 17; and Appendix C.	As a start: all 5no. proposed “locally significant views” need to be mapped so that full comments can be provided; the identified views should be listed under Criterion (a)(i); and SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD4 and SD6 need to be included (not SD9-11) in the conformity reference underneath the policy box. We will provide further comments at Reg16 once the above has been completed, but in the meantime our high level comments are as follows:	To correct omissions; To show alignment with SDLP; For ease of understanding; and To ensure justification.	The map has been added. The SG has added additional information to set out how the views were considered. The views have been discussed with the SDNPA and it was agreed to remove existing View 3.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.1 – No immediate issues with this identification. • No.2 – Not applicable to SDNP. • No.3 – We walked this area recently and the viewpoint only comprises the existing farm gate. The view appears to be limited by the existing school and mature boundary vegetation. There is no pavement on this side of the road and passing cars are unlikely to appreciate the view when in motion. <p>We note that the Examiner for the Send NDP (in Guildford Borough) wanted to know how locally significant views had been identified, and why there were considered to be valued / special. We recommend that the parish council review the examination and evidence for the Send NDP to ensure that there identification of locally significant views is justified and robust.</p>		<p>The SG sought suggestions of views from the local community and visited each to narrow them down and identify those considered to be most significant. One of the four main views (now view 2) is noted within an Area of Special Housing Character. Views in the Liphook Conservation Area were identified as part of the appraisal.</p>
84.	Page 64 – Figure 17	Please include Views 4 and 5, and their arcs, in the map. We cannot comment further until it is clear what all 5 views are.	To correct omissions; and for ease of reading and understanding.	Noted and these have been added.
85.	Page 65 – Paragraph 5.49	Please state that the South Downs National Park was designated as an International Dark Sky Reserve (IDSR) in May 2016.	Factual correction.	This has been added.

86.	Page 66 – Policy BL9 Dark Skies	Please also include link to SDNP Dark Skies TAN: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/technical-advice-notes-tans/dark-skies-technical-advice-note-tan/	Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	This has been added.
87.	Page 70 – Figure 19	I believe the red bold line is Liphook Town Centre, but please confirm and define in the key/legend.	For clarification.	Added to the map key.
88.	Page 67 to 72 – Paragraphs 6.1 to 6.16; and Policy BL10 Improving walking, cycling and equestrian opportunities.	You make reference to a 10-minute walking neighbourhood in earlier chapters and Policy BL1, but this policy does not really draw on this enough. I appreciate that there is a reference in Criterion (a), but to fully embrace the concept of a 10 minute neighbourhood, you may want to consider specific criteria related to development proposals within a 10 minute ped-shed of the town centre, followed by general criteria for walking, cycling and equestrian opportunities elsewhere in the parish. The considerations for both will be somewhat different. In addition to the above, SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD19-21 need to be included in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.	Greater emphasis and succinct explanation about how to create a 10-minute neighbourhood is needed. Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	See previous commentary on this matter. These have been added.
89.	Page 75 – Policy BL11 Mitigating Vehicular Impacts at Junctions & Pinch points	SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD19 and SD21 need to be included in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.	Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	These have been added.

90.	Page 76 – Policy BL12 Publicly Available Electric Vehicle Charging	SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD22 and SD48 need to be included (not SD19) in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.	Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	These have been added and SD19 removed.
91.	Page 91 – Policy BL17 Enhancing Community, Cultural, Sport & Recreation Facilities	It may be a good idea to include criteria about what you would do, and what you would expect, if facilities were proposed to be lost.	Amendments required to “future- proof” the policy and consider all potential scenarios.	This has been added as an additional clause.
92.	Page 91 – Policy BL17 Enhancing Community, Cultural, Sport & Recreation Facilities	SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD43 and SD46 need to be included (not SD3) in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.	Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.	This has been amended.
93.	Page 92 – Paragraph 8.10	<p>Please include the planning references either in text or as a footnote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC/39366/010 – Outline permission in June 2010 at Bohunt Manor for a new two-storey medical centre to accommodate both the surgeries in Liphook. • SDNP/12/00455/REM – Reserved matters approval in September 2012 at Bohunt Manner in relation to appearance, scale, and landscaping [0.85ha]. 	For ease of reading and finding information.	This has been added.

94.	Page 93 – Policy BL18 Adequate Health & Education Provision	I believe this is Policy BL18 (and not BL8 as written in the policy box)? SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD43 needs to be included (not SD45) in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.	Please correct policy number and include the correct SDNPA policy to show alignment with the SDLP.	This has been amended.
95.	Page 94 – Figure 24	What about the surgery off Station Road (near Portsmouth Road)?	Please double check map.	The SG confirm that this is now one (merged) surgery.
96.	Page 95 – Paragraph 9.4	I assume the question in this paragraph is a typo?	Please remove text error.	Amended.
97.	Policy BL19 Enhance Opportunities for Local Employment Policy BL20 Provide a Diverse Mix of Shops in the Retail Core of Liphook.	There is a bit of overlap between these two policies which leads to ambiguity when trying to implement in some scenarios. I would recommend being explicit about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BL19 focusing on Classes B, E, and F uses within identified employment areas, and Class B outside employment areas. • BL20 focusing on Classes C1, E, and F uses within the identified Liphook Town Centre boundary, and how you would want to consider the above uses outside the Liphook Centre boundary – both loss and provision of new. 	For ease of reading and understanding, and to avoid any potential ambiguity / policy holes.	Amended BL19. Agreed to amend the text to consider these matters. Also make reference to ‘light industrial’ being a particular need in the area (BL19)

98.	<p>Page 97 – Policy BL19</p> <p>Enhance Opportunities for Local Employment</p>	<p>I am wondering if the policy wording should be amended to state that “proposals for changes of use from existing employment and commercial premises (Classes B, E, and F) in the identified employment areas (see Figures 25 and 26), to a use and operation that does not provide employment opportunities, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that”</p> <p>You may also want to think about how you would consider the change of use of any existing employment sites outside the identified employment areas.</p>	<p>Amendments required to “future- proof” the policy and consider all potential scenarios.</p>	<p>This has been amended.</p>
99.	<p>Page 97 – Policy BL19</p> <p>Enhance Opportunities for Local Employment</p>	<p>The policy reads that you want to direct any new employment opportunities to existing employment sites. This is fine (and quite standard), but how would the policy be applied for new, or loss of, employment development outside the identified employment areas?</p>	<p>Amendments required to “future- proof” the policy and consider all potential scenarios.</p>	<p>This is addressed in Clause B of the policy.</p>
100.	<p>Page 97 – Policy BL19</p> <p>Enhance Opportunities for Local Employment</p>	<p>SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD34 and SD35 need to be included in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.</p>	<p>Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.</p>	<p>These have been added.</p>

101.	<p>Pages 100 to 101 – Policy BL20 Provide a Diverse Mix of Shops in the Retail Core of Liphook.</p>	<p>It’s not just about retail anymore. The policy name should be updated to “Liphook Town Centre” and be used to support the delivery of main town centre, commercial, and community uses (Classes C1, E, and F) in the defined Liphook Town Centre boundary (please include figure / map after the policy box).</p> <p>You should also explain how you would consider new, and loss of existing, town centre, commercial, and community uses outside of the identified Liphook Town Centre boundary.</p>	<p>Amendments required to “future- proof” the policy and consider all potential scenarios.</p>	<p>The policy has been renamed to “Enhancing the role and setting of Liphook village centre”.</p> <p>A map showing the village centre boundary has been added.</p> <p>This is considered within BL19.</p>
102.	<p>Pages 100 to 101 – Policy BL20 Provide a Diverse Mix of Shops in the Retail Core of Liphook.</p>	<p>SDNPA Local Plan Policies SD21, SD37, and SD38 need to be included in the conformity reference underneath the policy box.</p>	<p>Please include to show alignment with the SDLP.</p>	<p>These have been added.</p>
103.	<p>Page 103 – Policy BL21 Promoting Sustainable Rural Tourism</p>	<p>Are you defining “sustainable rural tourism” as tourism accommodation and related activities in the countryside, or as certain types of visitor accommodation (i.e., camping, glamping, and activity centres)? Clarity is needed here. In my broad view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New hotels and built accommodation should be focused in the defined settlement boundary, unless a proposal appropriately utilises the use of PDL and meets all other policy criteria. • New camping, glamping and activity centres proposed in the countryside should meet all criteria set out in SD23 	<p>Amendments required for clarity, and to “future-proof” the policy and consider all potential scenarios.</p>	<p>Definition added based on the South Downs National Park Sustainable Tourism Strategy (2015-2020).</p> <p>The policy has been slightly amended to incorporate the comments.</p>

		<p>and this new NDP policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing visitor accommodation (regardless of type) (either outside or inside the settlement boundary) should be protected and its expansion supported subject to all other policy criteria. As part of this, how would you consider a proposal which results in the loss (either in part or whole) of an existing tourist accommodation or attraction? <p>Criterion (A)(iv) needs to be strengthened to state that “the siting, scale and design of development should be informed by, and positively contribute towards, landscape character, natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage; and must not adversely affect the amenity, appearance, character, and historical significance of the area, including the South Downs National Park and its setting”.</p>		<p>Clause amended.</p>
104.	Page 105 – Paragraph 10.3	<p>Re second bullet point, is this planning meeting meant to be a “one-off” or a regular meeting? If so, please state frequency and membership, and please seek agreement with both EHDC and the SDNPA. In terms of the SDNPA, this would only be appropriate in bespoke circumstances so may not need to be a regular meeting.</p> <p>Re fourth bullet point, please amend to state that the adoption of the East Hampshire and/or South Downs Local Plans may trigger a need to review the NDP.</p>	<p>Factual correction and to seek clarification.</p>	<p>Amended to suggest a one-off meeting to discuss the content and broad application of the BLNDP policies.</p> <p>This has been amended.</p>

105.	General comment	If you have any infrastructure and community projects in mind, then it would be a good idea to list these here. References to projects in NDPs can help to: ensure that CIL money is used transparently to fund identified improvements/projects; and support applications for further s106, CIL and other funding sources.	For transparency, ease of reading, and understanding.	This section has been finalised by the PC.
106.	General comment	I think <u>some</u> of these non-policy actions could be potential projects (subject to wording and further review). You will need to be clear about what is a general infrastructure / community infrastructure project (Section 11), and what is a community aspiration /initiative (Section 12).	For transparency, ease of reading, and understanding.	As above.
107.	No.19	You may want to consider the delivery of “Changing Places”.	n/a	As above.
108.	General comment	I would recommend including a key/legend on each map, and only including the designations relevant to that map on the key/legend.	Amendments for ease of reading and understanding.	All maps have been reviewed and amended where necessary.
109.	General comment	As you have included HCC, it may be worth adding Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council (BLPC), East Hampshire District Council (EHDC), South Downs National Park (SDNP), and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) to the glossary.	Amendments for ease of reading and understanding.	Added.

110.	General comment	<p>Please include SDNPA SPDs and TANs – these can be found on our website here: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/</p> <p>In addition, please also include:</p> <p>South Downs Visitor Accommodation Review [2014]: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Visitor- Accommodation-Review- Technical-Appendices.pdf</p> <p>South Downs Tourism Strategy [2015]: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/national-park-authority/our-work/key- documents/sustainable-tourism-strategy-2015-20-2/</p> <p>South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) [2019]: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/south-downs-local-plan/local-plan/</p> <p>South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) [2020]: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/landscape-design-conservation/south-downs-landscape-character-assessment/</p>		Some are already listed. The others have been added.
111.	Appendix A – Bramshott & Liphook Design Guidance & Codes (page 125)	<p>There is no link to the design guidance and design code. Depending on size, this should be included in the appendix. We hope to review the design guidance and design code further at Reg16.</p>	For ease of reading and understanding, and finding information.	Link added. The document forms part of the Plan but is too large to include in the actual appendix in the Plan.

