

APPENDIX C:

TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON DRAFT BRAMLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

The consultation comments are separated into the following categories:

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Residents' Responses (Residents are numbered and list is available linking the response to name) | Pages 2-16 |
| 2. E mail responses (Responses numbered and names are available to link to the response) | Pages 16-31 |
| 3. Statutory consultees' responses | Pages 32-39 |
| 4. Non Reply from Statutory Consultees | Pages 40-43 |
| 5. Land owners and developers | Pages 44-56 |
| 6. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council | Pages 57-89 |

1) RESIDENTS' RESPONSES

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
<p>Record Number: 1</p> <p>Date/Time of Comment: 6/21/2015 20:55:14</p>	<p>The bias of the reports is towards the well-discredited 'predict and provide' policies of the 1990s. More roads, more carparks etc. If we provide a thousand car spaces for the station, then we'll get 1,000 cars using it. One of the big benefits of the level crossing is that it's closed much of the time, limiting through traffic. Much more value in footpaths and cyclepaths</p>	<p>Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan promotes the creation of a footpath and cycle way network.</p>	<p>No Action</p>
<p>Record Number: 2</p> <p>Date/Time of Comment: 6/28/2015 13:12:36</p>	<p>1.02. Plan includes whole parish, Razors Farm and Cufaude Farm. In conflict with 5.27.</p> <p>Arbitrarily drawn settlement Boundary.</p> <p>2.28-Level crossing useful factor dissuading traffic. Careful if any changes</p> <p>2.29 Speed limits on Rural Lanes down to 30 mph</p> <p>BSA5-National Cycle route through the village. Dangerous. Solution not to widen roads and have cycle ways as incompatible with maintaining Rural Character</p> <p>2.31-Redevelopment of Central part of village around the One Stop, Bakery, Garage, providing underground</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan includes Razors Farm and Cufaude Farm, mentioned in the Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan aims to be in general conformity with not just with the adopted Local Plan, but also with the Submission Local Plan which allocates at least 200 new houses for Bramley.</p> <p>5.27 is anticipating a proportionate future housing growth for Bramley which complements and enhances the rural character of the area and the village.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan uses the same Settlement Policy Boundary as the Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan no power over dictating speed limits. Hampshire Highways responsibility.</p> <p>Ref. above on speed. No intention of widening road but to have cycle ways/pedestrian way within village as per plan. Noted.</p> <p>Not proposed as part of the Neighbourhood Plan. Noted</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No Action</p> <p>No Action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No Action</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>parking, retail shops etc.</p> <p>RE2/6.80-No area of separation to the south or west.</p> <p>6.112-What measures to ensure traffic from Razors Farm, Cufaude Farm developments will not cause problems in Cufaude Lane</p> <p>6.119- Cufaude Lane Business Park buildings are “designed in a complementary style??”</p>	<p>The Local Plan 2011-2029 defines a Strategic Gap in the area to the south and west of Bramley village Basingstoke. The Area of Separation in the Neighbourhood Plan separates Bramley from Sherfield on Loddon to the east..</p> <p>Noted. Not in remit of NP.</p> <p>This example should have been named as the small business park on the south side of The Street between Cufaude Lane and Vyne Road, i.e. Stocks Barn.</p>	<p>Further explanation of the distinction between the Strategic Gap and the Area of Separation is provided in 6.79 to 6.82</p> <p>This is a matter for Hampshire County Highways Department. No action.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.129 amended.</p>
<p>Record Number: 3 Date/Time of Comment: 6/28/2015 13:41:14</p>	<p>Not saying what type, size, materials and spacing in between houses?</p>	<p>These matters are dealt with in Policies D1 and D2. Every site is different, so a uniform standard would be inappropriate. The Neighbourhood Plan does not look at individual sites, instead relying on principles to determine density. Sites will be assessed individually according to their context. Density will be considered in relation to the character of the adjoining area(s) defined in the Bramley Village Character Appraisal.</p>	<p>Policy D1 refers to the Bramley Village Character Appraisal to set the principles for determining density in different parts of the village.</p>
<p>Record Number: 4 Date/Time of Comment: 6/28/2015 20:58:39</p>	<p>Plan is acceptable</p>	<p>No action</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number 5 Date/Time of Comment: 6/29/2015 13:45:19</p>	<p>NP reflects fully the views of the community as analysed from the survey results conducted over the past 24 months. It is important that Bramley maintains its Rural Character.</p>	<p>Noted. No Action</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 6 Date/Time of Comment: 7/2/2015 17:17:23</p>	<p>NP in its current form is excellent. I have been consulted on this enough to bring tears to my eyes. Please now make it legally enforceable as soon as possible!</p>	<p>Noted. No Action</p>	<p>No action</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
<p>Record Number: 7 Date/Time of Comment: 7/16/2015 12:41:04</p>	<p>In favour generally of NP. Footpaths between Bramley and Sherfield would reduce traffic. Policy T1, Map 6g:- More direct route required following road.</p> <p>6.39- Where on Plan is proposed bowling Green</p> <p>6.32- Purchase land from Network Rail to build a footbridge</p>	<p>Suggested routes within NP. Route to Sherfield not direct because of need to avoid main road and avoid traversing privately owned land.</p> <p>6.40 reports on the community's preferences for new community facilities. The Neighbourhood Plan does not make site allocations.</p> <p>NP highlights suggestions from the community as to their requirements. The Borough Council would negotiate with land owners if required.</p>	<p>Illustration 6g amended to show footpath and cycleway network linking to existing public rights of way.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 8 Date/Time of Comment: 7/16/2015 15:26:58</p>	<p>I am totally against building more houses in Bramley. My car windows smashed on Longbridge Rd, in the middle of the day. I thought I would feel safe in this village- my concern is more houses, little to do, more trouble. Imagined bringing up children around here- I feel that as the school is under special measures- more developments will not help. Not enough resources such as GP time- to keep with the growing numbers.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan aims to be in general conformity with not just with the former Local Plan, but also with the Local Plan 2011-29 which allocates at least 200 new houses for Bramley. This has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields. Further development, if any, out to 2029 will complement the Rural Character of Bramley as defined in the Bramley Village Character Appraisal and policies D1 and D2.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan recognises the pressures on local infrastructure and seeks opportunities to mitigate these when new development is proposed.</p>	<p>No Action</p>
<p>Record Number: 9 Date/Time of Comment: 7/20/2015 20:04:58</p>	<p>Reflects the desires of the community. Fully support</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No Action</p>
<p>Record Number: 10 Date/Time of Comment: 7/20/2015 20:07:32</p>	<p>The principles sound good as we need to sustain bramley's rural nature</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan aims to protect and enhance Bramley's rural character.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Record Number: 11 Date/Time of Comment: 7/21/2015 19:49:27	The only houses that should be built in the area, must be social, and for the youngsters born and bred in the village	The proportion of affordable housing provided with new residential development is determined by policies in the Adopted Local Plan.	Policy H2 amended to allocate first occupancy of affordable housing to persons with a strong local connection.
Record Number: 12 Date/Time of Comment: 7/22/2015 13:07:41	Doesn't seem to be any infrastructure improvements, there is only a single road in and out of the village, traffic is already busy, this will make it far worse, especially if the roads get blocked again by falling trees. The small country lanes cannot handle the current level of traffic, this will make it worse and even more dangerous. Scrap It	The traffic congestion and road hazards are recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan. Road infrastructure is the responsibility of Hampshire County Highways.	No action
Record Number: 13 Date/Time of Comment: 7/23/2015 16:56:59	To meet all 13 policies challenging. Helpful if Planning Officers assigned weighting to various requirements. Own Priorities, 1) Maintain Rural aspect, 2) New assets of community value, 3) New shops, dentistry. Overall support, doing good job.	The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the policy requirements for new development. Infrastructure improvements can be achieved with new developments, but the Neighbourhood Plan recognises that Bramley's infrastructure is under pressure.	No action
Record Number: 14 Date/Time of Comment: 7/25/2015 7:52:59	Overall support. Concern on proposed growth which liable to attract large retail, banks etc. Concerned about increased traffic and erosion of Village feel. No increase in employment facilities when Basingstoke, Reading close by. Like level crossing	The Neighbourhood Plan aims to be in general conformity with not just with the former Local Plan 1996-2011, but also with the new Local Plan 2011-2029 which allocates at least 200 new houses for Bramley. This has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields. Further development to 2029 will be required to complement the rural and historic character of Bramley as defined in the Bramley Village Character Appraisal and policies D1 and D2. The Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for some local employment development in order to achieve sustainable balanced growth.	Policies H1 and H2 in the Neighbourhood Plan aim to ensure that new residential development in the parish does not adversely affect the rural character of Bramley. Policy E1 amended to ensure that new employment development is small scale and locally beneficial.
Record Number: 15 Date/Time of Comment: 7/27/2015 18:54:45	Generally the plan looks to be well thought out and reflects my thoughts. Like footbridge	Noted.	No action
Record Number: 16 Date/Time of Comment:	It is an excellent statement of the communities wishes for Bramleys future and I fuuly support its contant.	Noted.	No action

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
7/28/2015 10:55:46			
Record Number: 17 Date/Time of Comment: 7/28/2015 13:46:41	<p>Further development inevitable, so talk with planners developers so outcome fits with local environment and character.</p> <p>Major problem with the shop and traffic problems. Relocate to British Legion Site.</p> <p>Understand Footbridge rejected because only avail to able bodied people. Required as help a lot of people.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan policies seek to ensure that new development is proportionate to the scale of the village and respects the rural character of the area.</p> <p>The traffic problems are recognised. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that any new development does not exacerbate, and where possible mitigates these.</p> <p>The Borough Council is leading on this initiative.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>
Record Number: 18 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:07:47	<p>50 new houses per year sounds right.</p> <p>Speeding lorries need to be slowed down a lot.</p> <p>Create a cycle/footpath between Bramley and Sherfield. Road with no footpath very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists</p>	<p>Policy H1 limits each new housing development to no more than 50 homes.</p> <p>The traffic problems are recognised and the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that any new development does not exacerbate, and where possible mitigates these.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to create a safe footpath and cycle way network. Ref Record 21</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>
Record Number: 19 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:10:53	A good effort by volunteers. I am happy to support it and vote in favour	Noted	No Action
Record Number: 20 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:20:40	<p>Regarding D1 and H1. Regarding Minchens lane, not against east or west developments, but for D1 to happen, neither developments. Further development of overheated village will totally ruin it. Supposed to be RURAL.</p> <p>Should be protected from further development. 200 to 2029 too many. Just because NP exists does not mean it is any use to protect the village</p>	The Neighbourhood Plan aims to be in general conformity with not just with the former Local Plan 1996-2011, but also with the new Local Plan 2011-2029 which allocates at least 200 new houses for Bramley. This has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The Street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields. Further development to 2029 will complement the Rural Character of Bramley as defined in the Bramley Village Character Appraisal and policies D1 and D2.	No action

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
<p>Record Number: 21 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:25:30</p>	<p>Regarding policy T1 and T2, a footpath/cycleway should be made between Bramley and Sherfield. The road is not safe for cycle users and would encourage people to walk and cycle between the 2 villages if it were introduced.</p> <p>T2. Cambell Road roundabout wasted money. Is there hidden agenda?</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to create a safe footpath and cycle way network.</p> <p>Roundabout planned in association with German Road development.</p>	<p>Illustration 6g amended to show footpath and cycleway network linking to existing public rights of way.</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 22 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:28:56</p>	<p>Too many dwellings in the village- Reduce the number.</p> <p>RE1- It must be extended to stop any flooding to land or property within half mile of new development, not just the site of the development</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan aims to be in general conformity with not just with the former Local Plan, but also with the new Local Plan 2011-2029 which allocates at least 200 new houses for Bramley. This has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The Street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields. Further development to 2029 will complement the Rural Character of Bramley as defined in the Bramley Village Character Appraisal and policies D1 and D2.</p> <p>Policy RE1 is subordinate to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan which set the policy framework for flood prevention policies. A specific numerical limit as suggested would be very difficult to justify and would not align with strategic policy.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 23 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:33:43</p>	<p>The plan as it is will expand Bramley considerably, therefore it is imperative that the order in which the suggested work takes place is by far the most important issue. Bramley is already grid locked at peak times yet there is no mention of upgrades to access roads from Tadley or the surrounding area. Why not? Where are issues now, Roads, Schools, Doctors and the rail crossing and then consider where best to allocate funds</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan recognises road infrastructure problems and seeks to take opportunities to improve the local infrastructure whenever possible. Proposals to improve roads are the responsibility of Hampshire County Highways and are outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 24</p>	<p>T2 The speeding vehicles, 50mph is common. Pinch</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan recognises traffic</p>	<p>No action</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:37:16	points are dangerous. Two have been pushed over in my short time living here!	hazards and road safety issues in Bramley and seeks to mitigate these where possible. Appendix G provides details of the traffic hazards identified by the Steering Group and through consultation. Road speed limits are the responsibility of Hampshire County Highways and are outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Record Number: 25 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:42:57	Well done to the Steering Group. Can we contest being compared to Overton and Whitchurch- Ridiculous. Already Sherfield/Kinsclere are more relevant. Would emphasise more strongly that extra housing will need more public transport, especially as services have been cut back. Also how do we know that enough people will be attracted to live in the village. Some residents in German Road do not want to be here!	Comparison with Whitchurch town and Overton village made on the basis of size and local facilities, and to show Bramley has grown much faster than these similarly sized settlements over the past 20 to 30 years. The lack of a good bus service in Bramley is mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the frequency of bus services is not a planning policy matter.	No action No action
Record Number: 26 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:47:30	Bramley people be given priority for housing, not all town people. Sensible provision for parking as school parking horrendous	Local housing need is recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan. Responsibility for on-street parking lies with Hampshire County Highways.	Policy H2 amended to allocate first occupancy of affordable housing to persons with a strong local connection. No action
Record Number: 27 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 15:55:58	10/10. Happy if Bramley stays as it is. Concerned about on street parking. Car Park near school, so walk to school	Responsibility for on-street parking lies with Hampshire County Highways. The traffic problems are recognised. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that any new development does not exacerbate, and where possible mitigates these.	No action
Record Number: 28 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 16:08:43	H2- Balanced mix should include smaller dwellings, not just for young families but for older villagers wishing to down size and remain in the village (some single storey dwellings). RE3 -Strongly agree	Policy H2 aims to encourage a greater proportion of smaller dwellings for older people wishing to downsize and for younger persons and young families starting out. Noted	No action No Action