Table 5a: All other responses – Introduction

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
112.	Page 2	12 RES_2	Page 2 - Forward: “The Plan was developed through bringing together community aspirations” - STATEMENT NOT TRUE The Parish Council have steered and manipulated the NDP process and decisions over many years to ensure they get what they want (more CIL money) - the views of the community have NOT been reflected. E.G build 600+ houses where common sense suggests - behind Bohunt School, Central to the village with a purpose built infrastructure - when compared to distributing 600+ houses around the village, forcing the current infrastructure to cope. The Parish Council steered the NDPs journey for 7 years until they engineer this NDP version	<p>The SG consider that the Plan has been developed as a result of extensive community engagement. The decision not to allocate sites (of a strategic nature) was taken in January 2023 and the reasons are set out in the document.</p> <p>Notably the SG was written to in August 2022 by the SDNPA to state that site mentioned in the rep would not supported by the SDNPA for inclusion in the BLNDP as it is strategic in nature. Extract from the SDNPA email: “The National Park Authority does not support the allocation of strategic sites in Neighbourhood Plans. This is in line with Government policy. Therefore we would object to the allocation of Wetlands Park or indeed any other major development in the National Park in the Liphook Neighbourhood Plan”.</p> <p>Note that any sites in the EHDC part of the Parish will also be of a strategic nature.</p>
113.	Page 2	12 RES_2	Page 2 - “policies to address aspects of life that matter most to the community” STATEMENT NOT TRUE NDP Comments Pre-Submission Version July 2023 For the past 6 years - the NDP has been predicated on delivering “community benefits”. Delivering these benefit formed the basis of fundamental decisions made throughout its journey and steering committee meetings. All the community get now is - the Parish Council get more CIL Money to spend; EHDC and SDNP get an easy, non comital NDP and the NDP	<p>The BLNDP focuses on those areas that it has influence over relating to planning and is based on the views of local people following a comprehensive engagement programme.</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			Steering Committee get an easy ride - the community have lost all of the benefit originally outlined.	
114.	Page 2	12 RES_2	“Neighbourhood Development Plans are the way local people can have an input into decisions that affect where they live.” NEGLIGENT LEVEL OF COMMUNICATION Only a small fraction of community views have been considered and processed. Publication and communication of the NDP to the wider community was rejected by Parish Council design, withholding proper and wider public communication budgets to “keep the NDP under the public and Parish Council members radar”. This document is critical to Liphook’s future - but what communication has been done - 95+% of the community will not read it because they don’t know it exists and know even less about a NDP or the impact it is going to have. All fundamental decisions relating to Liphook’s future will now be made by the Developer, SDNP, EHDC - we - the community had our change to provide a clear and concise NDP outlining that the community actually wanted but this was never communicated with the community	The SG do not agree. A large amount of community engagement has taken place and this is set out in the Consultation Statement.
115.	Page 2	12 RES_2	“Once in place our robust NDP policies...” STATEMENT NOT TRUE The Policies provide are NOT ROBUST - they use weasel words to allow developer legal teams to deliver exactly what they want. NDP Policies must include words such as “will” and “must”, not “should”, “could”, “support”, “may”, “aims” ...	Policy wording has been strengthened where possible, however policies must be positively written and applicable to a range of development types.
116.	Page 2	12 RES_2	“The ongoing support of members, our planning consultant Alison Eardley, B&L Parish Council, SDNP & EHDC local authorities, Aecom and all the community is appreciated. “ STATEMENT VERY MISLEADING <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alison had done an amazing job. • B&L Parish Council - Have been heavily involve over the past 7 years- attending every NDP Steering Committee Meeting to ensure its going where they want it to go. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDNP and EHDC - only support the NDP if it represents what they want it to say • Aecom - The team from passfield proved Aecom incompetence. 	This is noted. As above, the Consultation Statement sets out the activities that have taken place throughout the process and how this has shaped the development of the Plan.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “all the community” is not true - only a small, select number have been engaged. 	
117.	Page 7 para 1.3	12 RES_2	Steering Group has established a vision and framework for the future of the designated area and to set out how that vision will be realised through planning land use and development change over the period to 2040. “ Please add a link to the Vision so that we can verify if the Vision is reflected in the Plan	The Vision is included in the Plan.
118.	Page 7 para 1.5	12 RES_2	“reflective of matters that are of considerable importance in the parish.” STATEMENT NOT TRUE The Parish Council have steered and manipulated the NDP process and decisions over many years to ensure they get what they want (more CIL money) - the views of the community have NOT been reflected. E.G build 600+ houses where common sense suggests - behind Bohunt School, Central to the village with minimal impact on the infrastructure - when compared NDP Comments Pre-Submission Version July 2023 to distributing 600+ houses around the village, forcing the current infrastructure to cope. The Parish council steered the NDP journey for 7 years until they engineer this version. “green boxes and these will be used to determine planning applications” - NOT TRUE, green box policies provide a wish list only. These will not be used to determine planning applications.	See responses above.
119.	Page 8 para 1.6 and 7	12 RES_2	“community projects” STATEMENT VERY MISLEADING During my time as Chair of the NDP Steering Committee - the Parish Council refused responsibility to lead “community projects” - has this changed? If so - is there a Parish Council Plan to deliver community / infrastructure projects? If so - who is actually charged to deliver this work?	Section 12 of the Plan sets out the Community Projects. These have been extracted from the engagement process. It is not necessarily the case that the PC would lead on these projects as there may be other bodies better placed to do this.
120.	Page 10 para 1.8	12 RES_2	“communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area” STATEMENT VERY MISLEADING Only a small fraction of community views were ever processed. Publication and communication of the NDP was negligent by Parish Council design, withholding proper and wider public	See previous response.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			communication budgets to “keep the NDP under the radar” was/is the agenda.	
121.	Page 13 para 1.19	12 RES_2	“Consultation Statement to be submitted alongside the Submission Draft Plan at Regulation 16” Please can you provide this now? As previously mentioned - Evidence of materials actually used or ignored will show only a small fraction of community views were ever processed. Publication and communication of the NDP was negligent by Parish Council design, withholding proper and wider public communication budgets to “keep the NDP under the radar” was/is the agenda	The Consultation Statement will be submitted to EHDC as per the legislation alongside the Submission Version Plan.
122.	Page 13 para 1.20	12 RES_2	“Images from the consultation and engagement events” These two images - truly reflect the lack of evidence supporting the level of communication with the community	The full record of engagement activity is set out in the Consultation Statement.
123.	Page 14	12 RES_2	“Sustainability and responding to the climate emergency” STATEMENT VERY MISLEADING My concern is that the Parish Council have ignored all this evidence when they invested £36k for a new Millennium Hall gas boiler and subsequent cost of gas to the public when a Heat Source Pump would have saved £1000's in gas costs. Where are the solar panels provide electricity to Parish Council buildings? - My point: This current Parish Council is and will continue to ignore “Sustainability and responding to the climate emergency” - how will they ever deliver “Community Projects”?	This is a comment for the PC as opposed to about the BLNDP and has been passed on.
124.	Page 15 para 1.26	12 RES_2	STATEMENT NOT TRUE How will the Steering Committee deliver this statement as it will be disbanded following a ‘made’ plan (See NDP Terms of reference).	The SG has considered each policy in terms of environmental impact. Whilst the SG will no longer exist should the plan be ‘made’, it ensures that future decisions involving the policies are future proofed.
125.	Page 15 para 1.27,28,29	12 RES_2	“The screening Determination Statement has concluded that the BLNDP is unlikely to have significant environmental effects on designated biodiversity, heritage and landscape assets and therefore will not require a Strategic Environmental Assessment environmental report.” STATEMENT NOT TRUE How can this be true - when you plan to build 600+ houses in Liphook	This is correct. The draft NDP has been screened by EHDC, in consultation with Historic England, Natural England the Environment Agency. This is as per the legislation. The screening has determined that the policies –

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			without impacting the environment and habitat population - What does "Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment (to be updated)" mean ?	individually and collectively – are unlikely to have significant environmental impacts. The superfluous words have been removed from the text.
126.	Page 18	12 RES_2	"Main opportunities and challenges facing the parish" FACT You need to add links or statements to evidence how the NDP will address / resolve these KNOW issues.	Not all the challenges can be adequately dealt with via the planning system. The BLNDP identifies challenges and opportunities and acknowledges them. The vision and objectives - and the policies themselves - seek to address them as far as possible.
127.	Page 20 para 3.1	12 RES_2	"the vision and objectives for the Parish to 2038" How does the NDP deliver these objectives?	Each policy has a conformity reference detailing which objective it relates to.
128.	Page 21	12 RES_2	"Figure 2: Principles underlying the BLNDP" STATEMENT NOT TRUE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood - you haven't listened to "residents" or "supported highest needs" • Sustainability - It not a holistic approach its more piecemeal development with not supporting infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative - no it not. • SMART - it's not - how do you plan to measure the success of the NDP? 	See previous comments relating to engagement on the BLNDP. The SG are working towards developing a series of measures to monitor the Plan. It is a policy document however, as opposed to an action plan, so the emphasis will be on understanding how the policies have been applied/ interpreted.
129.	Page 22 para 4.1	12 RES_2	"The Steering Group has carefully considered whether it might allocate sites within the BLNDP itself." FACT For 6 years it was agreed by SDNP, EHDC and Parish Council that the NDP WOULD allocate sites as required by the Community. This was changed because SDNP and EHDC wanted it to and the Parish Council wanted more Cash from CIL - how does this reflect or represent what the community wanted? Prior to this decision the community could decide where and when housing would be delivered - now - we appear to have given this decision to SDNP and EHDC. The consultation that presented this decision achieved meeting the "engagement process" but did not truly address the main issues, coupled with poor community	This is not correct. See previous reference to the email from SDNPA. There has never been a community consensus on the delivery of sites and notably confirming which site/s would be most appropriate to deliver. Regardless all sites are of a strategic nature. The policies, however, seek to influence development – including discussions with the LAs and prospective developers.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			communication - of course the NDP would take the easy decision to Support EHDC, SDNP and Parish Council....	
130.	Chapter 1 P27 Figure 4	12	<p>A) The location of any development within Liphook is very controversial and leaving allocation to the SDNP and EHDC allows the referendum to focus on wider issues.</p> <p>B) Liphook, with a railway station and the A3 nearby, is recognised as a Large Local Service Centre. However Covid and the internet have changed working and shopping habits, making both transport connections and Liphook's role as a "District Centre' with shops and other services" less important.</p> <p>C) Figure 9 shows at least 6 developments outside the existing EHDC settlement policy boundary for Liphook. Space for development within a 10 minute walk of Liphook centre is limited to two brownfield sites and land within the Park.</p> <p>D) The conditions proposed to regulate development outside settlement boundaries are welcome and designed to maintain the character of the area and prevent smaller developments to coalesce.</p> <p>E) However could these conditions also be applied to develop smaller settlements and provide more new housing within the parish? Fig 4</p>	<p>A. Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>B.This is noted, however, the BLNDP must be in conformity with the adopted Local Plans; the EHDC Local Plan categorises it as a Large Local Service Centre.</p> <p>C.Noted. The SG has applied a 10-minute approximate walk limit to the map however the emphasis is on <u>connectivity</u> to the active travel network as opposed to rigid restriction to 10 minutes, and the policies reflect this.</p> <p>D. Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>E.The principle of development is already established within the built up area. The other policies in the plan, however, collectively seek to ensure that all development – within or outside the settlement boundary – are sustainably located and planned and connected.</p>

Table 5b: All other response Vision 1 - Sustainable Development and Housing

131.	Chapter 1 P23 Allocation of sites	12	I'm sure you are right not to try to deal with 'allocations': far better to leave that to the two planning authorities who both have the capacity and professional expertise to assess the right allocations. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.
132.	Chapter 1 P23 Allocation of sites	12	I agree with the policies overall and with not allocating sites in Liphook as there does not need to be encouragement to build when there is no proven need.	Thank you for your comment. The non-allocation of sites in the BLNDP does not preclude the Local Authorities from making strategic allocations in the parish.
133.	Chapter 1 P23 Allocation of sites	12	It is a good idea not to allocate a particular site especially if extra housing is not needed at the present time.	There is a housing need, but this will be addressed via the strategic local authority Local Plans, influenced by the BLNDP policies, for instance in terms of the mix of housing delivered on any new sites.
134.	Chapter 1 P23 Allocation of sites	12	I agree it is the right thing to do not to allocate sites in Liphook given the difficulties of getting the SDNP land protected from unnecessary housing in a protected landscape area.	Thank you for your comment.
135.	Chapter 1 P23 Allocation of sites	12 RES_3	To avoid huge rows in and around the parish the group's decision to concentrate on "policies and codes" rather than sites seems to be a wise action, particularly given the dead hand effect on part of the parish being within the SDNP. Whatever might be proposed will need to be subject to the proposed East Hampshire District plan and its SNP equivalent. Until both of these plans are settled it is impossible for the NDP group to suggest possible sites, be they within or without the settlement boundary, to do so would make the parish council a hostage to fortune. In any event sites will be driven by the two senior plans, what the NDP might suggest will almost certainly be ignored.	Thank you for your comment.

136.	BL1	12 RES_2	<p>CLARIFICATION NEEDED A. Is it true that - this is a meaningless statement as Local Plans are controlled by EHDC and SDNP who can do what they want?</p> <p>B. Is it true that (i) to (v) apply to development outside the settlement boundary - eg. Chicken Farm, Devils Lane, Penally Farm, Headley Road, Passfield etc - all the areas originally covered in the NDP which were deemed "unsuitable" by the Steering Committee? Also - Re point (v) what is meant by "major development proposals", where is this defined?</p> <p>C. Is it true that - the only supported brownfield developments are not for sale or being considered for development?</p>	<p>A – The principle of development is already established in the defined settlement boundary.</p> <p>B.The clauses would be used to shape any future development outside the development boundary. The SG is in discussion with EHDC and SDNPA in relation to the emerging Local Plans, to ensure that these principles are embedded in any strategic allocations they bring forward.</p> <p>C. There are very few brownfield sites in the parish currently, but that is not to say that more may arise over the lifespan of the BLNDP.</p>
137.	BL1	12	<p>New housing to be within the 30mph limit.</p>	<p>Speed enforcement is outside the scope of the BLNDP and speed limits are subject to change. The SG consider it more prudent to ensure that new development is well connected to the key facilities of the village, as set out in BL1 and BL10.</p>
138.	BL1	12	<p>Having read this section a couple of times I am not sure whether my point set out below is covered.</p> <p>My comment is: Are you able to have a Policy that puts restrictions on converting smaller properties beyond their initial footprint. This would aid movement of people from smaller homes (lower in value) to larger homes, BUT probably more likely the other way around to encourage "down sizing". If you look at the current planning applications most of them are adding to the ground floor footprint. The other "problem" is increasing bungalow type properties, or even worse knocking them down and building a house (normally because of the size of garden). I think we need specific Policies to cover the</p>	<p>Permitted development rights already enable a certain amount of enlargement of properties to take place without the need for planning permission to be sought. A policy could not therefore prevent such rights.</p> <p>Some people may find it easier and more cost effective to enlarge or rearrange their existing instead of moving house.</p>

			protection the existing "range" of homes to really encourage people moving up and down to match their emerging needs and stop developers/owners from buying small properties and then enlarging them to sell off at a much higher price.	
139.	BL1 P30 FIGURE 9	12	Figure 9 shows at least 6 developments outside the existing EHDC settlement policy boundary for Liphook. Space for development within a 10 minute walk of Liphook centre is limited to two brownfield sites and land within the Park.	Noted. The SG is minded to apply a 15 minute and 20 minute walk time to the map – the emphasis is on connectivity as opposed to rigid restriction to 10 minutes, and the policies reflect this.
140.	BL1 P30 FIGURE 9	9	Figure 9 is considered to not accurately represent the issue of walkable neighbourhoods. The accompanying representations on the attached PDF set out that, East Hampshire District Council (EHDC), Hampshire County Council, SusTrans, Sport England, the Design Council, Living Streets, the Department for Education, Fields in Trust and Lands Improvement, are amongst the supporters of the “20-minute Neighbourhoods”. The emerging EHDC Local Plan Regulation 18 Part 1 Issues and Priorities also refer to 20-minute neighbourhoods. The distance in the figure should be increased to 20-minutes to reflect the situation identified by other key guidance and policy.	This is noted. The purpose of the policy is to support the concept of walkable neighbourhoods and enshrine this in the plan. It does not mean that developments cannot take place outside the red area, rather the emphasis is on accessibility and connectivity – hence that Figure includes strategic linkages that would need improvement in order to unlock sites beyond the most walkable areas.
141.	BL1	12	A; Development in the neighbourhood area will be focused within the settlement policy boundaries as shown on Figures 4 to 8 but upon the adoption of the East Hampshire Local Plan 2021-2024, the boundaries should comply to Local Plan policy. B: Development proposals outside the settlement policy boundaries will be supported where they:	The emphasis is on connectivity as opposed to rigid restriction to 10 minutes, and the policies reflect this. The 10 minutes is shown to reflect good practice on walkable neighbourhoods, as set out in the Town and Country Planning advice notes on '20 minute neighbourhoods' (where the 20 minutes refers to the