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>T1- Street lighting is a must between the Smithy and Strawberry Fields is a must if people are to walk to and from the station.</p> <p>BSA6- Aim. Include in appropriate policy-Parking. Look to short term parking, max 4 hrs?</p>	<p>Street lighting would improve safety but would have to be in keeping with the rural character of Bramley. Policies H1 and T1 would facilitate this, if considered appropriate in the circumstance.</p> <p>Street lighting is a Hampshire County Highways responsibility.</p> <p>There is concern that increasing parking will result in more traffic. In addition no suitable land is available.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 29 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 16:26:38</p>	<p>I think it looks OK.</p> <p>My main issue with development in Bramley is keeping green locations intact and not affecting the aesthetics of the village</p> <p>Parking an issue. Road under/over. Local shop needs competition</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan contains policies which protect the rural and historic character of the village and aim to ensure new development is designed to a high standard.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan recognises that car parking is an issue and seeks to alleviate this when possible.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 30 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 16:36:24</p>	<p>D1, RE4, T1 and T2 If improving the infrastructure in Bramley, there will be a breach of RE4. Roundabout is a blot on the landscape.</p>	<p>RE4 seeks to protect certain identified parts of the natural environment, not all of it without exception. Infrastructure can be provided in such a way that avoids damaging the important parts of the natural environment, in the great majority of cases. No change.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 31 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 16:48:09</p>	<p>We agree with what is contained in the NP. However our main concerns are the provision of schools and impact on the local doctor's surgery. The NP policy H1 should state "Maintain or improve current levels of local services and facilities per capita "</p>	<p>Agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan should aim to maintain or improve current levels of local facilities.</p>	<p>Policy H1 re-worded to maintain or improve upon levels of provision at the start of the plan period (2016).</p>
<p>Record Number: 32 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 16:55:07</p>	<p>Our major concern is not the number of houses per se but the adequate provision of local amenities to cater for residents, esp. retail and transport. We would not want arguments over housing numbers to jeopardise developers fund money being available for spending WITHIN the community</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan policies seek to ensure that new developments help deliver improvements to community facilities in Bramley.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Record Number: 33 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 17:04:27	I think the NP is very well considered and explained. I would be particularly interested to see how Policy T1 and T2 are actioned. Little can improve the rail crossing. The traffic at the shop and school traffic turning are huge contributing factors to the congestion in the area. Simple things like not allowing lorry deliveries during busy times would help.	Matters concerning the highway are the responsibility of Hampshire County Council.	Noted for consideration.
Record Number: 34 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 17:11:42	A thoughtful and well put together document. Thanks to the team work put in producing it. There should be a requirement to ensure that bus services are maintained, possibly improved and suit the needs of YOUNG and OLD Policy H2:- Could comment be made for single and or elderly residents and those down-sizing to BUNGALOWS i.e. No stairs to contend with.	The lack of a good bus service in Bramley is mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the frequency of bus services is not a planning policy matter. Policy H2 says “..the provision of.....accessible purpose-designed accommodation for older persons...” This includes bungalows.	No action No action
Record Number: 35 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 17:20:38	I wholeheartedly support RE2- can the separation distance be specified, so not nibbled away? T1- we need more cycle routes away from the main roads. H2- I hope there will be provision made for some retirement housing/flats.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to create a safe footpath and cycle way network. Policy H2 aims to encourage a greater proportion of smaller dwellings for older people wishing to downsize and for younger persons and young families starting out.	The supporting text now includes an explanation of why there is an Area of Separation policy in addition to the Strategic Gap policy in the Local Plan. The Area of Separation is precisely defined on a map, so there is no need for distances to be specified. No further action. No action.
Record Number: 36 Date/Time of Comment: 7/30/2015 17:50:21	22 years ago moved to the Village. It is now a car park for commuters. No street lights, a barrier that's down more than it is up. Pot holes that are pathetically filled. Infrastructure that cannot cope now, never mind more dwellings, one way streets due to commuter parking which causes blockages on one side of the road wearing	Matters concerning the highway are the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. Parking issues are recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to ensure that any new development does not	No action

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>out quickly-2 What a lovely village". There is no shelter at railway to stand in, no footbridge to walk over. It's disgraceful!! Poor roads, and parking issues</p>	<p>exacerbate, and where possible mitigates these.</p>	
<p>Record Number: 37/38 Date/Time of Comment: 8/4/2015 10:29:41</p>	<p>Will be happy if another shop and pub are opened or instead of the pub re-open RBL</p>	<p>Noted. If appropriate such initiatives would be delivered by the open market.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 39 Date/Time of Comment: 8/5/2015 17:37:25</p>	<p>The plan is entirely in line with the limited opportunity for development in Bramley. We do not have the infrastructure to support large developments... I completely support the plan in respect of the need to keep developments to a limit of 50 and to maintain the rural environment in our village.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 40 Date/Time of Comment: 8/6/2015 10:28:20</p>	<p>Very detailed and covers some of my concerns of increased dwellings in and around Bramley. B5 A6 3.17 mentions lack of parking for train station which I totally agree with. More development, more cars, car noise and increased pollution. Road deterioration and longer queues at the barrier. Not happy with further development.</p> <p>We don't have amenities, appropriate infrastructure and services to sustain our current population let alone for additional dwellings and population. Speed safety will also be a concern.</p> <p>I just hope Bramley doesn't lose its charm of being a rural village. I fear it's being degraded bit by bit. As I said before enough is enough.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan aims to be in general conformity with not just with the former Local Plan, but also with the new Local Plan 2011-2029 which allocates at least 200 new houses for Bramley. This has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The Street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields. Further development to 2029 will complement the Rural Character of Bramley as defined in the Bramley Village Character Appraisal and policies D1 and D2.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the policy requirements for new development. Improvements to Infrastructure and community facilities can be achieved in association with new developments, but the Neighbourhood Plan recognises that Bramley's infrastructure is under pressure.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Record Number: 41 Date/Time of Comment: 8/6/2015 18:01:04 HISTORIC ENGLAND</p>	<p>Response in Statutory Consultee section of this document.</p>		

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Record Number: 42/43 Date/Time of Comment: 8/9/2015 14:05:03	We feel that the two big developments investigated by Bramley Parish for the Campbell Road area (NP17 and BR10) should be permitted as these are the closest to the A33 giving easy access away from the village centre. These should be more than enough to meet our housing needs for the next 15 years. Any further small developments should not be considered as Bramley cannot take any more housing on the west side of the railway line due to congestion along with increased services on our Doctor's surgery and Bramley school. Further to this, the development at Cufaude Farm will increase the traffic issues in Cufaude lane	The Neighbourhood Plan does not identify housing sites. Instead it seeks to limit the size of each individual proposal for housing development and ensure that these are inside or immediately adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary. New development must complement the rural character of Bramley.	No action
Record Number: 44 Date/Time of Comment: 8/10/2015 19:50:24	We do feel with the Minchens Lane and Strawberry fields development that is sufficient. Let's keep the other small green areas in the village so that it still has a rural feel which gives Bramley its appeal.	Planning permissions for residential development at Minchens Lane, Strawberry Fields and The Street exceed the minimum allocation in the Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to limit the size of each individual proposal for housing development and ensure that these are inside or immediately adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary. New development must complement the rural character of Bramley.	No action
Record Number: 45 Date/Time of Comment: 8/13/2015 15:17:23	Broadly speaking they reflect our understanding and are in line with our thoughts. Reference to flood mitigation seems a little ambiguous and may require more explicit wording to ensure any development must not create flooding anywhere.	Agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan should seek to ensure new development does not cause flooding problems elsewhere.	Policy RE 1 and supporting text amended along the lines suggested by Thames Water.
Record Number: 46 Date/Time of Comment: 8/14/2015 10:08:32	The draft plan is a good comprehensive document and those responsible should be commended for their efforts. I particularly like the comparison with other villages to illustrate the recent growth of Bramley. Because of the enforced time scale of the review of this plan there are inevitably going to be opportunistic attempts by Developers to get in before the Plan can be adopted. Ideally a moratorium should be in place to prevent these attempts. Perhaps our local MP can raise this in Parliament as I am sure Bramley is not the only village in this situation.	Comments noted.	No action

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
<p>Record Number: 47 Date/Time of Comment: 8/15/2015 16:24:19</p>	<p>This draft plan is a thorough piece of work, and particularly strong on Bramley's rural characteristics For the better evolution of the environmental and countryside-preservation policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, and for their better realisation, would it be practical to pursue coordination with the areas surrounding the current Bramley boundary marked red on the plan?.</p> <p>This applies as much to the villages to east and west (i.e. Sherfield-on-Loddon and Sherborne St John) and their adjacent lands which are the counterpart of Bramley's, as it does to the urbanising northern margin of Basingstoke.</p> <p>Might it, for example, be possible to study significant views into and out of these settlements, and in the landscape around them, and include the results as (coinciding) view-cones on the maps and plans? Measures like this, by helping avoid inadvertent planning clashes which could be to the detriment of all parties in the district, would tend instead to benefit a wide public.</p> <p>If so wished, I would be content to advise further on the implications of this sort of thinking.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Adjoining parishes have been consulted on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>However, the Neighbourhood Plan is for Bramley parish, which is the Neighbourhood Plan Area, so views of other settlements are outside its scope.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>Record Number: 48 Date/Time of Comment: 8/15/2015 17:51:05</p>	<p>It is a very well thought out and balanced document. There has been far too much development in Bramley recently and the infrastructure is struggling to keep up. Ideally there should be no more development in Bramley but we have to accept that further houses are inevitable. On this basis I support the findings of the draft neighbourhood plan. I think the comparisons with Whitchurch and Overton are striking. The populations are similar and yet these two settlements have far more shops, pubs and parking than Bramley. Before further development takes place in Bramley, thought needs to be given to where all the new residents will park and shop, how the school and surgery will cope and what the traffic situation will be like, especially when the barriers are down.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Neighbourhood Plan sets out the policy requirements for new development. Improvements to Infrastructure and community facilities can be achieved in association with new developments, but the Neighbourhood Plan recognises that Bramley's infrastructure is under pressure.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Record Number: 49 Date/Time of Comment: 8/17/2015 20:44:40	We generally support the NP in its current form. We are particularly keen to preserve open green space between Bramley and neighbouring settlements especially Basingstoke and Sherfield The view from Clift Meadow facing North is an important view in terms of Bramley's rural character.	The Neighbourhood Plan identifies an Area of Separation between Bramley and Sherfield on Loddon which would be protected against inappropriate development. It also identifies important vista views and view points, and seeks to ensure any new development protects, complements or enhances such views.	No action
Record Number: 50 Date/Time of Comment: 8/18/2015 22:56:55	I fully support this draft plan. My only additional comment concerns ensuring the potential use of brownfield sites as a priority over greenfield development.	Agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan should prioritise the development of brownfield sites wherever possible.	6.14 amended to emphasise the preference for brownfield development.
Record Number: 51 Date/Time of Comment: 8/18/2015 23:12:02	I like that it calls out the massive expansion That Bramley has undergone since 1991 and that the facilities have not improved to cope with this. There is a risk of over development of Bramley which threatens to turn it into a giant housing estate I'd like to see suggestions of widening roads. If it is acceptable to place houses on green field sites, then making Cufaude Lane wider must also be acceptable	Comments noted. Matters concerning the highway are the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure that any new development does not exacerbate, and where possible mitigates any capacity problems identified.	No action No action
Record Number: 52 Date/Time of Comment: 8/19/2015 7:34:00	I agree with the proposals put forward in the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2029, which I think is a well-balanced document allowing for the growth of the village in a controlled, sympathetic manner which is in the best interests of the local community. In the Housing Policies section (page 33-34, section 6.12) Policy H.1: New Housing Development I suggest that a density limit should also be specified within the main component of the Plan and that it is based on the Housing Densities map illustrated in Appendix C, Section 7 page 29, and the conclusions	Comment noted. Policy D1 requires developments to be at densities which protect, complement or enhance the relevant character areas they are next to. The character areas within Bramley village are identified in the Bramley Village Character Appraisal, which states the existing densities for each character area.	No action Figures on densities of the different Bramley Village character areas have been included in Appendix C to support the implementation of policy D1.

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>reached on page 30 that a density of between 13 to 18 dwellings per hectare would be in keeping with a rural settlement.</p> <p>I consider this an important factor since future developers may try to maximise on an area by fitting the proposed maximum of 50 dwellings at a high density per hectare, (German Road 38 dwellings per hectare). By stipulating a dwelling density level per hectare developers would be encouraged to adhere to the rural character of the development and supply housing that is designed in keeping with the character of a village; not the urban town house style seen on the German Road development which is, in my opinion, more in keeping with an urban development and out of place in a village.</p>		
<p>Record Number: 53 Date/Time of Comment: 8/19/2015 12:26:32</p>	<p>I have read through the documentation and it looks to be a sound plan that I can support.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No Action</p>
<p>Record Number: 54 Date/Time of Comment: 8/19/2015 13:00:00</p>	<p>I strongly oppose the Cufaude Lane development. We have lived in this Village for 30 years and have seen lots of changes which are tolerable .However the villages infrastructure simply cannot take this further level of proposed development.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Cufaude Lane is a strategic housing allocation made by the Borough Council, which this Neighbourhood Plan cannot alter. Infrastructure deficiencies noted in the plan.</p>	<p>No Action</p>
<p>Record Number: 55 Date/Time of Comment: 8/19/2015 17:03:37</p>	<p>Acceptable.</p> <p>Provision for a retail shopping area away from the main road and no parking anywhere near the level crossing.</p> <p>A bridge over the railway urgently required.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not make site allocations.</p> <p>Parking issues are recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to ensure that any new development does not exacerbate, and where possible mitigates these.</p>	<p>No Action</p>
<p>Record Number: 56 Date/Time of Comment: 8/19/2015 17:10:12</p>	<p>I approve the policies in the plan. Good work. I would like to see explicit mention of public transport including buses and the rail station and a footbridge.</p>	<p>The lack of a good bus service in Bramley is mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the frequency of bus services is not a planning policy matter. The railway station is discussed in the supporting text to policy T1. SA6 seeks to improve safety associated with</p>	<p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
		<p>the railway level crossing. However, matters concerning the highway are the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan, so no proposals relating to these issues are made.</p>	
<p>Record Number: 57 Date/Time of Comment: 8/19/2015 17:14:02</p>	<p>Railway station parking important as I notice more on road parking</p> <p>Bramley must retain village character for the benefit of all.</p> <p>Will policing, safety issues be addressed as population increases. This is of concern due to recent problems we are aware of.</p>	<p>Parking issues are recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to ensure that any new development does not exacerbate, and where possible mitigates these.</p> <p>Policy D1 seeks to protect, complement or enhance the character of Bramley.</p> <p>Public safety matters are outside the remit of this Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>No Action</p>

2) E-MAIL RESPONSES FROM RESIDENTS

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Resident 1 (e mail)	Two Large developments that are in place are enough for next 15 years. Keep near the A33. Countryside around Bramley is disappearing. Any small developments should be on hold for 15 years.	Noted.	No action
Resident 2(e mail)	<p>Population increased by 85.5% between 91-2011 Comparing with Overton and Whitchurch, these have all amenities.</p> <p>Not agree with bowling Green, skate board park. Best amenity would be By pass.</p> <p>Developers should provide off street for at least 2 cars. Try to find alternatives to car ownership, but mean time provide adequate parking</p> <p>5.28. Not clear as to how much future growth is being proposed. 50 houses per development is vague?</p> <p>5.30 Mentions 40 % affordable. What is meant by affordable?</p> <p>6.41/6.42 Mentions need for community facilities. No specifics? Perhaps alternative community centre, shops, Drs, dentist?</p> <p>By pass alternative route?</p> <p>6.112 Safe routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists. Suggest safety from cyclists as becoming menace?</p> <p>New school in Bramley Green area ease the problem of school traffic parking on the streets</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The facilities listed were what the community asked for in their response to consultation.</p> <p>Parking standards are determined by the Borough Council.</p> <p>No specific housing growth is proposed beyond the allocations in the Local Plan 2011-2029.</p> <p>Definition of terms to be provided.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.32 explains this.</p> <p>Bypass is a matter for Hampshire County Council.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan identifies a cycle way network. Constructional details to be agreed with County Council.</p> <p>Requirements for new school dealt with by County Council.</p>	<p>Section 5 of Neighbourhood Plan amended to emphasise the different nature of Whitchurch town and Overton parish, compared to Bramley in terms of facilities.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>A Glossary of Terms has been added to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Resident 3 (e mail)	<p>Policy RE1 Developments, both domestic and industrial, identify and mitigate against existing properties being subject to an increased flooding risk, throughout the village</p> <p>Policy T2 Developments, both domestic and industrial, must assess impact upon and mitigate against increased problems for entry and egress to existing properties, facilities and features.</p>	Policy RE1 aims to do this.	No action
Resident 4 (e mail)	Agree with the NP in its present form. No suggested amendments	Noted	No action.
Resident 5 (e mail)	<p>Approve in principle. Feel particularly strongly about maintaining the rural character.</p> <p>Guard against more than 200 already allocated and met with Minchens Lane. Need to be sure that talking of 50 dwelling developments comes with a ceiling.</p> <p>Need to ensure access is onto the Sherfield road so as not to clog the country lanes.</p>	<p>This is a strategic aim within the Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan 2011-2029 says “at least 200 new homes’ for Bramley. Policy H1 seeks to limit the size of individual future housing developments to a maximum of 50 dwellings, subject to compliance with other relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Satisfactory vehicular access arrangements must be demonstrated in order to obtain planning permission. This is a responsibility of the Borough Council.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>
Resident 6(e mail)	As per resident 5	As above.	No action.
Resident 7 (e mail)	<p>Against further housing development in Bramley. Would have detrimental effect on Bramley, already happening with recent developments.</p> <p>Roads cannot cope and railway crossing makes life difficult. Also significant strain on already stretched local amenities, surgery, school. These are small sized amenities.</p> <p>The application for 50 houses on the land north of Sherfield road would blight the views and landscape that one sees. It would have real tangible affect upon</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan aims to limit the size of future residential development so as not to affect the rural character of the area.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges and seeks to address the pressure on local amenities from increasing residents. It aims to provide safer footpath and cycle ways, and to improve road safety. It also seeks to use any planning obligations monies to support and if possible improve local community facilities.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan contains policies requiring important views and the rural</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	drainage to the Loddon at Sherfield, increasing flood risk to village and area	character of the area to be respected. Policy RE1 requires new developments in affected areas to demonstrate how they will mitigate the risk of flooding.	
Resident 8 (e mail)	<p>Support the plan as it gives the local people chance to influence future developments Policy H1. Can the 50 hoses per dwelling be overturned by SS6 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy H2 Much emphasis on the need for small households. Trust need for reasonably sized 3,4,5 bedroom houses not overlooked</p> <p>Policy ACV2. Trust this does not mean new building going up for every housing development</p> <p>Policy D1 The wording of this suggests that where previous development has not been in keeping with the character of the village, for example Kirby Drive, any new development adjacent to it could be in keeping with the existing development, and not in keeping with the majority of the village.</p> <p>RE1. Any new development should also not increase the likelihood of flooding to existing development by causing reduction of run-off, or by over-loading sewers and drains.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan aims to comply with the housing allocations for Bramley proposed in the Local Plan 2011-2029, which says “at least 200 new homes” for Bramley. The Neighbourhood Plan will be part of the statutory development plan for the parish, so must be respected when planning decision are made. Policy SS6 of the Local Plan 2011-2029 allows small scale housing development in the countryside in restricted circumstances.</p> <p>This need was identified through community consultation. Policy H2 seeks to ensure that a reasonable proportion of new homes are smaller dwellings.</p> <p>New community facilities will be provided in accordance with locally expressed needs and within the limitations of the funds available.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that this part of the village is not designed in a manner which complements the rural character of the village (paragraph 6.09). This point to be further clarified.</p> <p>Policy RE1 aims to do this. Comments provided by Thames Water to be used to guide how this is achieved.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.49 re-worded to emphasise that it is the rural character of Bramley that is new development must protect, complement or enhance.</p> <p>Supporting text to policy RE1 amended to incorporate advice from Thames Water.</p>
Resident 9 (e mail)	Sections 2.09-2.11 The population statistics in the Plan demonstrate the growth of Bramley Parish 1951 to 2011. These statistics are factually correct but are distorted by the effect of Bramley Camp. The statistics are taken from census data which includes all people in	Agreed that the key figures relate to the growth in the number of houses in Bramley, although the population growth is also relevant. Historical figures for both population and numbers of houses in Bramley show that the	Paragraph 2.09 amended to clarify the role of the army base in the population statistics for Bramley.