			<p>iv: are capable of connecting to the primary movement route network (Policy BL10), supporting the 10min walkable neighbourhood concept</p> <p>According to the BLNDP Policy Map there is nowhere outside the Settlement Boundary that is within the 10 minute walkable neighbourhood concept so does that mean that BLNDP will not support any future development proposals outside the settlement boundary?</p> <p>Also the map is not a true representation of a 10 minute walkable neighbourhood, it is just a “line on a map” and not a representation of how long it takes to walk within the Parish using the existing footpaths and roads.</p>	<p>walking time from home to facility and back again – i.e. 10 minutes each way).</p>
142.	BL1	12	<p>Lack of truly affordable housing. The Housing Association affordable rent is not actually affordable as a single parent when your children do not live with you.</p>	<p>This is noted. Affordable rents are defined nationally as a discounted rate against market provision.</p>
143.	BL1	9	<p>We agree with the approach, whereby BLNDP is not specifically allocating development sites as this process will be best managed by the Local Plan Review, also ensuring conformity is maintained, in spite of different timescales for adoption. The policy seeks to ensure that development is directed to the most appropriate, sustainable locations where there is easy access to the main village services and facilities. This reflects national planning policy and its focus on accessibility is also welcomed and appropriate.</p> <p>We consider however that criteria B) of the policy, and particularly the definition and focus on “10 minute</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>As per previous comments, the emphasis is on connectivity as opposed to rigid restriction to 10 minutes, and the policies reflect this.</p>

		<p>neighbourhoods” is unnecessarily restrictive and that greater flexibility is required for the following reasons. Chiefly the proposed approach is much more onerous than well-publicised concepts by expert bodies consider necessary. These include the Town and Country Planning Association which focuses on concepts of “15 minute cities” and “20 minute neighbourhoods”. These are based upon industry practice, such as recommended walking distances provided by the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) and those set out in ‘Manual for Streets’. These identify and recommend distances that support the likelihood residents will choose to walk between their homes and local facilities and which are sufficient to achieve significant modal shifts away from private car use. Therefore a 10 minute target is not necessary.</p> <p>The aforementioned concepts also go further, however, than a focus on walking distances. The TCPA guidance “20 Minute Neighbourhoods” notes (pp19);</p> <p>“In seeking to make new or existing neighbourhoods more liveable, it is vital to understand the needs of local people and businesses, rather than taking a prescriptive approach to walking times and distances. It is important to recognise that the 20-minute neighbourhood is a holistic approach to place-making, and is not just a matter of improving walking conditions.</p> <p>Not all neighbourhoods will include a full range of services or facilities accessible by foot, which is why it is important to provide high-quality cycling routes and</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>public transport for longer journeys to other places. Public transport that is affordable, reliable, convenient, clean and accessible can also help to encourage people not to travel by car.”</p> <p>The Chiltley Lane site offers walking times of 14 minutes to the railway station, and includes proposals to improve accessibility to new and existing residents by enhancing the local bus services. Consideration at the previous planning appeal saw the appointed Inspector conclude the site was sufficiently accessible to support residential development.</p> <p>The Policy points to proposed strategic links and these (shown on Figure 9) show a strategic crossing of the railway line in the Chiltley Lane site. While my client is not averse in principle to the concept they have had no formal discussions (or requests for such) from the NDP group to discuss it. Bloor Homes had considered such a connection in scoping development options for the site and concluded that the provision of a crossing (pedestrian bridge) would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be prohibitively expensive to fund from the site alone in addition to CIL requirements which would in any event be expected to fund such infrastructure. 2. Involve third-party land on the north side of the railway line making it unfeasible for Bloor Homes to deliver. 3. Not have a meaningful effect on journey times on foot to local facilities, in any event, compared with available and safe routes through the Berg Estate and along 	<p>As above.</p> <p>The policy gives substantial weight, not priority weight. This conforms to para 119 of the NPPF.</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>Midhurst road. Evidence in this regard is set out by the Transport Assessment (para. 4.21, pp21, and Figure 3) supporting planning application 22789/007.</p> <p>Finally, we note that criteria C) of the policy gives priority weight to previously developed sites. This goes beyond government’s national policy stance, set out in the Framework at paragraph 85 for example, which gives equal billing to physically well-related sites on the edges of settlements.</p>	
144.	BL1	9	<p>(Agree) In part, provided that Policy relates to 20-minute walkable neighbourhoods in line with the National, County and Local Planning Authority recognised distance. See submitted details on the PDF document setting out the issue in detail.</p>	As above.
145.	BL1	9	<p>It can be difficult to ensure conformity with the strategic policies in a situation where the district-level development plan is out of date, therefore it is critical that the NDP provides enough flexibility to respond to an evolving strategic context in East Hampshire.</p> <p>We note the steering group’s previous intention to allocate sites for development based on local housing need, and that it is considered that the Parish has met its current housing number allocated within the adopted Local Plan. The steering group will be aware that EHDC’s emerging housing strategy has yet to be determined, and that it is evident that the district will need to identify more sites to accommodate the levels of housing need established by the local housing need calculated in</p>	<p>Noted and the SG has sought to do this.</p> <p>This is understood and the SG are aware that there is likely to be consideration in the emerging Local Plan(s) of a strategic site(s) as part of that work.</p>

		<p>accordance with the Government’s standard methodology. Liphook’s new status is as a Tier 1 (large) settlement where ‘more development is likely’ (as confirmed by the Issues & Priorities document). These are considered the most sustainable locations for development, which would reduce ‘East Hampshire’s higher-than-average dependence on the car.</p> <p>Clarity should be sought on the above, and the NDP should build in sufficient flexibility to ensure it accords with the emerging Local Plan at the point of adoption and therefore supports development where it is later allocated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We note that the draft NDP acknowledges at paragraph 4.16 that there will be a need to accommodate additional housing and employment sites. A set of parameters are then set out, to be considered to support the proposed growth strategies for both EHDC and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA). This includes focusing development to within defined settlement boundaries, however it should also be acknowledged that the current settlement boundaries date back a number of years, and that appropriate and sustainable development will inevitably have to be provided on suitable sites outside of the settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Draft policy BL1 seeks to set in policy a requirement for development to be focused within the settlement boundaries. Whilst there is acknowledgement that the current EHDC Local Plan will be succeeded, we suggest</p>	<p>The settlement boundaries are being reviewed at the strategic level and the policy will accord with those in the most up-to-date local plan(s).</p> <p>See comment above.</p> <p>Clause B seeks to do this.</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>that the policy should specifically recognise the likely increase in housing need resulting from the application of the standard methodology in the emerging Local Plan, together with the opportunity EHDC’s has to allocate sites outside of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The draft policy should be clear about the circumstances in which development outside of the settlement boundaries could be supported. This is important given the strategic context as described in this letter, namely the age of the district-level development plan, the lack of 5-year housing land supply (East Hampshire Five-Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement), and EHDC’s recent adoption of the Housing Outside of Settlement Boundaries SPD.</p> <p>We note that part B of draft policy BL1 now references a 10-minute walkable neighbourhood concept. Elsewhere within the NDP references are made to the 20-minute neighbourhood, and confirmation is given that this has derived from the concept promoted by the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA). There appears to be no explanation or justification as to the switch from the TCPA concept, as also promoted by EHDC, to a unique 10-minute proposal for Liphook. Bellway therefore objects to policy BL1 on this basis. The alternative of a 20-minute neighbourhood concept could be considered an admirable aim, but we consider that an Examiner is likely to require the NDP to go further, and to specifically address the likely situation whereby development outside of settlement boundaries has to be considered. On this basis, we strongly suggest that the</p>	<p>See previous comments on this.</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

			NDP sets out the broad parameters against which a planning application for housing outside of the existing settlement boundaries should be assessed.	
146.	BL1	11	The policy should make mention of the support given to expanded existing employment areas which are identified in the plan. A number of these are outside of the settlement boundary but would be the most sustainable option for providing additional employment floorspace.	Support for such expansion is included in Policy BL19.
147.	BL2	12	Particularly support prioritising provision for Key Workers and those with local connections to the parish. Percentages of percentages difficult to understand, pie charts might help interpret figures.	This is noted – Policy BL2 seeks to enable this through the implementation of First Homes, however, EHDC has suggested that they are not looking to include provision for First Homes in their emerging Local Plan – the SG will continue to support this product through the NDP, but not require it.
148.	BL2	12	Yes, all very sensible.	Thank you for your comment.
149.	BL2	12 RES_2	Is it true that all development is going to be in LIPHOOK - Bramshott has agreed to none?	No, the principle of development is established within defined settlement boundaries. Bramshott has a settlement boundary and therefore could be subject to development. This is in addition to any strategic sites brought forward via the emerging Local Plans.
150.		12 RES_3	The question of car parking was raised and the example of a 3-bedroom house occupied by mother and father and two adult children of working age came up. Given the nature of the village, particularly that most people leave it for the purpose of employment, that will almost certainly be a three or possibly four car family. Whilst there are national standards as the number of parking spaces per new dwelling, would it not be possible for any neighbourhood policy to acknowledge this situation and	A key challenge that has been raised by local people relates to traffic congestion in the village. Creating space for more cars will only add to this issue. The emphasis for the BLNDP is to encourage more active travel, where possible. This supports the HCC Local Transport Plan.

			say that for Bramshott and Liphook it should be “one parking space per bedroom”? Your group colleague Andrew (not sure of his surname) in passing mentioned as part of this conversation “over occupation”. I do hope he was not suggesting that occupation of the family home in those suggested circumstances (not unusual) is something to be deprecated.	Car parking at residential dwellings is supported and standards are set locally by EHDC/SDNPA.
151.	BL2	9	It is important that policy BL2 allow flexibility in light of the emerging evidence base to the emerging EHLP and also changing circumstances at a local level, including changing market signals and housing needs. Accordingly the policy should be revised to build in such flexibility.	This is noted, however the evidence base includes detailed information about housing need within the Parish itself, which does need to be addressed. It is likely that any strategic allocations in the emerging Local Plans would address this, as well as contributing to wider strategic needs.
152.	BL2	9	<p>Policy BL2. Meeting Local Housing Need</p> <p>We welcome detail on the expectations of housing mix, and note the individual findings of the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA. Aecom, 2021), the findings of which were complemented by the Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment commissioned by EHDC (HEDNA, Icen, 2022). Collectively these show a widening chasm of unaffordable housing and inadequate access to affordable housing in the village. We note the conclusions in regard to the sheer number of affordable homes that would be needed, annually, to meet present needs.</p> <p>We identify similar issues on a District scale in the Planning Statement for application 22789/007 and particularly highlight the long waiting list for those on the housing register and most in need of affordable housing – ranging typically as long as 4 years.</p>	This is noted, however the evidence base includes detailed information about housing need within the Parish itself, which does need to be addressed. It is likely that any strategic allocations in the emerging Local Plans would address this, as well as contributing to wider strategic needs.

			<p>We consider that Criteria A of the policy should recognise in more detail the scale of housing need, and clarify that it welcomes all forms, tenures and sizes of housing where it aligns with local demand and needs. In terms of Mix criteria A(i) should align to national planning policy and reflect Joint Core Strategy policy (CP10) in recognising a preference that follows the latest available evidence, rather than specify a wide focus on modest-sized 1-3 bedroom homes.</p> <p>As per the HNA smaller market housing is essentially as unaffordable as larger housing to wide groups in the local population. Therefore, ensuring the flexibility necessary is available to maximise the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered by market-led housing schemes is vital. Strong support should be given also to any proposed uplift in affordable housing above that required by the development plan (presently 40% in the JCS).</p> <p>Support for other types of housing is welcomed but the requirement of residential development to meet the needs of elderly persons in all cases, as opposed to where feasible is not recommended. While development at Chiltley Lane for example supports the inclusion of accessibility measures such as Optional Technical Standards under Building Regulations part M4(2) other sites may not have that capability.</p>	
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

153.	BL3	12	<p>I don't think slate tiles are common in Liphook.</p> <p>Changes to rules on permitted development could make maintaining a building's character more difficult to ensure.</p>	<p>The SG discussed this and considered that there are examples of this material in the parish, so have opted to retain reference to this.</p> <p>This is correct. The policy can only legally influence development where a planning application is required. That said, within the village core itself, some of the area is covered by the Conservation Area where pd rights are more limited.</p> <p>The Design Guide will be available for all residents to access and the community are encouraged to follow its guidance.</p>
154.	BL3	12	<p>Can't really object to this, all seems good.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
155.	BL3	12 RES_2	<p>“should demonstrate how they have sought to address the following matters” should be changes to - “must demonstrate how they will address the following matters... “</p>	<p>The wording has been amended as it is considered that all of the clauses are compulsory. The policy remains flexible as it is subject to the nature, scale and location of the development in question.</p>
156.	BL3	9	<p>Within the Bramshott and Liphook Design Guidance and Codes, 'BF03 - Define Front and Back Gardens' it states that "North facing back gardens should exceed 10m in length to ensure sunlight is maximised."</p> <p>We believe this should be deleted, as it is unnecessary. Many people like a north facing garden as it has good shade and that is their preference. A north facing garden still gets good sunlight during the day. The need for shade will become more important in the future, as the climate changes.</p>	<p>This is guidance and is considered to be flexible, while encouraging access to sunlight.</p>
157.	BL3	9	<p>BL3. Character and Design of Development</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