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Bramley at the time the census was taken regardless of where they actually normally lived. The table at 2.11 shows a population of 1510 in 1951 and a number of dwellings of 197 giving a ratio of 7.7 people per dwelling, an extraordinarily high number versus the more normalised 2.5 to 2.6 people per dwelling in the period 1991 to 2011. Publicly available data shows that the population number in 1951 was made up of 1037 men and 473 women i.e. 564 more males than females, clearly not a normal population distribution. In contrast the census of 1911 which was pre Bramley Camp showed a population of 417 in total with approximately equal numbers of men and women. Including the Bramley camp in the population statistics for the purposes of the NDP significantly understates the actual population growth that the village has undergone in permanent residents over the period from 1951 to 2011.</p> <p>I suggest that the statements in 2.09 and 2.11 relating to population growth are either modified to include statements regarding the impact of the camp, or are removed entirely and the focus is put solely on the dwellings increase as a measure of the growth of Bramley.</p> <p>Section 3.06 and BSA1 – Provision of new housing development Section 3.06 states purpose of BSA 1 is to meet the minimum housing allocations of the emerging Local Plan. As the local plan requires Bramley to take 200 new houses, and given that this 200 already has planning permission at Minchens Lane, I don't believe the NDP document is strong enough in emphasising this fact.</p> <p>In the remainder of the draft NDP document there is much discussion of sites, all of which I believe should be struck from the final document. Don't think publishing details of other sites reviewed is helpful to Bramley's future.</p>	<p>growth was dramatic from 1981.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan aims to be in general conformity with not just with the former Local Plan, but also with the new Local Plan 2011-2029 which allocates at least 200 new houses for Bramley. This has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The Street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields, as emphasised in paragraph 5.29.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not ignore the real possibility that between now and 2029 there will be pressure for more development in Bramley. The analysis of sites demonstrates that the Parish Council considered all realistic</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.36 and 5.37 amended to explain this point.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Undoubtedly it will encourage some landowners to promote these sites for development despite the emerging NDP, others encouraged to others to question why their sites were not considered.</p> <p>Section 5.03 Strategic context Statement regarding the 425 dwellings to be built at Razor’s Farm and the 390 potential dwellings on the site at Cufaude Lane viz. ‘640 of these will effectively be an expansion of Basingstoke and will not be near to Bramley Village’. This NDP covers Bramley Parish and these dwellings will be in Bramley Parish and the residents will be residents of Bramley Parish, what relevance can there possibly be in stating that these dwellings are not near to Bramley Village – this is not a Bramley Village NDP. Throughout the draft NDP there does not appear to be any consideration whatsoever of the whole of Bramley Parish, even the later discussion of important views in the parish is limited to the immediate vicinity of the village settlement area. Surely we have other parts of the Parish that we would want to consider and try to protect</p> <p>Sections 5.19 and 5.34 – Evaluation of development options and where should new development go? Evaluation of 19 potential housing sites as previously stated I think this should be taken out of the final document. The sites are all green fields, there are more green fields in the Parish that were not investigated thus leaving the NDP open to further challenge of the basis that a particular sight was not evaluated at all. Regardless of how the NDP team choses to treat the above, NP18 which is Beech Farm and its surrounding land should be removed as it is wholly in the</p>	<p>possibilities but decided not to allocate sites in the Neighbourhood Plan. Instead it was agreed that as the recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The Street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields have significantly exceeded the allocation of at least 200 new houses for Bramley in the new Local Plan 2011-2029, no further housing growth can be justified, as long as the Borough Council is able to demonstrate it has a 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan will apply to the whole of Bramley parish, albeit that the Settlement Policy Boundary serves to confine the great majority of any future development to the village and its immediate environs.</p> <p>Sites investigated were sites adjacent to or within the Settlement Policy Boundary. Other sites would not be in general conformity with the former or the new Local Plan 2011-2029. Sites within a conservation area are not automatically protected from new development, providing it “preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area”.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.03 amended to remove this reference.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Conservation area. Please remove all references to Beech Farm and its setting other than in discussion of the conservation area, protected views and preservation of important listed buildings and their settings.</p> <p>Section 5.32 – Needed or desired facilities, services and amenities Lists facilities, services and amenities needed or desired by the community. Surprised to see ‘Improvements to the road network by-passing the village’ listed here. That forms nice loop opening up further potential sites. Current road limitations also help to protect the village from even further and more rapid growth. I would like to see the reference to a village by-pass removed</p> <p>Section 5.36 and 5.37 – Sites discussion should be removed. Section 5.36 states that NP08, 09, 10, 11 and 12 do not adjoin the settlement policy boundary and are not suitable for development. Once the 200 houses are built on Minchens Lane then NP08 and 09 will be immediately adjacent to a revised settlement policy boundary and NP 10, 11, and 12 are adjacent to them. So to exclude these purely on the basis of distance from the boundary opens up opportunity for them to be re-considered. Better to leave site assessments out of the NP.</p> <p>NP18, Beech Farm again, should be removed from these sections entirely, the wording of 5.37 specifically regarding Beech Farm leaves the way open for some debate.</p> <p>Section 6.22 – Provision of housing to meet local needs Comparisons to Basingstoke and Deane regarding housing should be replaced with Comparison to other large villages. There is no desire to turn Bramley into a mini Basingstoke or into a miniature England, so please can we have statistics in the NDP that compare Bramley to similar sized rural villages.</p> <p>Section 6.24 – local property need</p>	<p>This paragraph reports what the community actually said and cannot be censored.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocated sites so detailed reference to individual sites is not necessary. However, the sites investigated were restricted to those which adjoin the approved Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) and the Minchens Lane site lies outside this boundary, so sites further out will not be adjacent to the SPB. The Neighbourhood Plan must consider reasonable alternatives, not just decide to have no additional development.</p> <p>See comment above about development in a conservation area.</p> <p>National and local comparative statistics enable the position of the parish to be put in context. Quoting an average does not imply that all parts should aim to be average. The purpose of paragraphs 6.21 to 6.26 is to demonstrate that Bramley needs smaller dwellings.</p> <p>This paragraph reports the views a local estate</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.36 and 5.37 amended to remove reference to specific sites.</p> <p>Reference to specific sites removed from 5.37.</p> <p>Paragraphs 6.21 to 6.26 amended to emphasise that the evidence suggests that Bramley is in need of more smaller dwellings.</p> <p>Policy H2 amended to emphasise the need</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Local estate agents are receiving enquiries for 2 bedroom semi-detached starter homes, 3 and 4 bedroom semi-detached family homes and 1 bedroom apartments. These types of property will not entirely satisfy the needs identified in the first sentence that ‘persons needing smaller accommodation who wish to remain in Bramley will find it harder to secure a suitable home’ This is because it ignores the needs of older people wishing to downsize from family homes to smaller bungalow accommodation. The shortage of suitable bungalow provision in Bramley should be more prominent in the NDP although I am pleased to see reference to accommodation for older persons in policy H2.</p> <p>Section 6.54 – Key views to be protected In total the NDP at minimum should clearly show 21 protected views versus the 7 that have been included in illustration 6c. I would not expect that the NDP would aim to reduce the importance of our local views so I suggest that the current 21 views are the minimum start point and that additional ones should be added as per the ‘Important views’ chart in Appendix D. Appendix D completely omits the southern part of the parish which also contains views which I am sure the NDP would wish to designate as important; Illustration 6c also concentrates on views out of the conservation areas but the views into the conservation areas from outside of them are equally important. Some of these are covered by the additional important views identified in Appendix D</p> <p>Section 6.83 re Policy RE3 Protection of Local Green Space NP 18 be removed as Local Green Space. SINC running between railway and cinder track is designated an accessible green space in the local plan</p> <p>Policy T1 – Improving the Footpath and Cycle Way Network This section of the NDP includes illustration 6g regarding</p>	<p>agents. Policy H2 and the supporting text emphasise the need for accommodation suitable for older persons to downsize, including bungalows.</p> <p>As a general principle, planning cannot protect someone’s right to a view. An exception to this is in situations where an important historic environment is affected and it is considered justifiable to require a new development proposal to have due regard to its impact on an important view of or from that historic environment. The important views identified in the Neighbourhood Plan should be limited to those which satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>Local Green Spaces must satisfy the definition in the National Planning Policy Framework. Upon further consideration NP18 does not fully meet this definition.</p> <p>The construction of the proposed cycle way on land at Bullsdown Farm and German Road would depend on securing the landowners’</p>	<p>for “dwellings designed for smaller households, including accessible purpose-design accommodation suitable for older persons to downsize”.</p> <p>Important views amended to comprise the vista views and view points identified in the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>NP18 (Beech Farm) removed from list of Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>footpaths and cycle ways which will be developed. Confused by the plan to develop a cycle way down the land to Bullsdown Farm and onto German Road as this is private property and the proposed cycle way/footpath would go through a development currently under construction. The map is also rather out of date as it does not include the German Road development at all.</p>	<p>permission; its inclusion in Illustration 6g allows opportunities to be taken in the future to realise this.</p>	
<p>Resident 10, e mail</p>	<p>General Comment: I cannot support the Neighbourhood Plan because "it is too vague at present and fails to deal with the long term challenges faced by Bramley"</p> <p>1.11:-The Neighbourhood Plan should reflect the views of the local community not just those who have contributed to it, including people from different geographic parts of the community</p> <p>3.03 Vision :-A detailed criticism of the Vision Statement challenging the meaning and deliverability of many of its components, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "attractive" is subjective. 2. The Parish Council supported development on Minchens Lane, so the use of the phrase "unspoiled rural setting" is inconsistent with recent actions. 3. Are "excellent and conveniently located community facilities" deliverable? Conveniently located means having facilities everywhere; excellent will be expensive to achieve. 4. "a range of high quality homes fulfilling local needs" – what determines local needs? What is high quality? 5. "safe and convenient access to transport services and green spaces" - Transport services are outside the control of any planning authority. Green spaces are managed space, as opposed to countryside, so this contradicts the rural setting. 6. "good opportunities for locally based employment" – contradicts the "rural setting" mentioned earlier 	<p>No reason given to support this statement.</p> <p>The Parish Council has gone to considerable lengths to engage all parts of the local community in the production of the Neighbourhood Plan, a process set out in paragraphs 2.19 onwards. Everyone has had the opportunity to contribute to the Neighbourhood Plan or say what they think.</p> <p>The Vision for Bramley is intended to be an aspirational, high-level statement of what the Neighbourhood Plan is trying to achieve.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The creation of an "attractive" village is an aspiration which most people would agree with. Removal of the word would weaken the meaning considerably. 2. The Minchens Lane development delivers the strategic housing allocation for the village in the BDBC Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan is seeking to accommodate strategic development allocations and limited further growth whilst maintaining the overall "unspoiled rural setting" of the village. This is not an inconsistency. 3. The Neighbourhood Plan is seeking provide conveniently located facilities whenever possible. "Excellent" does not always have to be expensive. This is an aspirational statement, seeking to move 	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>3.15:- BSA5 contradicts BSA4. Rural areas do not have tarmac footpaths or cycle ways.</p>	<p>towards a desired position, not a detailed programme of action.</p> <p>4. Local housing needs were determined by a householder survey carried out by Community Action Hampshire in 2013. High quality homes would be homes that are designed in accordance with the relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan (policies D1 and D2).</p> <p>5. Whilst transportation is not controlled by the planning authority, development plans including Neighbourhood Plans should aim to achieve the integration of transportation systems with the use and development of land. This is good planning practice. The term green space in this context means any green space which the public may have access to, so includes the countryside with public rights of way. The statement does not mean or imply that these will all be managed green spaces.</p> <p>6. The National Planning Policy Framework requires Neighbourhood Plans to contribute to sustainable development, which means delivering a balance package of land uses. Residential development without employment development means more commuting, which is not a sustainable approach. The employment policy E1 allows existing and new small businesses in Bramley to develop and grow, providing there is no adverse environmental impact and opportunities to re-use redundant historic buildings are taken, thus ensuring that Bramley's "rural setting" is protected.</p> <p>The aim of improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity within Bramley and to surrounding destinations does not contradict the aim of protecting the rural character and setting of the</p>	<p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>3.16:-The Neighbourhood Plan does not have powers to improve footpaths and cycle ways, which depends on land ownership and availability, so these objectives are potentially undeliverable.</p> <p>3.18:-The objectives of improving car parking provision near the centre of the village and improving road safety are potentially undeliverable because no evidence of a possible solution is provided. Traffic light (pedestrian) crossings would contradict BAS4.</p> <p>3.19:-This is arguing for more development, when local people want to restrict it. There are vacant industrial units available in Bramley, so there is no demand for new employment development in the village. Thought should be given to brownfield development, reducing pressure on greenfield sites.</p> <p>3.20:- High speed broadband is being provided. The</p>	<p>village. The rural setting is not just there to be looked at, but also to be used in an environmentally compatible way and to be enjoyed. BAS5 does not imply that rural footpaths will be “tarmacked”. No change necessary.</p> <p>Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan can provide the means whereby Section 106 contributions or community infrastructure levies imposed on new development can be used to improve the footpath and cycle way network. It would be the developer’s responsibility to resolve any issues of land ownership or availability, as part of the process of gaining planning permission.</p> <p>These are objectives, and not solutions. These statements are intended to provide a clear idea of what should be achieved when new development takes place near the village centre. Specific solutions will depend on the nature and location of the proposed development, and will be produced by the developer when planning permissions are being sought.</p> <p>Strategic aim BAS7 is intended to facilitate limited new local employment development, and to enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy E1 supports this, providing there is no adverse environmental impact. Clarification should be provided to ensure this is interpreted to mean small scale, local employment development only, and to make clear that brownfield development should be given priority whenever possible, although there are limited opportunities for this in Bramley.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan says that it will enable</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Supporting text to BAS7 (paragraph 3.20) amended to say “The purpose of this strategic aim is to provide opportunities for small-scale, local employment development in Bramley.....” Policy E1 amended to emphasise that it is intended to support locally beneficial small-scale employment. 6.14 amended to express preference for new housing development on brownfield land.</p> <p>3.20 amended to say “7B: To enable the</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Neighbourhood Plan should say it will assist in providing the current standard and will aim to have Bramley at the forefront of any new technologies. This does not require new development.</p> <p>4.11:-Affordable housing need has been met by the provision of 200 new dwellings on the Minchens Lane site. Other development should discount this need and be locally led housing though this plan.</p> <p>4.20:-Affordable housing can be provided by off-site contributions. The Neighbourhood Plan should make this a requirement for new development in Bramley. Affordable housing need has or will be met in German Road and Minchens Lane developments.</p> <p>5.03:-The Neighbourhood Plan accurately reflects the fact that much of this strategic housing allocation is an expansion of Basingstoke. The Neighbourhood Plan should call for these developments to be re-parished into the new Sherfield Park / Taylor's farm parish.</p> <p>5.08:- This is misleading. Only the 200 new homes (at Minchens Lane) should be included in the analysis.</p> <p>5.14:- The possibility of a northern bypass has been suggested by some people. This could relieve the C32 and potentially provide a safer new railway station with a car park. The Neighbourhood Plan should consider</p>	<p>the provision of high speed broadband and support employment growth. This ensures the Neighbourhood Plan complements the work of other agencies in providing high speed broadband. Clarification should be provided to ensure this is not misinterpreted to mean supporting large scale employment growth.</p> <p>4.11 is not about affordable housing need, it is about housing need as expressed by the local community.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing is determined by the relevant strategic policy in the Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine or alter local strategic policy. It is up to the developer to make a case to vary the local authority's affordable housing policy.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is not the appropriate place to discuss or propose parish boundary changes.</p> <p>Whilst 640 of the proposed additional new homes in Bramley will be next to the southern boundary of the parish and will be an extension of Basingstoke, it is a fact that these 640 dwellings would be within the parish of Bramley as currently defined so their exclusion from housing statistics for Bramley Parish would be difficult to justify.</p> <p>A northern bypass would be a strategic highway solution that is outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan. In addition it would potentially open up a considerable amount of</p>	<p>provision of high speed broadband to support local employment.”</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>this option.</p> <p>5.22:- The Neighbourhood Plan could suggest that development would be preferable in certain locations, but only if it brought improvements in physical or social infrastructure</p> <p>5.24:- Supports the 50 home limit on any new housing development, as a maximum.</p> <p>5.30:- The Neighbourhood Plan should challenge the requirement to deliver 40% affordable housing on site. Persons needing support and facilities would be better off living in Basingstoke</p> <p>5.32:- Does not support the provision of a skate park, as these uses often lead to anti-social behavior. There is adequate provision already.</p> <p>5.36:- BR10 could provide a replacement site for the school as part of a land swap. The pylons affecting sites NP14, NP15 and NP16 could be removed and the lines buried as part of a large strategic development. The Neighbourhood Plan should consider these possibilities.</p> <p>6/6.06:- Objective 1B is broad-brush and could potentially deliver the wrong sort of homes.</p>	<p>land to the north of the village for development, facilitating a level of growth that is well in excess of what local people have said is desirable in their consultation comments.</p> <p>5.22 summarises the reasons why the Parish Council, having considered the possibility of allocating sites for development, decided not to do so. The Neighbourhood Plan policies require new development to make the necessary improvements to physical and social infrastructure as opportunities arise.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing is determined by the relevant strategic policy in the Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot determine or alter local strategic policy. It is up to the developer to make a case to vary the local authority's affordable housing requirement.</p> <p>5.32 presents the actual results of community consultation, so is a statement of fact. The provision of any of the facilities identified would be determined in accordance with relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan.</p> <p>The options suggested are not in prospect, so the Neighbourhood Plan has not considered them. The removal of pylons as suggested would only be achievable with large scale housing development which is fundamentally at odds with the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The objective is worded to encourage the delivery of the type and size of housing</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>6.08/6.09:- It is important not to conflate Bramley Village and Bramley Parish. It would be helpful to clarify what is meant by “rural character”.</p> <p>6.11 is not sufficiently clear, as size, scale and design are subjective. It would be helpful to set out that the Neighbourhood Plan is targeting a maximum of 20 dwellings per hectare, with traditional vernacular architecture, and mainly larger high quality family/executive homes.</p> <p>6.20:- Is Bramley the right place for more affordable homes when it does not have a good range of shops and public services, isolating people from family and friends.</p> <p>6.22:- This makes a high proportion of detached houses sound like a bad thing. It isn't and we should ensure it remains the case so that Bramley is a place people aspire to live.</p> <p>6.24:- Bramley should not be trying to solve all housing needs for everyone everywhere</p>	<p>required to meet local housing needs. Such an objective is fundamental in order to make the Neighbourhood Plan relevant to the needs of local people.</p> <p>Greater clarification should be provided that it is the rural character of Bramley village that has been affected. A statement of what is meant by “rural character” should be provided, based on the evidence of consultation and other relevant material.</p> <p>The Bramley Character Assessment (Appendix C) defines the character of different parts of Bramley village and policy D1 requires new development to demonstrate how it complements the character area in which it is situated, or which it adjoins, in terms of scale, density, materials, etc. This would reinforce local distinctiveness. To strengthen and further clarify this, additional information on the density of the different character areas should be incorporated into Appendix C.</p> <p>Provision for affordable housing policy is made through strategic policies in the Local Plan, which the Neighbourhood Plan cannot amend or replace. The housing needs survey has identified local housing needs and the Neighbourhood Plan must take this into account.</p> <p>This paragraph presents the facts without any interpretation. The National Planning Policy Framework requires the planning system to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and a mix of housing types.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is following the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework in</p>	<p>A detailed explanation of the rural character of different parts of Bramley village is provided in Appendix C. A Glossary of Terms has been added which includes a definition of “rural”.</p> <p>Information on the density of the different character areas has been incorporated into Appendix C - Bramley Village Character Assessment.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>6.28:- “Sustainable” is the most over-rated word in planning and means absolutely nothing. Say what you mean</p> <p>H2:- Apartments will not preserve “rural character”.</p> <p>ACV1:- The policy could be used to deliver no change to anything even if some might be desirable, by relocating or replacing a community asset with something better located or with an improved facility</p> <p>6.39:- Disagree with a skate park for reasons stated above. Concerned about what “additional pedestrian crossings” and “improvements to footpaths and cycle networks” actually means. The Neighbourhood Plan should not propose vague concepts and ask for people to agree or disagree. Detail should be provided.</p> <p>6.40:- “Railtrack” should be “Network Rail”. The current proposal for a footbridge is a joint project involving BDBC, HCC and Network Rail and would be available for use by pedestrians generally, not just rail travelers.</p> <p>6.54:- A view cannot be protected in the planning process; it is not a planning consideration.</p>	<p>respect of providing for local housing needs.</p> <p>The definition of sustainable is given in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Neighbourhood Plan is clear about what is meant by sustainable development. This paragraph refers to one aspect of sustainable development – the balanced provision of housing to suit a range of local needs.</p> <p>The use of the word “apartments” is not intended to imply blocks of flats should be built. However, to avoid uncertainty this term should be removed from policy H2.</p> <p>This policy protects local community facilities and assets as the default position, whilst seeking opportunities to improve or enhance these whenever opportunities arise.</p> <p>6.39 provides a list of what people actually said in response to consultation, it is a factual list not a proposal. Planning policy is about establishing the principles upon which decisions will be made about future proposals for development. It is not intended to say exactly what will happen. This part of the Neighbourhood Plan is about planning policy, not about planning proposals.</p> <p>Correct name of the organisation should be used and reference to the footbridge removed.</p> <p>There are supplementary planning documents which protect views, but these focus on views of the historic environment. The Neighbourhood Plan should avoid reference to</p>	<p>Definition of “sustainable development” has been included in the Glossary of Terms.</p> <p>Policy H2 amended to say “.....one or two bedroom accommodation suitable for younger persons and small families.”</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>“Network Rail” substituted for “Railtrack” and reference to the proposed footbridge has been removed.</p> <p>Illustration 6c to be re-titled Important Views and amended to include only views which have been identified in the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>D2 (a):- Respond to the existing built form, providing it is good. Poor built form should not be followed.</p> <p>D2 (d):- This is cloud cuckoo land. Residents have cars and will use them.</p> <p>D2 (h):- The flip side to this is to say there should be a spine road through developments to allow easy access for deliveries and emergency services</p> <p>D2 (i):-One driveway parking space pre bedroom would be a good minimum standard, plus on-road, recessed visitor parking.</p> <p>6.79:- Rural Exception Sites would not be appropriate for Bramley. The existing need is met, so there is no need for any more affordable housing in Bramley.</p> <p>6.95:- As above, lacking in detail.</p> <p>6.97:- There are pedestrian crossings on the C32, but they are not controlled crossings. Would such crossings</p>	<p>“protected views” and ensure that views identified as “important” relate to the historic environment.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should not be used to justify the copying of poor quality built form. D2a) should be amended to preclude this possibility.</p> <p>Supporting the provision of good access to public transport and reducing car dependency is a key component of sustainable development, and the Neighbourhood Plan must demonstrate that it is achieving sustainable development. Not all residents have cars, especially young people, so the Neighbourhood Plan should make provision for them.</p> <p>The purpose of D2h) is to make roads in new developments safe spaces. Access for emergency services will be a requirement of the highway authority in the construction of new roads.</p> <p>The local planning authority has adopted car parking standards which are a requirement across the Borough. The Neighbourhood Plan does not intend to change these standards.</p> <p>The Rural Exception Sites policy in the Local Plan is a strategic policy which the Neighbourhood Plan cannot amend or alter. It enables affordable housing to be provided in the countryside for agricultural workers, etc.</p> <p>6.95 is a statement of objectives for transport and is not intended to be detailed.</p> <p>6.97 provides a list of people’s replies to consultation, a factual list. It does not specify a</p>	<p>Appraisal as important.</p> <p>D2a) amended to say “Respond to the existing traditional built form in terms of enclosure and definition of streets and spaces.”</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>be in keeping with the rural character</p> <p>T1:- Concerns as above about tarmac footpaths everywhere and cycle ways may not be deliverable, or lead nowhere.</p> <p>6.102;_ A controlled crossing near to the level crossing would not be safe for motor vehicles as people may end up stuck on the crossing so would not be allowed, so should this be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. A 20mph speed limit would be inappropriate on a C road. Enforcement of the existing 30mph speed limit would be better.</p> <p>E1:- There should be a condition to set out that if there is an oversupply in a 30 minute drive there should be no new industrial/commercial development. Retail could then be considered separately</p>	<p>response to these comments.</p> <p>Policy T1 does not state an intention to provide tarmac footpaths everywhere. The purpose of policy T1 is to establish a network of footpaths and cycle routes by joining up existing routes and providing new routes where appropriate, through the use of Section 106 contributions or Community Infrastructure Levies. The surfacing of these routes would be a detailed matter determined in accordance with the principles set out in policies D1 and D2.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.102 is a factual statement of what the Parish Council has already done.</p> <p>A condition of this nature would not take into account the very diverse needs of businesses for different types and sizes of accommodation. Availability of a certain kind of premises would not suit all needs. The purpose of policy E1 is to facilitate opportunities for local small-scale employment.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