		<p>We note that supporting text, Table 2 references more recent development like Chiltley Way estate as lower density allowing a more suburban feel.</p> <p>Policy criteria A sets out development should be high quality and designed to integrate well with local surroundings, changing need and natural environment which we welcome.</p> <p>We welcome further criteria in part B) of the draft policy. In both instances however, we recognise there is a need for additional qualification that some sites have the capacity to depart from adjacent character in favour of meeting NPPF goals. This was the case with the Chiltley Lane appeal scheme whereby the Inspector found there was no need to follow the character and density of adjacent development on the Berg Estate.</p> <p>That conclusion remains consistent with national policy in the Framework through which the government espouses both “making effective use of land” (para. 119-123), and “achieving appropriate densities” (para. 124 to 125). The latter recognises that development is an ongoing process and that using land effectively and efficiently reduces pressures to release as much land for development in the future.</p> <p>In that vein specifying through Criteria C) that development at the edge of settlements must mitigate effects through lower density development and be less dense to blend into the wider countryside. Therefore, we recommend that Criteria C is removed and re-</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, however, the SG are keen to reflect prevailing character in a given area.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SG have amended Clause C (now D), on the advice of the SDNPA. It is considered important to ensure that edge of settlement development is carefully planned and criteria as to how to manage this are provided.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			included as supporting text, not a requirement, and qualified to be “in many cases”.	
158.	BL4	12	This must be a priority, we need the infrastructure to encourage people to become more sustainable to create a safer future.	Thank you for your comment.
159.	BL4	12	Recent solar panels can be more aesthetically pleasing than older roof styles. Possible changes to financial support for renewable energy provision may lead to heat source pumps being more affordable	Thank you for your comment.
160.	BL4	12 RES_2	<p>“as appropriate to their scale, nature and location” - where is this defined? This gives developers the right to build what they want. B (viii) - “Providing the infrastructure for adequate electric vehicle charging points” - this is great for the single piecemeal development - this promotes failure because the development has NOT considered Liphook’s wider infrastructure. Change the wording to include “all changes to Liphook’s wider infrastructure to accommodate the piecemeal development”.</p> <p>REMOVE - “Where a development cannot achieve one or more of the criteria above (for practical reasons), this would not render the scheme unacceptable, provided that a robust justification can be provided by the developer.” - Guess what - each developer will not be able to “achieve one or more of the criteria above (for practical reasons)</p> <p>”and justification will be provided” - • Who will assess the “justification” -</p>	<p>The BLNDP policies must be relevant to all types of development, from a small extension to a major housing scheme. The policies are considered to be flexible to enable sensible interpretation to those applying them in practice. The clauses within the policy set out greater detail to be delivered. These cannot be stipulated, however, as it would go above and beyond national policy and building regulations requirements.</p> <p>SG agreed to remove the text under Clause B.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will decide to let it through? EHDC will accept £50 to allow it - as they always do and let the Liphook Community suffer. • Who is in control of this - the old NDP would have included the wider infrastructure issues - that is what the word holistic means as you introduced on page 21 SUSTAINABLE! “water-source heat pumps utilising the River Wey and installation of solar panels on community and public sector buildings” • What does this mean for the River Wey? • Other than a back-hander - why would a developer provide these? 	<p>This is the only NDP. There has not been a previous made Neighbourhood Plan in B&L.</p>
161.	BL4	9	<p>BL4. Climate Change and Design</p> <p>We note that the policy does not stipulate overall performance thresholds for energy or water consumption and that this is appropriate given that via the Energy Act 2008, the 2015 Written Ministerial Statement and national planning policy such standards are set through Building Regulations and Optional Technical Standards.</p> <p>There is a need to ensure that the NDP adheres to Local Plan Policy and National Policy requirements for sustainable construction and renewable energy/low carbon energy sources. Therefore additional clarity should be given in Criteria A, or separately, that measures required by draft policy BL4 in conformity with the wider development plan requirement at Policy CP24 of the JCS require at least 10% of energy demand from the aforementioned sources.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>All policies in the development plan are read collectively – there is no need to repeat a policy in the NDP policy. Policy CP24 referenced in the rep is included in the conformity reference below the BLNDP policy to assist in that read across.</p>

162.	CHAPTER 1 GENERAL	12	Housing development to be within or adjacent to the existing settlement policy boundary. Not in the countryside proper.	Noted. This is stipulated in BL1 but even national policy allows development in the wider countryside – the second part of Policy BL1 addresses this by applying additional criteria.
163.	Surface water drainage from Thameswater (see letter for full context)	3	With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan: “It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”	Noted. This has been added to the Design Policy (BL3) supporting text.
164.	Proposed new water policy from Thameswater (see letter for full context)	3	We consider that Neighbourhood Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of wastewater/sewerage [and water supply] infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend the Neighbourhood Plan include the following policy/supporting text: PROPOSED NEW WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT “Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.” “The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended	Noted although this is a strategic issue covered by the Local Plans.

			delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”	
--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Table 5c: All other response Vision 2 - Biodiverse Environment and Green Spaces

165.	Vision 2 GENERAL		I want more green/environmental policies/improvement. The environment is a key part of our existence and destroying it/suffocating it will have horrifying effects for humanity. This can be done by planting more trees in pavements which cross like an arch over the road etc.	Policy BL3 encourages the planting of trees as part of development. Policy BL5 explicitly supports the planting of street trees.
166.	BL5	12	Biodiversity is key, places like Liphook used to be a hotspot for wildlife when it used to be more rural than it currently is. This can still be restored by making the right decisions when it comes to new and current developments.	Policy BL5 seeks to address this by identifying Biodiversity Opportunity Areas in the Parish that should be prioritised for net gain.
167.	BL5	12	BOAs are agreed.	Noted.
168.	BL5	12	Any housing development must be designed with soft landscaping as important to the application as the house design.	Noted. This is included within Policy BL3.
169.	BL5	12	5.11. "space for local recreation, for instance in Radford Park important role in storm water management" River Wey (Blue infrastructure network -BLPC) 5.15. (p48) "Radford Park is proposed for designation as a	The BLNDP does not seek to divide up Radford Park. The PC has a Plan which seeks to enhance and improve the park from an historic, amenity and conservation perspective. The BLNDP seeks to designate the Park as

		<p>local green space separated into three distinct areas (historic, amenity, & conservation) plans to construct a boardwalk to enable a circular walk around the Park for all abilities. The ancient water meadows will be *kept open* & restored as much as possible. There are some areas where new trees could be planted, *especially on the amenity area.*"</p> <p>Recommendation: Although Radford Park is outside Settlement policy boundary it is in the Neighbourhood. It really is an open space. The NDP proposal insinuates dividing Radford Park into areas & restricting access or use under the guise of 'biodiversity conservation' -as evident with the new signage. Does this proposed GREEN SPACE designation benefit the public when it is clear that there is much room & need for improvement? Especially to make it more accessible & enjoyable. for example in many areas such as inadequate drainage runing from the houses, muddy paths, silting, pollution when it rains etc. Radford Park as a whole is primarily a community amenity for recreation, from walking to playing on/by the river, exploring, the history & so on (eg Natural Play BL17). Under no circumstances should it be divided & people be restricted to what they do there, to favour recreation over so called wildlife albeit within reason.</p> <p>For example p 137 (Appx B) Plans are in place to make this (Radford Park) accessible to *all* users with two circular walks. Is there is scope in GREEN SPACES to incorporate a cycle loop for casual/learners with possible 'Pumptack' section for the more energetic (a sort of 'Natural Play')? (BL10: Improving cycling opportunities. Also BL17. Enhancing recreational facilities.) Or will there be a No Cycling sign put up to favour the park for walkers only (Re:</p>	<p>a Local Green Space, which would safeguard it from inappropriate development.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			Dog fouling). See also comments in Policy BL13 Radford Park Heritage facility.	
170.	BL5	12 RES_2	A. “Proposals should be” - change to “must be” C. “Where net gain units cannot be delivered on site, these should be prioritised for use within the parish, focussing on maintaining and improving the biodiversity opportunity areas identified locally. “ • Who will manage this? D. “Measures” - what measures - who will define this and ensure it’s applicable for 30 years?	This has been changed, but with additional wording as the policy must be sufficiently flexible to all types of development. C. This would be managed by way of a legal agreement / planning condition.
171.	BL5 Figure 11	12	Figure 11 shows sunken lanes around Bramshott but not Chiltley Lane, and I would have expected others elsewhere in the parish.	The SG has checked the sunken lanes against the EHDC map and amended accordingly. Some lanes mentioned my not be defined sunken lanes by EHDC.
172.	BL5 Figure 11 & 12	12	Figure 11 and 12 appear to only focus on Sunken Lanes within Bramshott. No mention is made of Hewshot Lane, Devils Lane or Chiltley Lane. It would appear that Bramshott is being highlighted as a place needing special protection and Liphook is not. Some bias towards Bramshott not having any future developments appears throughout the Plan, even though there are areas within the village of Bramshott which could accommodate development.	As above.
173.	BL5	9	BL5. Green & Blue Infrastructure and delivering Biodiversity Net Gain The core requirement of policy BL5 Criteria A) is a 10% post development net gain, which reflects the impending requirements of the Biodiversity Net Gain Regulations; due to be enacted from November 2023 and April 2024 (for small sites). However, for that same reason it is not necessary to make this a further requirement in a	Noted, however the policy is seeking, as far as possible, to ensure that net gain is ‘spent’ within the parish so as to maximise benefits to the local community.

			<p>Neighbourhood Plan. Moreover, the requirement is not of the existing development plan policies which the Neighbourhood Plan must conform with and extend beyond its requirements. Finally, the additional detailed requirements set out by criteria such as at criteria B) and C), run the risk of not conforming with the Regulations. For these reasons Criteria A, B and C of the policy should be significantly simplified or deleted.</p> <p>Criteria G requires adherence to Building with Nature 12 standards. This should be reworded to be expressed as an aspiration and not as a requirement to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan confirms with policies in the wider development plan at present.</p>	<p>Noted, however the SG are keen to support such initiatives.</p>
174.	BL6	12	<p>Development has an environmental impact on the access route as well as the construction area, particularly if the site is outside a settlement boundary.</p>	<p>Noted – the policy would apply to a planning application, many of which will include information relating to access arrangements.</p>
175.	BL6	12	<p>Yes. Protect hedgerows. These are natures corridors as well as reserves in their own right. Use the Hedgerow Regulations to the full.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
176.	BL6	12	<p>Also a key policy which needs to be heavily pushed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
177.	BL6	12 RES_2	<p>A. “Development proposals should” - change to “must” B. “appropriate to their scale, nature and location” - who decided this? In the original NDP, the local community would have decided - but now we are leaving it up to the developer and someone in EHDC who doesn’t know Liphook. “Proposals should seek to” - what does this</p>	<p>This is worded as such to enable flexibility when applying to different types and sizes and locations of developments.</p> <p>Policies are ultimately used by the Planning Committee/ delegated officer in decision making. They must be adequately flexible to enable this.</p>

			mean? A developer will only deliver what they must - that will not “seek” anything extra....	
178.	BL6	9	<p>We have a comment on the requirement for at least one fruit tree to be provided in each residential garden. It is our experience that planting within private ownership can be subject to removal. Therefore, it is suggested, the policy could be improved by requesting fruit trees within the public realm and open space of proposed development. These trees can be managed properly and there will be greater control over their removal.</p>	Noted and text amended.
179.	BL6	9	<p>BL6. Managing the Environmental Impact of Development</p> <p>We support the general thrust of the policy but note there is a need to rebalance Criteria B to ensure that it is not overly pre-emptive or prescriptive. Development proposals may employ multiple design solutions that meet the overall goals of the policy, but in different ways.</p> <p>Applying the current wording it may not, for example, be necessary nor appropriate (in all cases), to meet biodiversity mitigation and enhancement (including net gain) goals in the manner expressed by the policy at present and the policy should instead focus on the achievement of goals, not particular features or products such as bat boxes (in place of bat tiles or bricks) or individual fruiting trees in private gardens in favour of groups of native trees which may have other visual or landscape benefits and achieve the same ends.</p>	The proposal is considered to be adequately flexible to apply to the full range of development schemes.

180.	BL7	12	I cannot find where the intended LGSs are mapped.	The maps are shown in the main report and individual maps for each proposed space are included in Appendix B.
181.	BL7	12	This is also important as green spaces may encourage those who are unsure to back a greener future (especially if they have doubts about climate change or the decline of biodiversity).	Thank you for your comment.
182.	BL7	12	<p>Recommendation 2: POLICY BL7: LOCAL GREEN SPACES (LGS) "made properly accessible" p 57 5.42. Local Green Space: Radford Park (7) [see comments on BL5] , Lowsley Farm Pond (22) Although mentioned (& on map in Green) as a LGS Lowsley Farm 'Park' (??) is not numbered, or in Appendix B, or even mentioned. Is the site is a designated public open space? Oddly enough there are 'ponds' in the (mysteriously absent from the NDP) Lowsley Farm Park with 'No Swimming & Danger' signs.</p> <p>Just to note, the dog waste bin was overflowing there on last visit.</p>	<p>This phrase is only included in the plan in relation to the wider green and blue infrastructure network and not the proposed LGS's, so unsure what is meant.</p> <p>p.57: the numbering on the maps has gone awry and will be reviewed for the Submission Version Plan. Lowsley Pond is identified as an LGS.</p> <p>Dog bins sit outside the scope of the BLNDP, however the PC has been made aware of this.</p>
183.	BL7	12	<p>The local green spaces listed and shown on Figure 12 show include 6 in Gunns Farm but only the entrance to the Berg estate, this may be because the whole estate is protected by being of architectural interest? Midhurst Road SUDS and tree boundary was initially a mystery but also made me wonder if Chiltley Lane banks, verges and tree boundary should also be recognised as a local green space; It is valued by local walkers and dog owners for its tranquility.</p>	<p>The LGS designation is only suited to green spaces, as opposed to 'built' areas.</p> <p>The guidance on LGS designation (produced by Locality) suggests that verges are not considered suitable for designation.</p>

184.	BL7	9	<p>BL7. Local Green Spaces</p> <p>Policy BL7: Local Green Spaces at Part A lists 30no. such spaces, however there are no Local Green Spaces protected in Local Plan Parts 1 or 2. Therefore, policy BL7 is not in conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.</p> <p>As a further aside, the consultation document does not set out as evidence the analysis undertaken to support their designation as LGS. We note paragraph 102 of the NPPF sets out the qualification criteria against which LGS must be considered. For several sites, such as no. 28 Chitley Way (Berg Estate) main entrance, for example, it is not justified to be demonstrably special or hold particular local significance for the reasons set out by the aforementioned paragraph of the Framework.</p> <p>We recommend that this policy be deleted, in light of our first point, and that LGS should be considered by the District Council as part of the Local Plan Review process instead.</p>	<p>The Local Plan was developed prior to the LGS designation being made. The BLNDP Policy conforms to the NPPF on this issue. Indeed many Local Plans do not designate LGS, they leave this to NDP groups.</p> <p>The information as to why each LGS has been proposed is set out in Appendix B.</p>
185.	Local Green Space	14	<p>Owner of site: LGS 2 Land adjacent to Presbytery, Headley Rd</p> <p>While the estates team at the Diocese of Portsmouth and charity trustees are still evaluating their response to this proposal I would like to set forward my views as parish priest.</p> <p>I would very much object to the church land being designated as a Local Green space. It is land that has been</p>	<p>The SG has discussed this and agreed to remove from the Plan in agreement with the reasons provided.</p>

			specifically entrusted to the Church for its mission in Liphook and the surrounding areas - including the provision of church, education, housing for clergy and teachers and the burial of deceased members of the Catholic Church and I would expect to be able to use the land for that purpose free from any unhelpful restrictions.	
186.	Local Green Space	14	<p>Owner of LGS10 Shipley Court Shared Space:</p> <p>I have consulted with the Shipley Court Residents' Association Committee. They wish me to convey to you that we do not want to be designated as a Local Green Space as part of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>Please pass on our decision to the members of the Parish Council.</p> <p>Also in the copy of the information you have put together it is stated that the ownership of "Shipley Court Shared Space" is EHDC. This is incorrect. The land enclosed by the 18 houses is jointly owned,, maintained and insured by the residents and this ownership is stated in each of our individual deeds.</p>	The SG has discussed this and agreed to remove from the Plan in agreement with the reasons provided.
187.	BL8	12	<p>I would recommend the view across an SDNP valley from the local green space , Admers playground in the south west corner of Gunns Farm. An unexpected delight. Narrow pavements and traffic make it difficult to safely appreciate views of the buildings in the conservation area.</p>	<p>The views have been carefully considered and consulted on. This has not been raised through that process and could be considered in a future review of the NDP, if there is widespread support.</p> <p>Pavement width is a challenge and is picked up in Policy BL20.</p>

188.	BL8	12	Some trees should be cut down to create more significant views	Thank you for your comment. The BLNDP encourages the retention of trees where possible.
189.	BL8	12	This is very important to keep a rural feel to Liphook.	Thank you for your comment.
190.	BL8	12	This one is very important locally	Thank you for your comment.
191.	BL8	9	<p>BL8. Protection of Locally Significant Views</p> <p>Further clarification on the Locally Significant Views is required as views 4 and 5 are labelled as not yet shown in Figure 17. We question whether these will be subject to separate consultation as we are unable to offer comments at this stage? No evident qualification process has been applied in the selection of the proposed significant views, specifically the extent of the area identified.</p> <p>Concern is raised as there is no detailed guidance or further information on how impacts upon such views could be mitigated. Each proposal should be considered on its own merits as to how it impacts such Locally Significant Views.</p> <p>Compliance is required to Local and National Planning Policy. CP2: Spatial Strategy of the JCS requires new development to fully acknowledge the constraints of the South Downs National Park and its supporting text includes views from and to the surrounding hills as such a constraint.</p>	<p>This is noted – the views have been mapped and are included in the Submission Version Plan. The locations and descriptions were included in the Pre-Submission Consultation.</p> <p>Noted – the policy enables the flexibility to do this.</p> <p>Policy CP2 has been added to the conformity reference.</p>
192.	BL9	12	Yes Agreed. Very Good.	Thank you for your comment.

193.	BL9	9	<p>BL9. Dark Skies</p> <p>We acknowledge the proximity and relationship of Liphook with the South Downs National Park and welcome the desire to protect the night skies of the National Park from unacceptable levels of light pollution.</p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that new developments do not detrimentally impact upon the darkness of skies mapped within the Parish. Reducing external light pollution has a beneficial effect upon human health as it impacts our circadian cycle.</p> <p>It is necessary to ensure NDP adheres to Local Plan Policy and National Requirements for pollution control/ reduction. Policy CP27 of the JCS states lighting must be proportionate to the development and glare and light spillage from the site must be minimised to limit impact upon local residents, vehicle users, pedestrians and the visibility and appreciation of the night sky.</p> <p>We consider NDP policy should take note of the requirements of new lighting to achieve road adoption, and allow for flexibility in lighting proposals to allow for and facilitate this. Alternately the policy should recognise the implication that if street lighting is unsupported by the NDP, that this may lead to provision of more private streets. This also has other impacts such as crime prevention and designing safe communities.</p> <p>In addition, the indicator of success for BL9. is annual monitoring of dark sky data from CPRE compared to</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is noted in the conformity reference.</p> <p>Street lighting on the public highway falls outside the scope of influence of the NDP. It is the responsibility of HCC as the highways authority.</p> <p>Noted – the indicators are in draft form at the moment and do not form part of the BLNDP, rather they will be a tool for the PC when considering response to</p>
------	-----	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			baseline data. We question whether, should there be a decline in dark skies, this could be wholly attributed to operational development.	planning applications and in monitoring the successful application of the BLNDP.
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 5d: All other response Vision 3 - Safe and Active Travel

194.	BL10	12	Current footpaths often have hedges over growing or numerous cars parked up on them. This has meant I have had to enter the road to pass safely with my children.	Noted – this is a maintenance issue and sites outside the scope of planning policy. The comment has been passed to the Parish Council, who will raise it with HCC as the Highways Authority.
195.	BL10	12	Lack of access to Public transport specifically buses to gain access to work in neighbouring towns. Current route 23 starts too late and finishes too early. Also no longer provides direct access to Alton or Basingstoke. I can no longer get to work in Bordon using public transport without significantly reducing my hours Cycle routes should extend beyond the town centre to allow safe travel between other nearby towns.	This is an important comment, but the provision of bus services sits outside the scope of planning policy. Figure 20 provides a map of the cycle route aspirations as prepared by HCC for Liphook. The BLNDP supports the provision of these and connectivity to neighbouring parishes and settlements.
196.	BL10	12	The effects of electric vehicles is occurring already and will grow. Hardly "...not for a considerable time". 2030 is sooner than you think !	Thank you for your comment. The BLNDP seeks to support less polluting vehicles where possible, in line with Government net zero aims.
197.	BL10	12	The continued inclusion of ways to encourage walking or cycling for local journeys is completely ridiculous, impractical and unachievable for both families with young children and the more elderly members of the community. The only exception would be children travelling to Bohunt,	This is noted and appreciated. The BLNDP does not have influence over the strategic road network. It seeks to encourage more 'active travel' where possible, which in turn will help to alleviate some of the challenges raised by the community in relation to

			who should definitely be encouraged to walk or cycle, thus reducing traffic problems in the Square.	congestion and air quality. It is accepted, however, that car use is required for many people.
198.	BL10	12	I am in broad agreement with this policy, but sceptical about how its aims will be achieved. Traffic calming measures can be as much, if not more of, a hindrance to cyclists as to motorists, and segregated cycle lanes often then require cyclists to dismount, or give way to motorists, which rather defeats the object. Please consider measures which will actually make cycling and walking more convenient, not just 'safer'.	Thank you for comment. The policy would be applied on a case by case basis and seeks to influence the provision of opportunities to encourage more active travel.
199.	BL10	12	Figure 19 shows Hampshire 'walking desire lines' around Liphook but no corresponding routes into the South Downs National Park promoted by the Park Authority. There do appear to be 2 or 3 rights of way. The SDNP local plan rejects commercial and housing development within the Liphook area of the Park but what is their attitude to walking, cycling or riding? Rights of way guarantee some public access to the park but does the authority promote wider access as happens in Dartmoor and other National Parks? Does the SDNP local plan prevent the BLNDP expressing a wish to link paths across the parish?	Additional access routes would be (as per the policy) supported in development, should that occur in the SDNP part of the Parish. There needs to be a balance, however, between creating greater access routes to the Park and encouraging greater footfall, which would have environmental impacts on the landscape.
200.	BL10	12	P67: Policy BL10: Improving walking, cycling and equestrian opportunities - "Crankers" p69: "Enable circular cycle route around village, including across South Downs land, traffic pinchpoints a focus."	Crankers is a local cycling group – this has been added to the text. Noted – pinchpoints are considered in Policy BL11 specifically.

		<p>Page 70: Public rights of Way. (in Red along Westland) Along verge on Left hand side of Longmoor Road heading downhill (technically SDNP)</p> <p>p71: Figure 20: Bikeability map for Liphook village 6.13 Lines in purple of the map denote priority areas for upgrading cycle routes to ‘green’.</p> <p>Recommendation 1: The (overgrown) Left hand heading West/downhill verge of Longmoor road, from Bohunt School to just past the Lowsley Farm Estate roundabout has potential to be upgraded to a (sustainable) gravel track for cyclists (& walkers) for north gateway to SDNP & Woolmer forest. Clearly this would involve some lateral thinking & heavy lifting. But ultimately would have a myriad of benefits to the community (too long for this comment). [A good example of this is the recent 1 km path running alongside the A272 Petersfield Road in Bramdean, Alresford SO24 0JN for access to Church Lane. See satellite maps]</p> <p>Recommendation 2: Radford Park an BL10 opportunity As suggested in BL7 p137 (Appx B) Plans are in place to make this accessible to all users with two circular walks. Why not make one of the tracks able to accommodate kids biking? with an view to a pumtrack as suggested in 'Community Project Ideas (CPI)' Page under REG14 TAB Ref 21. Providing "additional sports facilities" eg pumtrack</p>	<p>This has been added to the map description.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>These ideas have been passed to the Parish Council for consideration. Rec 2 has already been part-way delivered.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

201.	BL10	12 RES_2	<p>A. "all new developments should ensure", "and where possible", "Proposals should demonstrate that" - replace weasel words with "must". This is our environment - a developer will not make any change unless we (the community) tell them to make changes.</p> <p>B. "where feasible" - guess what - it will never be feasible! - we must insist that this happens - stop using weasel words.</p>	<p>This would then need to be caveated with e.g. subject to scale, nature and location to be applicable to the full range of proposals.</p> <p>B. It may not be practically feasible in all cases. The policy has to be positively written and flexible.</p>
202.	BL10	9	<p>The Policy relates to Figure 19 which does not accurately illustrate the true issues to the east of Liphook. The issues are set out clearly in the accompanying PDF document. These issues have also been highlighted to the BLNDP Steering Group over the course of the past 12 months through representations.</p> <p>Figure 19 MUST be updated to reflect the illustrated changes set out in the attached PDF document.</p>	<p>See previous comments on this matter.</p>
203.	BL10	9	<p>We question the distance that has been used by Figure 19 for the 10 minute walking radius, this distance should be clearly stated. The Manual for Streets states that a 10 minute walk is the equivalent of 800m. When putting an 800m radius from The Square ourselves, the radius is extending further than that shown in Figure 19.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Manual for Streets also states; "However, this is not an upper limit and PPS134 states that walking offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly those under 2 km."</p> <p>Therefore paragraph 6.12 and Policy BL10 of the draft NP can be seen to be restricting the location of development with no justification.</p>	<p>As per previous comments.</p>

		<p>Within the proposed Design Guide and Code it states at SP 01 Active Travel; "Where there is a choice, new development in the Parish should be selected where it would generate the least amount of car movements and be within a comfortable distance of local services. This will help to promote active travel, an important feature in 'livable' neighbourhoods;"</p> <p>This is considered a better more flexible wording than that currently within paragraph 6.12 of the draft NP, which states "Any new strategic developments in the Parish, which may be allocated in a future Local Plan for instance, should seek to ensure that they are within this 10-minute walkable zone.". And part A of Policy BL10 which states "Proposals should demonstrate that they are accessible to The Square or railway station within a 10-minute walking radius.".</p> <p>The only land available for strategic development within the 10-minute walkable zone currently shown in Figure 19 (which does not include a radius for the railway station) consists of school playing fields and land within the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>The wording within the design guide and code allows there to be consideration to the fact that more areas may be needed for development and acknowledges that different facilities will be in different parts of Liphook. Therefore, different locations will be sustainably located in different ways and not restricted to the radius shown.</p>	<p>See previous comments.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

			It is also suggested that a cycling 10 minute radius is added to Figure 19.	
204.	BL11	12	Far too woolly	This is noted, however the majority of transport related issues sit outside the sphere of influence of neighbourhood planning, as they sit within the remit of HCC as the Highways Authority (and National Highways for the A3). The BLNDP is seeking as far as possible to ensure that new development provides opportunities for active travel (as supported by the NPPF, paras 104 and 106). This would also help to address challenges raised by the community relating to local congestion.
205.	BL11	12	Fix the potholes first.	Thank you for your comment. The repair of potholes on adopted roads falls within the remit of the Highways Authority and should be reported to them (HCC).
206.	BL11	12	Drivers can be encouraged, or obliged, to avoid the peak travel times during the school term times. At other times traffic flow is ok. Reports of traffic snarl-ups at the village mini-roundabouts have become exaggerated. I am a driver as well as cyclist and walker, and I simply avoid the mini-roundabouts during peak times.	This is noted but cannot be applied through a planning policy. Thank you for your comment.
207.	BL11	12	Figure 21 clearly shows how 6 roads converge on the Square causing traffic congestion. I would add a second map showing the long diversions necessary if the Square is closed to traffic. Is there any provision for emergency vehicle access? An alternative road route around the Square could solve the problem but Hampshire Highways would be responsible, not the BLNDP. This context would explain why mitigation is the only policy presented for consultation.	This is noted, however the majority of transport related issues sit outside the sphere of influence of neighbourhood planning, as they sit within the remit of HCC as the Highways Authority (and National Highways for the A3). The BLNDP is seeking as far as possible to ensure that new development provides opportunities for active travel (as supported by the NPPF, paras 104 and 106). This would also help to address challenges raised by the community relating to local congestion.