3) E-MAIL RESPONSES FROM STATUTORY CONSULTEES

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Highways England Highway Authority, Traffic Authority and Street Authority for Strategic Road Network.	Would be concerned with any proposals that might impact on SRN. With distance from M3 and M4, no specific comments	General comment noted.	No action
Chineham, Parish Council	Chineham Parish Council congratulated Bramley Parish Council. Chineham Parish Council supports the Policy RE2 for strategic gap	Support noted.	No action
Natural England, Area 3A Noble House London	Thank you for consulting Natural England. No comments to make on the plan	Noted.	No action
Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council	PC considers the plan is well written and coincides with the PC's thoughts on the process. SOL PC fully supports aims and policies	Support noted.	No action
NHS North Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group	NHCCG supports the Neighbourhood Plan, Specifically RE3, Protection of Green Spaces RE4, Protection and enhancement of the natural environment T1, Improvement of footpaths and cycle way network, All of which contribute to heath improvement and peoples wellbeing, all part of the Vision of the CCG	Support noted.	No action
Environment Agency	As the NP does not allocate any sites for development, there are no comments to be made	General comment noted.	No action
Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Savills UK Ltd) Statutory Sewage Undertaker do northern part of BDBC, hence "specific consultation body"	Key sustainability objective of NP should be for developer to co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of the existing infrastructure Par 156 of NPPF "Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area of the local plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater" Par 162 of NPPF relates to the infrastructure National Planning Practice Guidance includes section on water supply (Para:001 Ref ID: 34-001-201400306) Unclear as to the demand on the Thames Water Infrastructure will be? Developers must demonstrate that adequate wastewater (and water supply)	Noted.	No action.

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>infrastructure exists both on and off the site</p> <p>Recommend text added to the NP:- “Sewerage [and Water Supply] Infrastructure It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.</p> <p>Further information for Developers on sewerage infrastructure can be found on Thames Water’s website at:</p> <p>http://www.thameswater.co.uk/cps/rde/xchg/corp/hs.xsl/558.htm</p> <p>Or contact can be made with Thames Water Developer Services by post at:</p> <p>Thames Water Developer Services, Reading Mailroom, Rose Kiln Court, Rose Kiln Lane, Reading RG2 0BY; By telephone on: 0845 850 2777;</p> <p>Or by email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk”</p>	<p>Adequate sewerage and water supply are essential for new development and Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that these needs are taken into account.</p>	<p>Suggested text inserted in Neighbourhood Plan at 6.71 and 6.72.</p>
<p>Marine Management Organisation</p>	<p>The MMO has no comments to submit in relation to the NP</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Hampshire County Council Economy, Transport and Environmental Department Strategic Aim</p>	<p>BSA5 and 5A Supported. Objectives fit closely with those of Hampshire Countryside Access Plan. http://www3.hants.gov.uk/hampshire-countryside/countryside-development/access-</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>plans.htm</p> <p>The Hampshire Countryside Access Plan emphasises the need to work with local communities to improve and develop those parts of the walking and cycling network that are important to local people. Hampshire County Council Countryside Services would therefore suggest including a reference the Countryside Access Plan within the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan in order to support future joint working between the community within Bramley and the Countryside Service to help facilitate the delivery of this 'key link'. This could neatly be referred to somewhere in paragraphs 6.101 to 6.104</p> <p>Paragraphs 6.13-6.16, and Policy H1 The Neighbourhood Plan should also recognise Cufaude Farm housing allocation of 390 dwellings in the emerging BDBC Local Plan (policy SS3.8) which is referred to in Paragraph 5.10 of the Neighbourhood Plan, as being outside the scope of the policy H1. This should be explicit in the text to H1 to confirm that the NDP policy (and limitation to sites of 50 units) relates to additional future sites, and not those identified in the emerging BDBC Local Plan. Otherwise this may cause confusion and would be contrary to the NDP requirement of being "in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the local planning authority". Reference should be included to Cufaude Farm in Paragraph 6.13 and the words "beyond that allocated in the emerging Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan" (or words to that effect) should be added after the word "Bramley" and before the word "will" in the second sentence of policy H1.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.65 states "Several instances of localized flooding have been recorded by the Parish Council on the north side of Bramley village in recent years due to inadequate drainage". Hampshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) recommends that the last four words of this</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan should make reference to this document.</p> <p>Reference to development at Upper Cufaude Farm should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy H1 should be clear that it relates to future new housing development.</p> <p>Amend to delete these words.</p>	<p>Reference to the Hampshire Countryside Access Plan incorporated into 6.114.</p> <p>6.13 amended to include reference to development at Upper Cufaude Farm as a strategic housing allocation in the Borough. H1 amended to say "Future new housing development in Bramley...."</p> <p>6.67 amended to remove the words "due to inadequate drainage."</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>sentence are deleted as there is no evidence that the flooding was caused in all cases by inadequate drainage</p> <p>Hampshire County Council as the Education Authority ordinarily recommends that early contact is made with the Children’s Services Strategic Development Officer to discuss the implications for school place planning in the area and how this links in with travel to school.</p> <p>Whilst it may now be relatively late in the plan preparation process, if HCC is approached at an early stage of the plan making process the County Council can then start to develop strategies to ensure that, if new housing development is proposed in a neighbourhood plan area, the County Council can provide appropriate advice in relation to potentially improving any footpaths, cycle ways and other necessary infrastructure in the area to support travel to school by means other than the car. The County Council has a School Travel team who are also able to advise on this specific issue if appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>
<p>National Grid Amec Foster Wheeler</p>	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid has identified the following electricity transmission assets as falling within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · YYM line – 400kV route from Bramley substation in Basingstoke and Deane to Melksham Substation in Wiltshire. · 4YG line – 400kV route from Bramley substation in Basingstoke and Deane to Didcot substation in Vale of White Horse. · 4VX line – 400kV route from Bramley substation in Basingstoke and Deane to Fleet substation in Hart. · ZH line – 400kV route from Bramley substation in Basingstoke and Deane to West Weybridge Substation in Runnymede. · Bramley 400kV substation. 	<p>General comment noted.</p>	<p>Details added to consultation database.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>From the consultation information provided, the above transmission assets do not interact with any of the proposed development sites.</p> <p>Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database n.grid@amecfw.com laura.kelly@nationalgrid.com Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK National Grid House Gables House Warwick Technology Park Kenilworth Road Gallows Hill Leamington Spa Warwick Warwickshire CV34 6DA CV32 6JX</p>		
MOD Defence Infrastructure Organisation Kingston Road Sutton Coldfield West Midlands B75 7RL	<p>Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) in relation to the above consultation.</p> <p>The statutory height consultation zone for RAF Odiham encompasses the area of Bramley, in particular the designated area falls within the 91.4m height zone. The MODs main concern is development which may have the potential to infringe/inhibit air traffic movements.</p> <p>Therefore, any development exceeding this height criterion should be referred to this office for review.</p> <p>I trust this adequately explains our position on this matter.</p>	General comment noted.	No action.
HISTORIC ENGLAND EASTGATE COURT 195-205, HIGH STREET GUILDFORD SURREY Postcode: GU1 3EH	Historic England welcomes the short history of Bramley in paragraphs 2.02 - 2.08, which give a good introduction to and flavour of the historical significance of the parish. However, there could be a reference in one of the paragraphs to the other Scheduled Monument in the parish? The moated site west of Cufaude Farm. Paragraph 2.05 could also helpfully	Further information on the historic environment of Bramley parish to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Number of listed building in Bramley parish added to 2.05. Reference to the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area Appraisal added to 2.14.