			<p>The geography of the Square offers little scope for improving road conditions, so minimising traffic flow by encouraging alternative walking or cycling routes are the best options.</p> <p>Any further housing, particularly on the outskirts of the village, will increase the number of cars and be detrimental</p>	<p>Noted – the BLNDP is seeking to encourage linkages to enable active travel where possible.</p>
208.	BL11	12 RES_2	<p>A. “Development proposals should ensure that they have no unacceptable impact on the following locations” - • change “should” to must evidence” • This list is not complete - if, as suspected for example developers will build on Chicken Farm and Devils Lane - the junction where it joins Haslemere Rd - will be deadly unless a new roundabout or other traffic calming measures are introduced.</p> <p>This is CLASSIC - the NDP Steering Committee have given up on considering the impact of local issues by not allocating sites - this mean you have accepted that the developer and EHDC know best -THIS IS WRONG. You need to accept that your decision (I know this was a ‘community’ decision but we all know it was a Parish Council direction} will have significant impact on the village and to mitigate this decision - you (NDP) need to consider the full impact on traffic and the infrastructure.</p> <p>C. Where have you considered the inclusion or included ANYTHING from the HCC Local Traffic Plan? (https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/localtransportplan) is this deliberate?</p>	<p>This has been amended.</p> <p>See previous comments relating to site allocations.</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan prepared by HCC has been considered and the BLNDP policies align with it, for instance in terms of promoting active travel. It is agreed that explicit reference to the Plan should be made and this has been included.</p>

209.	BL11	12 RES_3	<p>In terms of traffic problems discussed, these mostly related to the school opening and closing times. Additional problems be found with traffic returning to the village after the schools are closed was not raised. It will be an ongoing problem for which there is probably no solution until a relief road to take the traffic coming from the Guildford direction down the Portsmouth Road is created. I suspect most people would agree any relief road should be in a line roughly from the Deer’s Hut to The Links public houses. This possibility of such a solution seems not to have been considered at all in the policies.</p> <p>There was a suggestion from the audience that a Pelican crossing to replace the Zebra one by Hamptons and the Royal Anchor would solve a lot of the problems at school opening and closing times. Is there any reason why that could not be promoted now by the parish council, outwith any NDP considerations? It may well be an excellent solution to the current, extremely time-consuming and irritating, snarl ups which can be found in The Square every day in term time? Technology could no doubt produce variable crossing times and indeed could link this Pelican crossing with the one just down the Portsmouth Road beyond Lloyds bank to work together. Additionally, a Zebra crossing by the Midhurst Road public car park would help, it would also act as a traffic calming measure.</p>	<p>The BLNDP has no influence in the provision of a relief road. Nor can it require pelican/zebra crossings. Responsibility for this sits with the Highways Authority. The BLNDP policies seek to influence any new development to encourage active travel, which might lead to the provision of crossing points as required.</p>
210.	BL11	9	<p>Figure 19 is considered to not accurately represent the issues of a significant pedestrian pinchpoint which have been identified through submissions to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the past 12 months regarding pedestrian safety along Haslemere Road to the east of the settlement boundary. The issues with</p>	<p>The SG has carefully considered this and believe the Figure represents the current situation.</p>

			Figure 19 are set out in detail in the attached PDF document.	
211.	BL12	12	Good	Thank you for your comment.
212.	BL12	12	Idiotic.	Noted.
213.	BL12	12	This is key, people are still unsure about the national move to EVS because of a lack of chargers, if they are more common in Liphook, this should help the local area to change their views.	Thank you for your comment.
214.	BL12	12 RES_2	Why would a developer offer any of this? We must insist and include - that for every 5 houses built - the developer must install one public charging point.	It is now unnecessary for planning policy to require the installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure on individual dwellings, as this is a recently introduced requirement imposed by Part S of the Building Regulations.
215.	BL12	12 RES_3	The trendy reference to public EV charging points is only that. No doubt the group would have noticed in the press recently report of facilities at Gatwick and at a service station on the motorway network are sitting idle because no connection can be made to the National grid to provide an adequate power supply.	Thank you for your comment.
216.	BL12	11	This policy should also include the identified employment areas as having potential for the provision for publicly available electric vehicle charging points.	This has been added to the policy.

Table 5e: All other response Vision 4 - Preserved Heritage

217.	BL13	13	<p>Owner of Priors, Ludshott Common:</p> <p>Our clients recently purchased Priors and we have since undertaken various applications to regularise some of the outbuildings within the curtilage. As such, we have an in depth understanding of the planning history and heritage significance of the various buildings at Priors.</p> <p>I note that your letter identifies Priors as a potential non-designated heritage asset due to its 'historic association – part of Ludshott Manor, held by the Prior of Selbourne and then by Magdalen College, Oxford'. It is important to clarify, the existing dwelling at Priors is a reconstructed building, records for which illustrate it was first altered, reconstructed and extended under reference F23347, on 27 June 1977. This building has subsequently been extended at various times since this date, including an additional wing, conservatory, first floor and modest extensions to the north. The resultant dwelling does not have any evidential heritage significance which would justify a non-designated heritage asset status. A photograph of this dwelling is In light of the above information, we do not consider it appropriate to put forwards as a nondesignated heritage asset.</p>	The SG discussed this and agreed to remove this as an NHDA.
218.	BL13	13	<p>Owner of Deers Hut Pub:</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 21st July addressed to the Northcott Trust. The Deers Hut Pub is in fact owned by myself. I would not wish it to be included as a non- designated heritage asset, but will of course continue to uphold the standard we have achieved over the last ten years.</p>	The SG discussed this and agreed to remove this as an NHDA.
219.	BL13	15	<p>Owner: Jubilee Terrace, Headley Road:</p> <p>Please can you accept my first email below as an objection to the Local</p>	The SG discussed this and agreed to remove this as an NHDA.

			<p>Listing of nos 32 to 48 Headley Road.</p> <p>I pretty much object to the proposal as it stands. The addresses are retained within the Liphook Conservation Area which protects any major form of development without undue consideration of impact on the identified heritage significance of this part of Liphook by Council planners. The Conservation Area designation also removes several permitted development rights, such as roof extensions and single storey side extensions, so that a developer would have to seek permission for these extensions anyway from the Council, and therefore again due consideration would be given to impact. As the properties are terraced they are not likely to be proposed to be demolished or greatly extended beyond a simple side or rear extension.</p> <p>What is the rationale behind the proposal to add to the local list, and has a study been carried out suggesting they should be Listed? can you answer this question if possible?</p>	
220.	BL13	13	<p>Owner of Passfield Oak:</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt my clients object any proposal to include it as a non-designated heritage asset. The fact that it was "built in the late Edwardian period 1908, representative of architecture for pubs built at that time" does not in itself provide justification for non-designated heritage asset status.</p> <p>The property has not been used as a public house since before 2001 when permission was granted for a change of use to offices and residential. Since then, permission has also been granted to change the use to a care home. As a consequence, since Passfield Estates</p>	<p>The SG discussed this and agreed to remove this as an NHDA.</p>

			<p>acquisition of the building in 2017, the building has undergone significant change to accommodate the changes in use. This has included internal and external alterations which have cumulatively altered the building from its original form as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property was completely stripped out and reconfigured internally including adding walls and staircase and blocking off the basement. • All the M&E was stripped and replaced. • The property has been split into 2 separate freeholds. The Barn is now an office and Goldcrest Lodge is a care home. • The Barn has been completely gutted and converted to a modern office. • Goldcrest Lodge has been completely gutted and reconfigured to provide modern facilities compliant with use as a children's care home and in line with CQC and Ofsted guidelines. • The basement floor is no longer accessible and has been effectively removed. • A rear fire escape extension has been added. <p>The building continues to be used for care home use and is subject to a lease for many years and there is no prospect of it returning to its former use as a public house. The tenant has recently obtained consent from Ofsted and CQC to use the property as a home for disabled children.</p> <p>Given the above, the changes in use have resulted in the erosion of the original character of the building and necessarily removed many features that could be deemed worthy of protection. It is therefore not of local historic, architectural or townscape merit.</p>	
221.	BL13	12	I cannot see mapped the "23 identified sites".	There are 16 non designated heritage assets that have been

				identified and these are mapped on the corresponding Figure.
222.	BL13	12	<p>Chapter 4) 7 Preserved Heritage Policy p77 BL13: Conserving the heritage of the Parish</p> <p>River Wey (Blue infrastructure network -BLPC) The River Wey Conservation Area Archaeological ALERT Orange buffer.</p> <p>"5.11. space for local recreation, for instance in Radford Park. The River Wey Trust: opportunities for enhancements"</p> <p>There's a "No Swimming " sign on the Radford Park Pond? Does that apply for paddling on the river on a hot day? The ducks seem to be only there because they are often fed. Either way the murky pond is heavily silted to the point of 'dead capacity' & is void of any other life.</p> <p>It is a shame really because the water floes ("carriers"/channels) & cascading waterfalls are very special features of the Park. Recommendation to restore the water features (walls & embankments, pools etc) & dredge the pond(s) to remove the mud. If possible sand to be filtered out & the spoil used to raise sodden areas elsewhere.</p> <p>Children often paddle & play in the river. Dog walkers dogs too. But how clean is this river at various times? Knowing that Thames Water Hasmere WwTW effluent discharges intermittently is upstream. Is it time to propose a future 'bathing water' designation so that water quality testing for pollutants can be ratified.</p>	<p>Comments have been passed to the PC, who have developed a strategy for Radford Park improvements.</p>
223.	BL13	12	<p>Found the map Figure 22, and list of both designated and non-designated heritage assets very interesting; is it available at the heritage Centre?</p>	<p>Comment passed to the PC who will be hosting a display relating to the NDP.</p>
224.	BL13	12 RES_2	<p>B. "either directly or indirectly " - ALL development in Liphook will impact (indirectly) the heritage of the Parish - Will the decision be made by someone who doesn't know or care about LIPHOOK?</p>	<p>Decisions relating to planning applications are made by the Local Authority (either the planning committee, who are elected by the community, or by a delegated officer).</p>

225.	BL13	10	Is there any merit (financial or otherwise) from our (<i>Heritage</i>) Society being mentioned within the Document as the source of many of the Parish's Heritage Records?	Agreed that the Heritage Society should be mentioned in the Plan.
226.	BL14	12	I would have expected more sunken lanes in the parish. Does Chiltley lane not qualify, at least in part?	See previous comments on this.
227.	BL14	12	Haven't looked into this but these are roads? Devils Lane lanes need to have a few spots widened to make it safer for cyclists.	Noted – this sites outside the scope of the NDP and falls within the remit of the Highways Authority (HCC).
228.	BL14	12	Our sunken lanes are being damaged by drivers riding up onto verges - causing damage to these historic verges. This is the issue that needs to be addressed.	The policy seeks to preserve the sunken lanes.
229.	BL14	12 RES_2	A. "should respect " - replace with "must"	This has been amended.
230.	BL15	12	Personality is key when it comes to supporting the community and it's unity.	Thank you for your comment.
231.	BL15	12	I hardly see that this proposal is either workable or is needed.	The policy would come into effect should a planning application be submitted.
232.	BL15	12	frivolous	Thank you for your comment.
233.	BL15	12	Poor maintenance can impact on neighbouring properties as well.	Noted. The maintenance of properties falls outside the remit of the BLNDP.
234.	BL15	12	I suggest ditch BL15.	Thank you for your comment although no reasoning has been provided for this suggestion.
235.	Chapter 4 general	12	More emphasis must be given to protection the River Wey conservation area from development	The River Wey Conservation Area is already protected under

				the NPPF. The BLNDP could not raise this further.
236.	Chapter 4 general	12	I like the idea of stimulating interest in the history of the village. Signboard stories with pictures would do a lot, there and elsewhere where appropriate.	Thank you for your comment.
237.	Chapter 4 general	12	<p>Of most concern to myself is the total lack of mention of a very important heritage asset the Parish has, the designation of an Area of Special Housing Character within it's boundary.</p> <p>EHDC has designated 5 sites within it's Planning Area as Areas of Special Housing Character covered under it's Planning Policy H9 and the Chiltley Way- Shepherds Way area is one of them. This is an asset the Parish should be proud of and any Planning document generated must ensure it mentions it and should build on it's inclusion, and therefore promote it's protection and enhancement within any Neighbourhood Plan. Throughout the whole Draft Plan and Design Codes it is never mentioned or referred to. This is a glaring omission and oversight by both the Steering Group and it's contracted experts.</p> <p>The Plan must provide Policies to protect the Area of Special Housing Character and it's immediate vicinity and the opportunity to incorporate them could be made in the following BLNDP Policies:</p> <p>BL1: B ii Maintain or enhance the natural and built character or appearance of the area. Ensuring that any new development within or taking access from it reflects the layout, density, scale and character of any designated Area of Special Housing Character.</p> <p>BL3: Character and Design of Development Ensuring it responds and integrates well with any designated Area of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The SG discussed this and agreed that this area will be included in the Design and Character section of the Plan and identified as a 'local character area'. This will be referenced in the policy. Information about the character areas already exists in the form of a guidance document.</p> <p>Policy BL3 identifies the need to protect and reinforce the character of Chiltley Way Area of Special Housing Character (ASHC), which would also encompass the views within the area itself and the heritage value.</p> <p>BL6 – TPOs are noted in Table 2 and trees are specifically mentioned in the policy.</p> <p>Policy BL8 references specifically the view to Goldenfields, which is the view referenced in the supporting evidence for that ASHC.</p>

		<p>Special Housing Character.</p> <p>BL6: Managing the Environmental Impact of a Development No mention of the number of large areas of open grass and TPO'd specimen trees within the Area of Special Housing Character, and how they should be protected.</p> <p>BL8: Protection of Locally Significant Views No mention of the special street scene views into and within the Area of Special Housing Character, and also the distant views across open fields towards Devils Lane and the SDNP.</p> <p>BL13: Conserving the Heritage of the Parish No mention of the Area of Special Housing Character to be included as a Heritage Asset.</p> <p>The BLNDP appears to not want to help protect an area that EHDC deemed needing protection via it's H9 Policy. Surely the BLNDP should take that on board and include it in their list of Heritage Assets, why have they not?</p> <p>There is also not mention of the Area of Special Housing Character on the BLNDP Policy Map, a glaring omission.</p> <p>It is also noted that there is no mention of the Area of Special Housing Character within the BLNDP Design Codes. That document would be an ideal location to highlight the outstanding design features of the area and ensure any future developments within or adjacent to it adhere to the design, density, layout and character of the protected area.</p>	<p>The ASHC has been added to the policies map.</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------

Table 5f: All over response Vision 5 - Connected and Supported Communities

238.	BL16	12	Outdoor activity that promotes a social community and contributes to healthy eating.	This has been added to the text.
239.	BL16	12	This is key, climate change means that it may become harder to import fruit and veg so this may help. This should support biodiversity as most crops are RHS pollinator friendly.	Thank you for your comment.
240.	BL17	12	This supports the community too so this is very important.	Thank you for your comment.
241.	BL17	12	<p>Connected and Supported Communities (CaSC) p87 Page 88. BL17. Enhancing cultural sporting and recreational facilities "Existing facilities are safeguarded New/expanded facilities provided – to be identified" Recreation Ground - EHDC Local Plan: Open Spaces 2019 p90 "There is little interest in the skate park in the & is scheduled for demolition as it is no longer fit for purpose." There is 'little interest' because residents have to drive elsewhere to partake in the various recreational activities that a functioning non-dangerous skatepark provides.</p> <p>"Scheduled for demolition' & Need: improvements" before demolition The Little Rec Skate Park MUST be scheduled for replacement with (a bigger) high-quality facility that is fit for purpose to modern (SE) standards with provision for all users 5-16yo+ (children of families) scooters/roller blade/even bmx/parkour. Examples are exemplary new & upgraded 'skateparks' in Petersfield, Horsham, Alton, Bordon etc The skatepark is also a community asset considered 'at risk' to the point of dereliction (BL13 heritage asset, such as the recently replaced footbridge over The Wey, (Pooh Sticks Bridge (The River Wey Trust) over Troubled Water))</p>	Table 8.1 (now an appendix) has been amended to take account of the most recent annual Community Facilities Study.