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Martin Small	<p>explain that there are 50 listing entries in the parish, some of which are for more than one building. We would like to see a reference to the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area? When and why was it designated, what date was the Character Area Appraisal etc.?</p> <p>Is there a list of locally important buildings and features within the parish (if not, perhaps the Parish Council could consider preparing one with the local community? advice on local listing is available on our website at http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/good-practice-local-heritage-listing/ - as non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity?. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states?? where it is relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. ? In addition, and where relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions?).</p> <p>Reference could also be made to any non-scheduled archaeological interest, details of which can be found on the Hampshire Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record.</p> <p>Historic England considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan. Paragraph 58 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local and Neighbourhood Plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives</p>	<p>Reference to be made to the local list.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The quality expected from new development proposals is set out in policies D1 and D2.</p>	<p>Reference to the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest included in 2.05.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Reference to Bramley Village Character Assessment added to 2.17.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. We therefore welcome the references to character in paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13, although we would have expected a reference to the Bramley Village Character Assessment (which we also very much welcome).</p> <p>We note that the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment is not identified as a main issue. According to the 2014 Historic England Heritage at Risk Register, there are no higher grade listed buildings at risk, nor have the two scheduled monuments in the parish or the conservation area been identified as being at risk. However, the Register does not include grade II buildings, which are the vast majority in Bramley parish. Has there been any survey of the condition of these grade II listed buildings? Has there been any or is there any ongoing loss of character, particularly within the Conservation Area, through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation, insensitive street works etc.?</p> <p>We welcome and support the reference to “strong historic character” in the proposed vision for Bramley, Aim BSA2, paragraph 3.08 and Objective 2A. We also welcome and support, in principle, Aim BSA4, although we would like it to be “To protect and enhance the historic character” and Objective 4E, although we would prefer “conserve” to “preserve” as terminology more consistent with the NPPF and as recognising that sensitive change can take place that maintains or even enhances the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>We welcome and support, in principle, Policies D1, D2, RE2 and RE4, although we would prefer there to be a specific policy or part of a policy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment of the parish and the heritage assets therein. We would also like Policy D2 to include an additional principle “m) Relate satisfactorily to adjacent or nearby</p>	<p>The Borough Council does not maintain an up-to-date Heritage At Risk Register for Grade II listed buildings.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should use appropriate terminology when discussing the historic environment.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan policy should include specific references to the historic environment, in the appropriate place.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>BSA4 amended to say “To protect the historic character and rural setting of the village...” Objective 4E amended to say “To conserve and enhance the historic character of Bramley.”</p> <p>Addition criterion (e) inserted in policy D1 relating to the historic environment. Policy RE2 amended to include the sentence suggested. Policy RE4 amended to included the phrase suggested.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>historic buildings and, if within or adjacent to the Conservation Area, not detract from the special interest of the Area” and the final sentence of Policy RE2 to read “Development which would detract from the open or undeveloped character of this area, or reduce the visual separation of Bramley and Sherfield on Loddon, or be harmful to the significance of the Bullsdown Iron Age Plateau Fort, will not be permitted”. The second sentence of Policy RE4 could be amended to read “...or woodland of arboriculture, ecological, amenity or historic value, or which..’.</p>		

4) NO RESPONSES FROM STATUTORY CONSULTEES

1. The Honourable Antonia Elisabeth Wellesley, Marchioness of Duoro,
The Right Honourable William Waldegrave of North Hill
Peter John Troughton
Alexander Rycroft
C/o James Hare
Estate Manager,
Stratfield Saye
Reading
RG7 2BT
2. John and Ann Ryall
4 Lundy Close,
Basingstoke,
Hampshire
3. Attn. Mike Dalgarno
Manager/MD
G.B. Foot Ltd
Farm House
Manor Farm
Monk Sherborne
Tadley
RG26 5HW
CC. Peter Todd
Mike Filson
Jennie Foot
4. Attn. Guy West
Westbuild Homes Ltd
Hunters Lodge
Rectory Road
Padworth Common
Reading
RG7 4JB
5. clerk@silchester.org
Silchester Parish Council
6. ssjclerk@gmail.com
Sherborne St John Parish Council

7. pennyjmayo@aol.com
Stratfield Saye Parish Council
8. clerk@pamber-pc.gov.uk
Pamber Parish Council
9. r.j.walker@soton.ac.uk
Stratfield Turgis
10. Ackwasi Mensah
Department of Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
LONDON
SW1P 4DR
11. Peter Jones
Homes and Communities Agency
Davidson House
Forbury Square
Reading
RG1 3EU
12. Mr Jamie Rockhill
Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
Department for Transport (Rail)
13. clerk@pamber-pc.gov.uk
E.A.Knight
Clerk to Pamber Parish Council.
14. fwm@hants.gov.uk
Consultations
Local Flood Authority
15. nhccg.enquiries@nhs.net
Primary Care Body
NHS North Hampshire
Clinical Commissioning Group
Lime Tree Way
Chineham Business Park
16. paul.bond@hhft.nhs.uk
Primary Care Trust
North Hampshire Hospital

Foundation Trust
Aldermaston Road
Basingstoke
RG24 9NA

17. reading.depot@sse.com
Consultations
Scottish and Southern Electricity
Arrowhead Road
Theale
RG7 4AH
18. plantlocation@sgn.co.uk
Consultations
Southern Gas Networks
Aldershot Depot
North Close
Aldershot
GU12 4HA
19. info@bmforum.org.uk
Vied Leitchev
Basingstoke Multicultural Forum
Chute House
Church Street
Basingstoke
RG21 7QT
20. islam.jalaita@basingstoke.gov.uk
Islam Jalaita
Basingstoke Faith Leaders Forum
21. mark.baulch@hampshirechamber.co.uk
Mark Baulch
Business Development Manager
Hampshire Chamber of Commerce
22. info@bddf.org.uk
Chief Executive Officer
Basingstoke and District Disability Forum
The Orchard
White Hart Lane
Basingstoke,
23. rebecca.kennelly@bvaction.org.uk
Chief Executive Officer
Basingstoke Voluntary Action
The Orchard

White Hart Lane
Basingstoke
RG21 4AF

24. countryside@hants.gov.uk
Hampshire County Council;
Countryside;
Planning;
Admissions team;
25. rachel.cavender@bt.com
Asst to Director Sales and Service
BT-Openreach
26. businessstoo@o2.com
Planning Team Telefonica O2 Ltd
Bath Road
Slough
SL1 4DX
27. osm.enquiries@ackinsglobal.com
Land Use Planning Department
Vodafone
Vodafone House
The Connection, Newbury
RG14 2FN
28. executive.office@orange.co.uk
Planning Team Orange
Orange Centre Office
The Point
London
W2 1AG
29. info@westhampshireccg.nhs.uk
Strategic Health Authority
West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group, Omega House
112 Southampton Road
Eastleigh
Hants
SO50 5PB
30. elliott.stamp@networkrail.co.uk

5) LAND OWNERS AND DEVELOPERS

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
JPPC (Chartered Town Planners) on behalf of The Royal British Legion Own premises at Ordinance Road, south of the street.	<p>Support the general objectives of the Draft NP Aim BSA1 and BSA2:- Agree general intention. Must meet the strategic growth requirements as per local plan but not at expense of Local Character.</p> <p>BSA3:-Benefit from greater clarification as to what type of facilities the PC considers to be “community and recreational facilities”. Exclude the RBL Clubhouse as ceased exist in 2009.</p> <p>5.34-5.37:- Where should new development go? Site BR07, or BRAM007 within the SHLAA is in our opinion avail for development and the basis for declaring that it has “Access difficulties and would be problematic to develop” is unclear. It is appropriate and consistent with Policy H1.</p> <p>Illustration 6e, Local Green space: Relevance of the hatched area?</p>	<p>This is stated in several places in the plan.</p> <p>Table 6A gives a list of these, which does not include the RBL clubhouse.</p> <p>As the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites, details of the pros and cons of different sites need not be included in the plan.</p> <p>Illustration 6e has some unnecessary detail.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Reference to specific sites removed from paragraphs 5.34 to 5.37.</p> <p>Illustration 6e amended to remove unnecessary detail.</p>
Pro Vision for Stratfield Saye Estate Ref Beech Farm	<p>The estate supports the NP process and as a whole considers that the draft NP is a comprehensive document that sets out the overall aims of the community</p> <p>Noted that NP does not set overall housing target, as deemed Minchens Lane meets the apportioned housing by the borough. Noted the 50 housing site allocation.</p> <p>ACV1 assets of Community Value. Beech Farm not identified as a community asset.</p> <p>Policy RE3. Relates to protection of Local Green Space. Beech farm is designated. Beech farm is not Open Space, it is private land.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Bramley is allocated at least 200 houses which has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields.</p> <p>Beech farm not an Asset of Community Value.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should include only sites that satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework definition of Local Green Space.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Beech Farm removed from the schedule of Local Green Spaces in Bramley (Illustration 6e and Appendix E).</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Appendix C refers to enclosed space adjoining beech farm in Character assessment G Viewpoint of the listed building questioned Appendix D Views- No ref to Beech Farm</p> <p>Paragraph 5.37 States “development of sites is constrained by the statutory duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area” Also protected by the Local Plan. NPPF recognises that restoration goes with development in keeping with the significance of the designated heritage asset.</p>	<p>Important views should be restricted to those which involve the historic environment and which have been identified in the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Important views identified in Appendix D and Illustration 6c.</p> <p>No action.</p>
<p>Bell Cornwell LLP</p> <p>Oakview House, Station Road, Hook, Hampshire RG27 9TP</p>	<p>Bramley Neighbourhood Development Plan - Consultation Draft Land at Silchester Road, Bramley</p> <p>Consultation Draft Bramley Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>We have no comments to make on the draft NP Aims and Objectives. These appear to present a reasonable and pragmatic set of objectives, linked to the outcome of the ongoing Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan examination.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed NP Policies, we have the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Policy H 1: It is appropriate that the policy does not place a cap on the amount of new development in Bramley and that any new development should be either within or adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. o Policy H2: This policy is too proscriptive as to the type and size of new housing in Bramley. We suggest that the policy is re-drafted to read as follows: ' housing for Bramley. This may include the provision of.... '. In that way, any new development will 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>In order to deliver its intentions policy must be necessary and precise. The suggested wording weakens the policy considerably to the point where it may be difficult to deliver its objectives. The more robust wording</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>be more able to respond to its context and surroundings, but the parish council's overall aims and objectives will not be not lost.</p> <p>Our suggested small change more closely reflects the government's policy position - as set out in paragraph 50 of the NPPF: 'To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities .. ', We have no further comments to make in connection with the draft NP policies.</p>	<p>proposed is considered necessary to deliver the objectives of the policy.</p>	
<p>Gleeson Developments Ltd, On behalf of Stratfield Saye Estate Prepared by Savills on behalf of Gleeson Developments Ltd</p>	<p>Gleeson generally supports the objectives of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, but wishes to make certain recommendations to ensure it takes a reasonable approach in balancing the development needs of the parish whilst providing an effective framework for its future in terms of provision of infrastructure and sustainable development in line with National Planning Policy objectives and in particular, accords with the basic conditions that require the plan to have regard to the NPPF and to conform with the strategic policies in the Development Plan.</p> <p>Comments are made with specific reference to the land north of Sherfield Road, Bramley, a site which is within the sole ownership of Stratfield Saye Estate. GDL= Gleeson Development Ltd.</p> <p>Paragraphs:- 1.4 – says Illustration 5a in the Neighbourhood Plan does not correctly reflect the area of land submitted in the SHLAA and should be corrected.</p> <p>5.10 NP: - Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 GDL - Gleeson supports Section 5 of the plan to treat the 200 dwellings in the emerging Local Plan as a minimum, but questions it being dependent on the local community feeling the additional development would be advantageous for the parish as a whole.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Illustration 5a shows the sites that were assessed by the Steering Group, so represents what was actually done.</p> <p>The Local Plan 2011-2029 says “at least 200 additional dwellings in Bramley”. The reference to community views is made because Government advice is that Neighbourhood Plans must accommodate strategic housing allocations but may provide for additional new homes, if the local community want this.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Amendments made to appropriate places in the Neighbourhood Plan which refer to the strategic housing allocation for Bramley. 5.10 re-phrased to say “....can make provision for more if there is evidence of need and the development would be advantageous for the parish as a whole.”</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>5.18 NP; _ Paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 GDL - Questions whether the Bramley has inadequate transportation infrastructure and wants the word “inadequate” removed from the plan.</p> <p>6.07 NP:- Paragraph 3.7 GDL – asks that the phrase “...right amount of development in the right locations” is replaced by “...right amount of development in the most sustainable locations</p> <p>Policy H1 NP :- Paragraph 3.11 GDL – asks that greater clarification be given in policy H1 that the 50 dwelling limit for individual developments is not the total sum of growth to be permitted under policy H1.</p> <p>Policy H1:- Paragraph 3.12 GDL – asks that policy H1 be re-worded to anticipate future revisions of the Settlement Policy Boundary which may come forward through the emerging Local Plan or through the granting of planning permissions by deleting reference to Illustration 6a</p> <p>Policy H1 NP: - Paragraph 3.13 and 3.14 GDL– the Settlement Policy Boundary should reflect the planning permission for 200 houses at the site at Minchens Lane and include this site in the SPB, or the Neighbourhood Plan will fast become out of date.</p>	<p>The facts presented in paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15 explain the ways in which the transportation infrastructure in Bramley can justifiably be described as “inadequate”.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should actively support sustainable development.</p> <p>Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan should be unambiguous.</p> <p>It is not the Neighbourhood Plan’s role to anticipate or pre-empt possible future changes to the Settlement Policy Boundary. The Local Plan 2011-2029 does not propose to change the SPB and the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared on the assumption that it will remain unchanged for the foreseeable future. The proposed re-wording would facilitate a level of additional development which is required neither by the Local Plan 2011-2029 nor by the local community as expressed in consultation.</p> <p>The Minchens Lane development meets the minimum strategic housing allocation in the emerging Local Plan. Policy H1 allows limited additional growth, in sustainable locations adjacent to the SPB which would be more than sufficient to meet expressed local housing needs. Enlarging the SPB as proposed would create several opportunities for additional development to the north and west of the Minchens Lane site, which would result in significantly more growth than is required to meet local housing need and would adversely affect the rural character of the village, conflicting with Strategic Aims BSA2 and BSA4</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>6.07 amended as suggested.</p> <p>Policy H1 amended as follows – “...up to a maximum of 50 dwellings for any individual development site immediately adjoining....”</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Policy H2 NP:- Paragraphs 3.16 and 3.18 GDL– supports H2 in principle but asks that additional wording be inserted as follows: “The precise housing mix of new development should be determined on a site-by-site basis having regard to the above, along with scheme characteristics, site constraints, viability and prevailing market conditions”</p> <p>Policy D1 (d) NP: - Paragraphs 3.20 to 3.21 GDL– questions whether the Conservation Area Appraisal document (2000) is sufficiently up to date to justify the use of the important views identified in that document as “protected views” in the Neighbourhood Plan. - Questions how the “important views” mentioned in Appendix D have been identified. The advice of an independent landscape professional should be sought to confirm the importance of the views identified. Appendix D in relation to policy d1(d) NP:- Paragraph 3.22 to 3.23 GDL - Appendix D identifies a number of important views on the north side of the village which, if they are protected by policy D1, would preclude almost all development on the north side of Bramley village. Combined with the constraints of Bramley Camp to the south, this would mean there is limited scope for development adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary.</p> <p>Policy RE3, NP: - Paragraphs 3.24 to 3.27 GDL – The Plan refers to Local Green Space as “areas not to be developed or affected by any kind of development”. National policy states that not all development would be inappropriate in such locations. Policy RE3 and Illustration 6e are extremely negative and as such go against national policy to “plan positively to support local development”. Adequate justification for designating areas as Local Green Space is not given.</p>	<p>in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The need to ensure viability is not affected is accepted and this will take into account prevailing market conditions. If the precise mix is determined on a site-by-site basis, this will take into account the site constraints. The “scheme characteristics” will always be a consideration in any planning decision, so this phrase is superfluous.</p> <p>Important views and vistas are identified on the map in the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area Appraisal document. Although this document dates from 2004 (not <u>2000</u>), little has changed in and adjacent to the conservation areas in the intervening time, so there is no need to have an up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisal. However, there is a need for consistency and simplicity in the terms used, so the views mentioned in the policy should be termed “important views” in order to correspond to the terminology in the Conservation Areas Appraisal document.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework says that Neighbourhood Plans must plan positively to support local development. Local Green Spaces designated in the Neighbourhood Plan must satisfy the criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the Framework. Policy RE3 should reflect the provisions made in the Framework to protect areas designated as Local Green Space.</p>	<p>Policy H2 amended to include a final sentence which says “The precise housing mix of new development will be determined on a site-by-site basis, having regard to viability and other relevant factors.”</p> <p>The views referred to in policy D1 and identified in Appendix D and Illustration 6c renamed “Important Views”. Policy D1 (d) amended to say “the important views identified in Appendix D and shown in illustrations 6(c) ...” Illustration 6c amended and retitled “Important Views”.</p> <p>6.87 amended to say “New development must not normally encroach on and must not adversely affect areas designated as Local Green Space.” Policy RE3 final sentence amended to say “Development on designated Local Green Space will not be permitted, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it will complement or enhance, and will not adversely affect, the character of the Local Green Space concerned.”</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Policy T2 NP: - No indication is given in the Neighbourhood Plan as to how the “traffic hazards” have been identified. Robust technical evidence should be provided to justify their inclusion.</p> <p>A suggested alternative wording is proposed for the final paragraph in policy T2, to remove ambiguity about defining significant development, and to allow the highway authority to seek mitigation measures where necessary.</p>	<p>Description of Hazards included in Appendix H along with Hampshire County Council Accident Data and Traffic Count for Bramley. 6.110 and 6.111 state how the traffic hazards have been identified.</p>	<p>A schedule of the areas to be designated as Local Green Space provided in a table form showing how each of them satisfies the criteria laid down in paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Policy T2 final paragraph amended to say “Development proposals which have an impact on known traffic hazards will make provision for appropriate mitigation measures that will contribute to improved road safety, in the form of physical works or financial contributions to relevant physical works.”</p>
<p>Hollins Strategic Land (HSL) Suite 4 1 King Street Manchester M2 6AW</p> <p>Agents for Land south of the Street, Bramley, and corner of Cufaude Lane</p>	<p>Hollins Strategic Land LLP (HSL) wishes to make the following comments on the pre-submission version of the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2029. HSL controls land lying immediately south of The Street, Bramley and have recently submitted a planning application to Basingstoke and Deane District Council for 49 market dwellings and 33 affordable homes.</p> <p>Below, we outline our key concerns with the Neighbourhood Plan as drafted.</p> <p>Prematurity</p> <p>The progression of a Neighbourhood Plan to independent examination in advance of an adopted Local Plan is effectively contrary to Para 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which is clear that the Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.</p> <p>Indeed, Para 1.07 of the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges this requirement. The Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan is yet to be independently examined. The examining Inspector has raised fundamental concerns regarding soundness of the draft Local Plan in his letter dated 12th October 2014 and again in the exploratory hearing in December 2014. He commented</p>	<p>The Parish Council considers the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity not only with the strategic policies of the former Local Plan as required by legislation but also with the new Local Plan 2011-2029. The Parish Council recognises the possibility of additional new homes being required in Bramley in the 15 year plan period over and above the minimum number anticipated in the Submission Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for this. Policy H1 has been formulated to allow additional housing developments of 50 houses or less, if Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council can be</p>	<p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>that the Local Plan ‘<i>may not provide a sufficiently robust platform for providing new homes</i>’ and has concerns about ‘<i>deliverability</i>’. The Examination is scheduled to commence on Tuesday 6th October and, as such, is only a week away. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore be suspended given the fact that significant issues need to be addressed in terms of the spatial strategy and housing distribution policies, otherwise the Neighbourhood Plan carries risk of been out of date upon adoption and having little weight for the purposes of decision taking. We expand on the legal position later in this submission.</p> <p>Housing Requirement</p> <p>The pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan is based on a superseded housing figure within an emerging Local Plan. As such, there is no certainty of what the housing requirement for Bramley will be until at least next year. Basingstoke and Deane District Council is proposing a revised housing requirement, increasing from 740dpa to 850dpa. Whilst there has been an acknowledged uplift in housing provision, it is still a long way short of the base position proposed in the now revoked South East Plan which required at least 945dpa. Additionally, the 2012 based sub national household projections published by Department of Communities & Local Government (DCLG) in February 2015 indicate an average projection of 936dpa. Indeed, the District Council’s latest evidence provides a range of figures including a higher figure of circa 1000dpa reflecting jobs growth in the area. There is therefore a clear indication at this time that the housing requirement is not known and may likely increase as the emerging Local Plan progresses. Any increase in housing provision will no doubt have implications on the spatial strategy and housing distributions policies set out in a final Local Plan and thereby possibly affect housing numbers at Bramley.</p> <p>There is therefore too much uncertainty at this time for the Neighbourhood Plan to continue on a sound basis. Whilst Basingstoke town is the largest settlement in the district and will be the focus of growth, the evidence is</p>	<p>shown not to have a 5 year housing supply, providing this does not adversely affect the rural character of Bramley. The Neighbourhood Plan does not put a cap on the number of additional new homes to be provided in Bramley. This flexibility makes the Neighbourhood Plan resilient to change. There is no need to suspend preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>quite clear that other sustainable settlements such as Bramley have capacity to absorb planned growth. Bramley is a sustainable settlement and is closely influenced by Basingstoke town in terms of job provision and higher order services and facilities. The revoked SEP sought to focus growth in this sub regional area identifying Basingstoke town and Bramley as locations suitable to accommodate housing. There is therefore past acknowledgement of Bramley's credentials and potential capacity to deliver a proportion of any uplifted housing requirements set out in the Local Plan. Our initial analysis indicates a housing requirement of at least 350 dwellings to Bramley. We note that based on past trends alone, the housing requirement would be in the region of 580 dwellings. This latter figure seems to reflect the 580 dwellings proposed as an option in the 'Bramley Development and Planning' survey dated 2014 and thus may have some weight in going forward.</p> <p>Neighbourhood-level Housing Need and a robust Evidence Base</p> <p>We have not seen evidence to date that can robustly underpin the housing number proposed in the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan and there is absolutely no certainty that the figure of at least 200 dwellings will actually be the requirement once the District's Local Plan is adopted. Moreover, the District level housing requirement is a minimum and as such any distribution to settlements must also be seen as minima figures.</p> <p>Concluding Points</p> <p>With regard to the above, it is imperative that progression on the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan should be suspended immediately, pending the outcome of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan examination and further work on identifying demand and housing needs progressed in addition to identifying suitable housing sites. Otherwise, the Neighbourhood Plan will risk been found unsound in that it fails to meet basic condition (a)</p>	<p>No housing number is proposed in the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan and no cap on total housing numbers is proposed.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a flexible document which makes provision to accommodate additional housing growth beyond that envisaged in the new Local Plan 2011-2029, should the Borough Council be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply and proposals are justifiable against other relevant policies.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	and (e) of the requirements. At the very least it will be rendered out of date and fail to hold weight in the decision-taking process.		
<p>Gladman Developments Ltd Gladman House Alexandria Way Congleton Business Park Congleton Cheshire CW12 1LB</p>	<p>General Page 1 – Introduction The BNP is based on a strategy that will contain the physical growth of the settlement through its restrictive use of a tightly drawn settlement boundary and ‘capping’ future development proposals to a maximum of 50 dwellings. This approach has no regard to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing or the presumption in favour of sustainable development. If the BNP is progressed in its current form it will likely be found contrary to basic conditions (a), (d), (e) and (f) and may be found unable to proceed to referendum.</p>	<p>This comment is based upon a misunderstanding of the growth strategy underlying the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan does not “cap” future development proposals to a maximum of 50 dwellings. Individual developments would be limited to 50 dwellings, but there is no limit on the number of different developments that could be proposed and no cap on the total number of dwellings is proposed. As the Local Plan housing allocation of at least 200 new homes for Bramley over the plan period (to 2029) has been significantly exceeded with recent planning permissions granted for 200 houses at Minchens Lane, 65 houses at The Street and 50 houses at Strawberry Fields, policy H1 will not take effect unless it can be proven that the Borough Council no longer has a 5 year housing land supply.</p>	<p>Policy H1 amended to clarify that the policy applies to individual developments and does not imply a numerical cap on the numbers of dwellings that may be built in Bramley.</p>
	<p>Page 3 - Relationship with Local Plans The adopted Local Plan covers the period up to 2011 and is out of date. The Neighbourhood Plan should not be progressed in advance of the emerging Local Plan, when the Council does not have a demonstrable 5 year housing supply.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a flexible document which makes provision to accommodate additional housing growth beyond that envisaged in the Submission Local Plan, should this be necessary and justifiable against other relevant policies.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
	<p>Page 3-4 – Woodcock Judgement The Neighbourhood Plan does not accommodate the principles established in the Woodcock High Court Judgement, so the Neighbourhood Plan should not be progressed until the housing supply and priorities for the wider area are more certain.</p>	<p>The Woodcock judgement relates to a case where the High Court decided that too much weight was given by the Secretary of State to an emerging Neighbourhood Plan in determining a planning appeal. These are very different circumstances to whether a Neighbourhood Plan should be progressed and are not directly comparable.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
	<p>Page 4 – Vision</p>	<p>Paragraph 157 of the Framework relates to</p>	<p>Ensure the plan period coincides with that</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>The Vision statement is fundamentally flawed because it does not cover an appropriate timescale required by paragraph 157 of the Framework, preferably 15 years for Local Plans. This requirement also applies to emerging Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Local Plans and does not mention Neighbourhood Plans. It is not prescriptive, but advisory: it states “preferably 15 years”.</p>	<p>of the Submission Local Plan, i.e. 2011 to 2029.</p>
	<p>Policy H1: New Housing Development The policy will act to contain the physical growth of Bramley with no regard to the Borough’s full Objectively Assessed Need. Policy H1 is inflexible, ineffective and will be unable to respond rapidly to changes in the market. The policy is based on a restrictive approach to growth and does not support a key aim of the Framework to significantly boost the supply of housing. It does not accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The use of a restrictive settlement boundary will fail to deliver the housing needs of Bramley and the wider area. The requirement of H1 to make a contribution to local services or facilities should be tested for its effect on development viability. Gladman propose an alternative form of wording for the policy: “Development adjacent to the existing settlement will be permitted provided that the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development.”</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan accommodates the strategic housing allocation for Bramley made in the new Local Plan 2011-2029. In addition, if the Borough Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply the Neighbourhood Plan allows proportionate additional housing growth on sites adjoining the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) so long as the proposed developments satisfy other relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan. The objection to this policy appears to be based on a misunderstanding of the nature of the 50 dwellings limit. This is not a cap on the total number of houses that can be provided in Bramley over the plan period, but a limit on the number that can be provided on each individual site, allowing a level of additional housing growth that can be accommodated in Bramley without adversely affecting the rural character of the village. It will, however, only take effect in the event that the Borough Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply. The SPB is the same as has been determined by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in the production of the Local Plan 2011-2029, so is up to date and in general conformity with strategic policy. H1 states that the required contribution to the provision or improvement of local services and facilities must be proportionate and allows this contribution to be in the form of on-site green space.</p>	<p>Policy H1 amended as follows – “...up to a maximum of 50 dwellings for any individual development within or immediately adjoining the Bramley Settlement Policy Boundary.....”</p>
	<p>Policy H2: Provision of Housing to meet Local Needs</p>	<p>The local authority’s strategic policy does not</p>	<p>Retain policy incorporating wording</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	This matter is more appropriately dealt with by the local authority's strategic policy and the policy should be deleted.	provide the detailed requirements for individual parishes in the Borough. The local planning authority supports the policy, with some clarification and additional flexibility regarding the provision of smaller dwellings.	suggested by the local authority.
	Policy ACV1: The limited amount of development envisaged will mean the level of financial contributions will be minimal and may not enable the delivery of this policy. It is therefore necessary to allocate additional housing land and this will affect the delivery of future sustainable growth.	Policy ACV1 seeks to take opportunities to improve or enhance assets of community value. It does not require or expect developer contributions to fund this in its entirety, but to make appropriate contributions towards it.	Insert text supporting the policy as follows: "...make a proportionate contribution to the provision of relevant local services and facilities....." Explanatory text added to define "proportionate" so that developer contributions can be made without undermining development viability.
	Policies D1 and D2: Protecting and Enhancing the Rural Character of Bramley Design of New Development Design policies should be in strict accordance with paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Framework. Policies D1 and D2 imposes policy burdens which may act to restrict the ability of future sustainable growth opportunities being delivered viably. It is questioned whether the inclusion of important views has been informed by robust evidence, such as an up to date landscape and visual character assessment. The policies should be deleted.	The Framework states that good design is indivisible from good planning, so the inclusion of carefully formulated design policy is not only appropriate but necessary for a balanced planning policy document. Policies D1 and D2 provide criteria by which the design quality of development proposals can be assessed which precisely reflect the issues identified in paragraphs 59 and 60 of the Framework, and also include additional nationally recognised criteria derived from the work of Design Council CABE and Building For Life 12. Policy D1 makes explicit reference to the Bramley Village Character Assessment 2014, which provides an up to date character assessment of the village. Policy D2 explicitly states that a flexible approach will be taken when high quality innovative designs are proposed, as is advised by paragraph 60 of the Framework.	Policies to be retained. Reference to the Borough Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy given to provide standards for the provision of green space.
	Policy RE1: Reducing Flood Risk Sufficient weight is already afforded to the alleviation of flooding in national policy and the application of	Flood risk policies are highly relevant at neighbourhood level. Policy RE1 should focus on sites that are recognised to be at risk from flooding.	Policy to be retained, with amendments suggested by the local authority. Policy RE1 amended to relate specifically to sites which are recognised as being at