		<p>Provision for teenagers Little Rec "Preference has been expressed locally for a BMX / bike track to be created. The Little Rec was gifted to the Parish in trust for the use of families and young children so a replacement or a BMX/cycle track would not comply with the terms of the Trust." This is nonsensical. So what the draft is saying is that the under 12 playground on the Recreation Ground technically should be in the Little Rec & the Basketball Hoop doesn't comply? Both grounds are for the public, teenagers are from/in local families. Provision for younger & older children under 12s/Children in general, families etc. Sport England (SE) sums it up quite nicely: 'Maintaining active, high-quality places & spaces. Creating, Providing activity infrastructure & maintaining activities'. Active design Note: Scooters! (clockwise) Bikes, Bench, Running: https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design</p> <p>p90: 'outdoor exercise: explore desire for outdoor gym equipment' Outdoor exercise & out door gym equipment are two very different things. At a basic level, Calisthenics frames/scaffold are various types of bars eg monkey bars, pull up bars, bucket swing bars, olympic bars (parallel/uneven) etc. This relatively simple 'Play Station' is more than sufficient, inexpensive to install & insignificant to maintain. As activity infrastructure it caters for all ages as children (&parents) graduate from 'hanging around' the <12yo bars in the 'fenced play area' & head across the Rec 'to the big swings'. 'Street Bars' should be desired by BLPC before "outdoor gym equipment" eg the rather encumbering 'recumbent & spinning bikes' etc. Refer to : 'The second site' in: https://www.horshamblog.co.uk/2018/01/12/new-free-outdoor-gym-in-horsham-park/ & in: https://www.horsham.gov.uk/parks-and-countryside/horsham-park/activities-in-horsham-park</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>Build it (well) & they will come & use it. (see skatepark) & could be accommodated in BL17: New/expanded facilities provided</p> <p>Also see article in Liphook magazine about the girl who went on to become a competitive climber.</p> <p>No local bouldering or climbing wall. Although we do have entry level boulders, a climbing tree & a cliff next to a cave in Radford Park.</p>	
242.	BL17	12	<p>Good for physical and mental wellbeing and promotes community involvement and social interaction</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
243.	BL17	12	<p>Lack of public toilets and fresh drinking water particularly near children’s play areas with having to buy expensive plastic bottled water</p>	<p>This comment has been passed to the Parish Council for consideration as a non-policy project.</p>
244.	BL17	12 RES_2	<p>A - too many weasel words - “should seek to engage”, replace with “will” (i) “where relevant” - what does this mean - relevant to whom? (iii) - “significant adverse impacts” - who will decide this - Will the decision be made by someone who doesn’t know or care about LIPHOOK?</p> <p>C Is missing - re Parking facilities at a football pitch. Developers may provide a football pitch without any consideration for parking of cars on a Sunday morning / Match Day - leaving local road blocked by the volume. Developers must provide off road parking for 50 cars to stop local lanes becoming blocked.</p>	<p>Amended.</p> <p>Policies are to be used by the planning committee/delegated officer when making decisions.</p>
245.	BL17 (/non-policy actions?)	12	<p>Little Rec centre - Bear in mind that families have children of a span of ages so one cannot exclude older children from this area, and there is better harmony if there are also things that appeal to all ages.</p> <p>This area definitely needs a revamp, better equipment, better layout, more seating, even a picnic table with the seats attached.</p> <p>I disagree that the skate structure is inappropriate. Children of many ages love things to move on, things that challenge and excite. Replace that old one and relocate a new and better designed one to a boundary so that it</p>	<p>Table 8.1 (now an appendix) has been amended to take account of the most recent annual Community Facilities Study.</p>

			<p>takes up less of the playable space. Ditto the netball hoops now broken and not useable. Relocate and have at least one at a lower height. There is room for an outdoor gym here. Children like things to swing on like bars, climb up like a wall or nets, and to use imagination eg a boat, train engine, cubby hole . Get ideas from families, and playground specialists. A good sized fenced Sandpit is a possibility.</p> <p>Are there close by toilets, drinking water fountains?</p>	
246.	BL17 (/non-policy actions?)	12	<p>Big Rec Grounds</p> <p>From Little Rec to Big Rec there are not maintained tennis courts which no one can use ! These need sorting out to be the amenity they should be to the public. A volley board at one end is a real boon.</p> <p>There is a large barnlike building with a drop down serving part that must have been a great place for outdoor family events in the past, A place for an open air market was mentioned as desirable in the draft plan. With all that lovely space around it would be an ideal place for this. Add a couple of seats. A thought – sporting people may contribute these if they can be delegated as a memorial or focus for a person or event.</p> <p>Bigger kids play apparatus in the far corner needs some attention to increase the activity range there. A fitness trail with different apparatus starting there and with stations along the boundary would be splendid.</p> <p>Some little kids also play there if they can, so have some gear that is ageless like a climbing web. Add seats for the olds.</p>	This has been sent to the PC to consider including as a non policy project
247.	BL17 (/non-policy actions?)	12	<p>There is an empty, falling into disrepair, building sharing part the boundary of the Lttle Rec that would be a superb location for a swimming pool complex and fitness centre . Well designed it would be a tremendous asset to Liphook ,its people and a drawcard for visitors . Negotiations with the building owners may enable the donation of it and perhaps financial contribution with, for example, naming rights for the pool- fitness complex.</p>	This has been sent to the PC to consider including as a non policy project.

248.	BL18	12	Surgeries are local but lie between two NHS trusts so referrals can be to hospitals and clinics in rather a wide area: Haslemere, Bordon, Milford, Petersfield, QA, RSCH, St Marys, and further afield. Transport to appointments can be difficult. Believe funding for a new surgery opposite Station road was not forthcoming because NHS wanted local provision focused in Bordon.	Thank you for your comment.
249.	BL18	12	The Education and Health authorities already have sophisticated methods for deciding when and where any new facility becomes needed. I'm not sure that this policy has been properly thought through.	Thank you for your comment.
250.	BL18	12	Education should support development of the area in the long-term so this is important.	Thank you for your comment.
251.	BL18	12 RES_2	B (ii). "would not have unacceptable impacts on the local road network" - any development will have an impact on local roads - who will decide if the development will impact the roads? I assume Highways- another organisation / person who doesn't know or care about Liphook. B (iii). "within the development boundaries as defined in Policy BL1" - where is the development boundary defined?	Policies are to be used by the planning committee/delegated officer when making decisions. The Highways Authority is a statutory consultee and will make an assessment on the severity of the impact of development on roads. Defined on Figure 4, but likely to be amended as part of the Local Plan Reviews.
252.	CHAPTER 5 GENERAL	12	Liphook has some very active societies for a range of ages – Scout movement, Girl Guiding, WI, u3a, horticultural society, BLACS, sports clubs, art and hobby groups, etc. All run by volunteers and providing a background to Policy BL17 as well as more formal provision by church communities, schools, the Day Centre and the library.	Thank you for your comment.

253.	CHAPTER 5 GENERAL	5	<p>East Hampshire District Council have put forward for review as part of their ‘Large Development Sites Consultation’ a proposed site, which will be south east of Liphook for up to 600 dwellings. NHS Hampshire & Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board (ICB) have responded advising that this will increase an already overburdened patient list size at Liphook and Liss surgery and Liphook Village surgery by a further 1400 patients and these surgeries are already under severe pressures.</p> <p>Liss village itself, is in the SDNP as is the SDNP land that has been reserved for a new surgery.</p> <p>In order to support the pressures that primary care are facing the ICB has requested that a CIL allocation be made for £369k for the reconfiguration of one or both surgeries.</p>	Thank you – this is noted.
------	----------------------	---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------

Table 5g: All other response Vision - Enhanced and Circular Local Economy

254.	BL19	12	<p>Whilst there is a history of residents travelling out of the parish for employment there are also those commuting in to Liphook to work. The availability and cost of housing and the higher salaries gained by commuting have contributed to this situation. However Covid, homeworking and the internet have changed life/work balance for many; will that provide more opportunities for people to live and work in Liphook?</p>	Potentially this is the case. Policy BL19 seeks to support availability of workspace in the parish (where it cannot already be delivered through permitted development). It also safeguards against the loss of such employment facilities and sites.
255.	BL19	12	Good.	Thank you for your comment.
256.	BL19	12	Supporting local businesses should open up more jobs, tackle unemployment numbers and encourage more wealth/funding in the local area.	Thank you for your comment.

257.	BL19	12 RES_2	A - This is standard EHDC policy - why repeat it?	Thank you for your comment. The Clause provides further caveats to guard against the loss of such uses.
258.	BL19	11	We support the identification and protection of the existing employment areas. However part b should be more explicit in stating that new employment floorspace will be supported at the identified existing employment areas.	Clause B does support the expansion of existing employment premises.
259.	BL20	12	This is key as it should support the community.	Thank you for your comment.
260.	BL20	12	I see no evidence of commercial demand for a 'covered market'. This seems like wishful think to me !	Evidence was gathered in support of this via the community consultation activities.
261.	BL20	12	For many the internet has changed the way we work and how we live. Shops and offices are not necessarily at the centre of every town or village, so a shift in focus is needed to maintain village life. Liphook has already a variety of cafes but a more continental market style of approach could work. Policy BL21 focuses on tidying up the street scene in the EHDC part of the village and making it more attractive to both residents and visitors.	Thank you for your comment. The policy seeks to encourage the village to offer a range of facilities and amenities, beyond just retail.
262.	BL20	12	The idea of seating is good; consider that 2 together encourages contacts.	Thank you for your comment.
263.	BL21	12	In the past Liphook station and the A3 have been seen as routes out of Liphook to London, Portsmouth and the wider world. However trains and the A3 also provide routes for tourists to visit Liphook and the South Downs National Park and yet, so far, nothing has been made of this asset on our doorstep. The BLNDP applies to the Park as well as EHDC and should be	The role of the parish – as a gateway to the SDNP is explicitly mentioned in the supporting text and is something the BLNDP supports.

			framed to encourage SDNP to promote Liphook as a 'gateway' to the Park.	
264.	BL21	12	Liphook already is an official Gateway to the National Park. The Gateway itself is the railway station.	Thank you for your comment.
265.	BL21	12	Rural tourism is important as it should make becoming more sustainable more appealing.	Thank you for your comment.
266.	CHAPTER 6 GENERAL	12	<p>Liphook is ideally situated to provide access to the South Downs National Park and could be supported as an activity and cultural centre for walkers, cyclists and riders. There is a golf course and support for other sports would promote a healthy life style. Shops catering for visitors with countryside interests and hospitality needs could well increase the local economy and develop a vibrant centre in Station Road.</p> <p>Benefitting local towns and villages is part of the remit for National Parks so the BLNDP can legitimately propose that Liphook should develop in this way and the SDNP could open up the (mostly) hidden asset of the Park to residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>PS The consultation documents are very comprehensive and would take time to read completely (I reached page 107) so I have commented on particular policies. The quick summaries did not give me the details that initiated comments. I hope others have found the documents equally informative They must represent many hours of work, congratulations on the result!</p>	Thank you for your comment.

267.	P105 Implementation and Review	12 RES_2	10.2 - Do not assume the NDP will be 'made' - I will be leading a campaign to reject the NDP at referendum on the grounds that building 600+ houses behind Bohunt School is the common sense approach for the village which was never considered by the NDP Steering Committee and has never been voted on by the residents. There are lots of lovely words here BUT each point needs to be SMART as you say on page 21. Each point needs to say what committee is accountable to deliver each point.	Please see previous comments relating to this. The SDNPA have explicitly rejected this as something they would support – the allocation of such a sizeable site in an NDP is not supported in the NPPF – see paras 70 and 69(a). Such sizeable sites have an impact that is far greater than simply on the parish – and it therefore makes planning sense that they should be planned for at a more strategic level. That said, the BLNDP policies will be used to influence such sites, should they emerge in the new Local Plans – and will inform discussions with the local authorities and prospective site promoters.
268.	P107 Infrastructure improvements and provision	12 RES_2	11.1 - “The Parish Council is keen to influence the way in which developer contributions are spent “. My concern here is that the PC already has the responsibility to make these infrastructure changes but does nothing to change Liphook’s infrastructure. With 600+ more houses and without a commitment re who and how these infrastructure changes will be implemented - the NDP will be rejected at referendum.	Thank you for your comment.
269.	P108 Non-policy actions	12 RES_2	“Possible Actions” - this is not SMART please see page 21. We - the community needs to know who is doing what, when - otherwise this section is completely meaningless.	Thank you for your comment.
270.	P108 Non-policy actions	12 (live on site)	Liphook’s only bank is closing down – could the LMC be used as a community banking hub?	Thank you for your comment. The Coop/PO has multi banking counter.
271.	P108 Non-policy actions	12	I wholeheartedly agree with the suggestion for a bank hub now that all the banks have moved from Liphook. Lloyds used to have a secondhand book area which was well used Indeed a larger space for such would not interfere with the library as it enables books to be passed on in ownership.	Thank you for your comment.

Table 6: General comments

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
General comments				
272.		4	No comments.	Noted.
273.		7	<p>Thank you for your e-mail dated 28 July 2023, inviting National Highways to comment on the above Consultation.</p> <p>National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such National Highways works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A3 Trunk Road.</p> <p>We have reviewed documents available on your planning portal and have 'No Comments'.</p>	Noted.
274.		12	It's very vague and wooly: full of laudable aims but definitely not any plan of how to achieve them.	The policies are not actions to be achieved, rather they provide the framework against which the planning committee at the Local Authority make decisions relating to planning applications.
275.		12	The Draft Bramshott and Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan (Regulation 14) appears to be very much a "cut and paste" document using many policies lifted from	Thank you for your comment.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			<p>other plans and given a local twist.</p> <p>Many of the policies come across as a “wish list” and don’t appear to have a great deal of robustness, with many uses of the words “where possible”, “in so far as is reasonably practicable” and “subject to viability” rather than the words “must adhere to” or “will comply with”.</p> <p>It is also noted that all Policies state that “Proposals for development will be supported” rather than state that “Proposals will not be supported unless they are in accordance with...”. This appears to allow developers opportunities to play with words and plans to ensure they are in accordance with the NDP Policies.</p> <p>It would appear that the NDP Steering Group do not want to write policies that would oppose or object to development plans, only to support them, even when those proposals are not the local communities wishes, are in unsustainable locations or give no benefit to the community.</p> <p>The B&LNDP Mission Statement says:</p> <p>“To listen to the community to deliver a Neighbourhood Plan to enhance the Parish of Bramshott and Liphook, both now and into the future”</p> <p>Reading the whole Plan there appears to be few Policies that reflect the wishes of the community, so any “listening” that has taken place appears to of not been acted on.</p> <p>The NDP website states that:</p> <p>“The NDP is a way for residents to say what is needed and have some control over development. Benefits of YOUR NDP include ensuring the right type of housing and tenure, in the right place, with required community facilities, protecting the environment”</p> <p>Unfortunately the above statement doesn’t ring true with this draft NDP as it does not allocate sites for development, therefore it will have no influence on the type of</p>	<p>The policies add additional local detail to the Local Plan’s policies.</p> <p>Guidance dictates that neighbourhood plan policies should be flexible and care needs to be taken in using terms such as ‘must’ and ‘preserve.’ You should only use must where the requirements of a policy are compulsory in all circumstances and ‘preserve’ is rarely appropriate outside of the consideration of listed buildings and conservation areas. This is because it discourages positive change which could improve and enhance the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>Neighbourhood planning gives the opportunity to shape the development of the area in a positive manner rather than as a tool to stop important development proposals from proceeding. Planning policies should use positive language, looking at ways to enhance and improve the area. This can be achieved by using phrases such as ‘planning permission will be</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			<p>housing, location of housing and any community facilities will be totally at the whim of any developer, not the NDP.</p> <p>Although the NDP Steering Group made the decision NOT to allocate sites for development, there appears to be no Policy to ensure any proposed development sites that come forward are in the most sustainable and acceptable locations There are no policies to ensure any locally needed housing and infrastructure improvements will be provided on these proposed sites and which of the proposed sites the NDP/Parish Council (as owners of the NDP) would oppose or accept.</p> <p>There is nothing that ensures the wishes and aspirations of the local community will be at the forefront of the responses to any future development proposal, and how these wishes are to be communicated with EHDC and SDNP during the planning application process.</p> <p>The NDP had the ideal opportunity to force cooperation between EHDC and SDNPA if they had asked for a housing number for the whole parish, and advised that total housing number would be provided on a Parish wide allocation. This opportunity being lost has resulted in the Parish, and in particular Liphook, being open to speculative development in locations that are unsustainable and against the communities wishes.</p> <p>After 9 years of work and consultation this draft Plan is such a disappointment and is seriously lacking in any worthwhile substance. Has it been watered down so much as to just be a money making exercise for the Parish Council, ensuring it receives a higher amount of CIL payments without actually ensuring the parish receives the right development in the right place providing the right infrastructure and benefits so badly</p>	<p>granted provided that' and 'development will be encouraged where it' rather than 'we will not allow development unless'. The words 'encouraged,' 'supported' and 'will be permitted all convey positive approaches to development.</p> <p>Policy BL1 seeks to achieve this – read collectively alongside the other policies.</p> <p>Individuals are able to make representations relating to planning applications and can also respond to the emerging Local Plan consultations. The PC will also make representations.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			needed!	Noted.
276.		12	<p>I am grateful for the invitation to take part in the Regulation 14 Consultation on the Formal Draft NDP. May I commend everybody who has worked on this Plan over the years for bringing it to this point.</p> <p>However, I am disappointed that your Key Principles upon which the Plan is apparently base, have not been taken forward into sound, robust policies that address the development of the Parish, both in the EHDC and South Downs National Park (SDNP) areas.</p> <p>Those Key Principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen to residents, • Carry out local research, • Review published evidence of what works, • Support highest needs first as defined by local people. <p>While this Plan has been under development, residents have frequently and regularly made their views well known on several difficult and controversial issues. Not just regarding housing developments but also traffic congestion, flooding of homes (often with sewage), power shortages, schools, doctors, public transport and the location (and therefore the influence of) the SDNP – the list is long, diverse and full of critical problems and challenges. And yet this Plan, in its present unfinished format and the policies it promotes hardly mentions them and instead presents Liphook in a rose-coloured light. The recent flooding on the Midhurst Road is evidence that these are a real and current danger.</p> <p>In my opinion, policies that are needed in the Plan but appear to have been overlooked, include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How controversial Planning Applications are to be addressed. 2. How Liphook’s Site of Special Housing Character (one of only five designated by 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Flooding has not been raised as a major issue locally. The parish is not within a flood plain or area subject to major flooding incidents. The majority of flooding issues relate to maintenance issues of drains etc.</p> <p>There is some concern about sewage and capacity of pipes, but this falls outside the remit of the BLNDP. It is for HCC (as the Flood Authority) and Thames Water as</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			<p>EHDC within its Planning Area) is to be protected.</p> <p>3. How proposals for SANGs are to be evaluated and responded to.</p> <p>4. How the interface (if any) between the SDNP and EHDC is to be managed.</p> <p>5. How the “10-minute neighbourhood” (as shown on Figure 9) is to be achieved when much of the Liphook area is already outside it.</p> <p>6. Where the most sustainable sites for development are and which of those might be supported.</p> <p>7. An incomplete and shortened list of sunken lanes, a key feature of the Parish.</p> <p>In my view this is not a “Plan” but merely an appraisal of Liphook, that will not ensure the future prosperity and well-being of the Parish I love, cherish and regard as home. I am concerned that it is not yet in a form that will provide a positive and fruitful impact on the future of Liphook, whilst also reflecting the needs and aspirations that the residents of the community have clearly stated.</p> <p>Of those policies that are presented, most come across as a “wish list” without robustness or conviction, with many uses of the words “...where possible...”, “..in so far as is reasonably practicable...” and “....subject to viability.....”, rather than being more assertive. It is also noted that they all state that “proposals for development will [my italics] be supported.....” rather than “proposals will not be supported unless they are in accordance with...”. The current wording appears to allow developers a greater opportunity to be in accordance with the policies and so achieve an automatic approval.</p> <p>In summary, while I applaud the amount of work that has been done to date, I am concerned that unless there are substantial improvements this NDP in its present form with few, if any, concrete proposals and recommendations, may struggle to achieve success at referendum.</p>	<p>the provider to address these matters. The provision of sustainable drainage is also already addressed in the local plans.</p>
277.		12	<p>There is no alternative way of influencing planning policy for Bramshott & Liphook.</p> <p>The policies could be more strongly worded and provide more detailed examples. However to reject the Neighbourhood Development Plan for minor matters would be</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			to 'throw the baby out with the bathwater' and lose the opportunity to contribute to how the area develops in the next few years.	
278.		12	I think that our lovely countryside around Liphook should be as protected as possible and the neighbourhood plan is a good way to do that.	Thank you for your comments.
279.		12	I think the policies of protecting the countryside around Liphook and the views are good ones.	Thank you for your comments.
280.		12	This is not a plan, it has no strategic view for Liphook and does not deal with the very large elephants in the room, the questions of inadequate infrastructure now and improvements in future on the one hand and the relationship between East Hampshire District Council as a planning authority for part of the parish and the South Downs National Park on the other.	Thank you for your comments.
281.		12	Balanced, all encompassing with admiral aspirations.	Thank you for your comments.
282.		12 RES_3	Having stripped out the policies myself into a separate set, and briefly looking through them, I can find no reference to village infrastructure improvements as being a key element for any future housing other development. By this I mean “water in”, “water out”, electrical or gas supplies, GP and dental services, schools etc., etc. Is that a deliberate omission? “Water out” has been a particular question brought up many times in recent years, the ability of what I understand to be the single sewage pipe which conducts Liphook’s waste to the nearest treatment plant at Linford has been raised as a concern by parish councillors in the past. Should not any sensibly drawn set of policies treat current and future infrastructure needs as a major item? “Water in” is probably not so much of a problem (although my comparison it has been raised in Haslemere’s past and continues to be so), Liphook problems are more to do with the constant leaks in the current system which appear due to moving to metered supplies and connections which are substandard, if nothing else.	These are not the remit of the NDP.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			Gas and electricity are subject to all the usual national problems – in essence we don't have enough electrical generating capacity nationally now let alone in future, when oil and gas are supposed to be removed from the energy mix.	
283.		10	<p>The following letter has been sent by email and hard copy, and presents the views of the Residents' Group.</p> <p>Thank you for the invitation to take part in the Regulation 14 Consultation on your Formal Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). May we start by commending you and everybody who has worked on this Plan over the years for bringing it to this point.</p> <p>However, we are disappointed that your Key Principles upon which the Plan is apparently based, have not been taken forward into sound, robust policies that address the development of the Parish, both in the EHDC and South Downs National Park (SDNP) areas.</p> <p>Those Key Principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen to residents, • Carry out local research, • Review published evidence of what works, • Support highest needs first as defined by local people. <p>While this Plan has been under development, residents have frequently made their views well known on several difficult and controversial issues. Not just regarding housing developments but also traffic congestion, flooding of homes (often with sewage), power shortages, schools, doctors, public transport and the location (and therefore the influence of) the SDNP – the list is long, diverse and full of critical problems and challenges. And yet this Plan, in its present unfinished format, and the policies it promotes hardly mentions them and instead presents Liphook in a rose-coloured light.</p> <p>In our opinion, policies that are needed in the Plan but appear to have been overlooked, include:</p>	Thank you for your comments.

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			<p>1. How controversial Planning Applications are to be addressed, 2. How Liphook’s Site of Special Housing Character (one of only five designated by EHDC within its Planning Area) is to be protected, 3. How proposals for SANGs are to be evaluated and responded to, 4. How the interface between the SDNP and EHDC is to be managed, 5. How the “10-minute neighbourhood” (as shown on Figure 9) is to be achieved when much of the Liphook area is already outside it, and 6. How sites proposed for allocation by EHDC for housing development are to be assessed and responded to.</p> <p>Although the NDP Steering Group made the decision NOT to allocate sites for development, there appears to be no Policy to ensure any proposed sites are in the most sustainable and acceptable locations. There is nothing that ensures the wishes and aspirations of the local community will be at the forefront of the response to any future development proposal, and how these wishes are to be communicated with EHDC and SDNP during the planning application process.</p> <p>Of those policies that are presented, most come across as a “wish list” without robustness or conviction, with many uses of the words “...where possible...”, “..in so far as is reasonably practicable...” and “....subject to viability.....”, rather than being more assertive.</p> <p>It is also noted that they all state that “proposals for development will [our italics] be supported.....” rather than “proposals will not be supported unless they are in accordance with...”. The current wording appears to offer developers an obvious opportunity to be manipulative, with the aim of achieving automatic approval.</p> <p>In our view this is not a “Plan” but merely an appraisal of Liphook that will not ensure the future prosperity and well-being of the Parish we all love, cherish and regard as home. We are concerned that it is not yet in a form that will provide a positive and fruitful impact on the future of the Parish, whilst also reflecting the needs and aspirations that local residents have clearly stated.</p> <p>In conclusion, while we applaud the amount of work that has been done to date, we fear that unless there are substantial improvements, this NDP in its present form with</p>	

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			<p>few, if any, concrete proposals and recommendations, may struggle to achieve success at referendum.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, For and on behalf of the South and East Liphook Residents' Group</p>	
284.		12 RES_2	<p>Thank you for consulting with us (the Liphook Community) - it makes a lovely change. My primary concern for this document is that it completely ignores what the vast majority of the community actually want. I would like to see a public consultation AND VOTE that offers building 600+ houses on land behind Bohunt School. Yes - I know the constraints of SDNP - but that is not a communities concern - Let the community VOTE and then let SDNP reject the view of the community. The NPPF (Para 11) states - that any development must be sustainable. This plan is not sustainable as it makes no commitment to deliver the infrastructure needed for 600+ houses. Summary - • The plan is NOT sustainable. • Lots and lots of story telling - not much substance. • The Infrastructure changes need to support 600+ houses has been left to the Parish Council to implement! On the grounds that they have had this responsibility and done nothing for 20 years - the community will not get any new changes needed for 600+ houses. • What little real engagement with the community has happened - a significant proportion (90%) has been ignored. • Community Benefit were the true basis of all key decisions for 6 years - all now removed - there are no Community Benefits in the NDP which makes 6 years of NDP decisions and process invalid. • It doesn't reflect what the community actually want - it reflects what the Parish Council, SDNP and EHDC want. • The NDP Committee activity refused to address building 600+ houses where the community wants them - Behind Bohunt School • You say the NDP is SMART (page 21) but it is FAR from SMART • Its lack of commitment to actually do anything to support 600+ houses makes this a very dangerous, pretty and political document designed just to get the Parish Council more CIL (£) • It has many untruths / political statements - created to present a NDP to the community with only one outcome Without addressing the points above, and addressing who and how the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See previous responses on specific points raised.</p>

Ref.	Page/ Para	Rep.	Summary of comment	Response
			infrastructure changes will be implemented - I'm sure the NDP will be rejected at referendum.	