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>national standards is more suited to delivering this policy. The policy should be deleted.</p>		<p>risk from flooding, the definition of which is given in the supporting text.</p>
	<p>Policy RE2: Area of Separation Gladman contend that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation or resulting in the loss of openness or character. The purpose of policy RE2 is questioned, particularly if it would frustrate efforts to deliver future sustainable housing growth to meet the district's housing needs. The policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>The distance between Bramley and the neighbouring village of Sherfield on Loddon is approximately 700m and the intervening land is slightly elevated between the two settlements. Any new development in this area would be very evident visually. Policy RE2 seeks to ensure Bramley does not merge with Sherfield village, to maintain the separate identity of settlements, and to preserve the setting of the scheduled monument Bullsdown Iron Age Fort. The boundary of Bramley parish adjoins the western edge of Sherfield village, so any neighbourhood planning policy which aims to maintain the separation of the two settlements must be in the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Further text supporting policy RE2 added to make this clear.</p>
	<p>Policy RE3: Protection of Local Green Space Gladman state that Local Green Space should be designated in accordance with paragraphs 76 and 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The supporting text in the Neighbourhood Plan says that new development must not encroach on or affect areas designated as Local Green Space. This is not a requirement in the Framework and so should be deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has chosen areas to designate as Local Green Space which satisfy the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Framework says "By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances."</p>	<p>Wording of RE3 amended to reflect more closely the phraseology in the National Planning Policy Framework as follows: "Development on designated Local Green Space will not be permitted, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it will complement or enhance, and will not adversely affect, the character of the Local Green Space concerned."</p>
	<p>Policy RE4: Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment Gladman state that new development often offers the opportunity, where necessary, to improve existing biodiversity values which can often be integrated into development proposals through high quality design. This helps to maintain their role as part of the local and wider areas biodiversity network. The loss of some</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework says that local authorities should set criteria-based polices against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. Whilst the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan is not a Local Plan, this approach would help clarify the requirements of the policy and enable a degree of flexibility to be</p>	<p>Policy RE4 amended to list the factors to be taken into account when determining the impact on biodiversity.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>biodiversity assets may be necessary i.e. for access in order to ensure the delivery of the wider scheme and the benefits associated with its development.</p> <p>RE4 should be reconsidered to ensure it is consistent with the requirements of Chapter 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the approach taken allows for sufficient flexibility.</p>	<p>incorporated.</p>	
	<p>Policy T1: Improving the Footpath and Cycleway Network</p> <p>Policy T2: Improving Road Safety in Bramley</p> <p>Gladman support the rationale for the inclusion of these policies as they will encourage sustainable travel. However, not all development proposals will be of a sufficient scale to justify and support the improvements to local sustainable transport methods. This policy should be tested for its effects on development viability.</p>	<p>The comments apply to Policy T1, and not to Policy T2 which is about mitigating road hazards not sustainable transport.</p>	<p>6.116 amended to make clear that the contribution should be proportionate to the scale of the development.</p>

6) BASINGSTOKE AND DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	ACTION
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	Need for improved clarity of Policies H1, D1, D2 and RE2.	Issues not specified here.	No action at this point.
	Potential conflict with National Planning Policy Framework.	Issues not specified here, so no response can be made.	No action at this point.
	Policy ACV 1 refers to Assets of Community Value, but none have been nominated. This is misleading and could lead to confusion.	This issue now dealt with as Community-Valued Assets. Potential Assets of Community Value may be formally nominated by Bramley Parish Council at a later date.	Wording of policy now changed to CVA1 – Community Valued Assets, and supporting text amended accordingly.
	Some policies do not have sufficient evidence to support them, e.g. policy RE3 and areas defined as Local Green Space.	Further evidence relating to the proposed Local Green Spaces has been gathered.	Schedule added to Appendix E listing the areas designated as Local Green Space and stating how each of them satisfies the criteria in paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
	The Bramley Neighbourhood Plan should focus on the background to Bramley rather than comparing Bramley with Overton and Whitchurch.	Bramley has had a disproportionate amount of growth compared to similar settlements in the Borough over the past 3 decades. Only by comparing the level of growth in Bramley to that in similarly sized settlements nearby is it possible to assess whether Bramley is getting a proportionate or a disproportionate amount of growth.	No action.
	Paragraphs 5.34 to 5.37 mention that all 19 sites assessed for their development potential scored negatively. What is the status of the 4 sites that the Neighbourhood Plan suggests have some potential for development?	As the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites it is considered inappropriate to discuss specific references to the development potential of any site. A small number of sites may have development potential, but the burden of proof for this lies with the prospective developer.	Paragraphs 5.34 to 5.37 amended to remove specific references to any potential development sites, and to explain the rationale for policy H1 limiting the size of any future residential development in the parish.
	Some land is given double protection through ACV and Local Green Space designations.	Land and buildings can be covered by multiple planning policies.	No action.

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	ACTION
	<p>Is it necessary to include paragraphs 5.36 and 5.37? If both continue to be included it should be explained why and more detail should be provided in H1 to clarify where new housing may be permitted.</p>	<p>See comments against paragraphs 5.34 to 5.37 above.</p>	<p>No further action.</p>
	<p>Policy H1 permits housing developments of up to 50 dwellings which could result in high levels of development in the neighbourhood area. The cumulative impacts of this policy should be considered.</p>	<p>This wording of this policy is designed to allow a limited amount of development. Paragraphs 5.34 to 5.37 provide a rationale which demonstrates that in practice this will not result in “high levels of development in the neighbourhood area”.</p> <p>The opportunities for additional development within or immediately adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary are limited for a variety of reasons including access, historic environment setting, Bramley Camp, and Policies RE2, RE3, RE4, D1 and D2.</p>	<p>6.17 amended to make reference to the other policy considerations and wider development management considerations that will be applied when determining planning applications.</p>
	<p>Policy RE1 (and others) repeat the National Planning Policy Framework. The objective of Policy RE1 should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>Policy RE1 does not merely repeat the National Planning Policy Framework, it extends the requirements of the Framework by requiring developers to show how a Sustainable Drainage System or other appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposed development. In doing so it follows the Framework’s advice “to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk...”</p>	<p>Policy RE1 and supporting text amended to align the policy more closely with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Submission Local Plan by linking its requirements to developments which must provide a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
	<p>Policies H1, T2 and E1 place additional financial burdens on development and may therefore affect viability.</p>	<p>The requirements of these policies need not place <u>additional</u> financial burdens on development. S106 agreements and the CIL policy will apply an infrastructure charge to new developments, some or all of which can be used to pay for the requirements of these policies.</p>	<p>No action.</p>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	ACTION
	Policy T2 should be supported by further information on known traffic hazards.	Sufficient information should be included within the Neighbourhood Plan to enable the locations and nature of the known traffic hazards to be understood.	Further information on traffic hazards is provided in Appendix G.
	In seeking to achieve sustainable development certain policies in the Neighbourhood Plan may affect viability, i.e. H1, T2.	See response above.	No action
	The Bramley Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the adopted Local Plan (1996-2011). It is good practice to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan aligns with the emerging Local Plan. A potential area of conflict with the latter is RE2 (Area of Separation). An explanation is needed as to why this policy is required in addition to the strategic gap policy (EM2) in the Local Plan.	Additional justification for this policy should be provided.	6.77 amended to explain the purpose of the BDBC Strategic Gap policy (to maintain the separation of Basingstoke from Bramley and Sherfield) and 6.79 amended to explain the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan's Area of Separation policy RE2 (to maintain separation of Bramley from Sherfield on Loddon, and to protect the setting of the scheduled monument).
	There is a need to avoid inconsistency and conflict between Policy RE4 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy EM4 of the Local Plan.	Any inconsistency and conflict between the Local Plan 2011-2029 and the Neighbourhood Plan should be eliminated.	6.91 amended to make reference to Local Plan policy EM4 as the overarching statement of the factors that will be taken into account when considering the impact of development proposals on biodiversity. 6.93 amended to make clear that policy RE4 complements Local Plan policy EM4 by identifying the specific trees, hedgerows or areas of woodland that are of particular value in Bramley parish.
	There are several issues identified in respect of the Special Environmental Assessment.	These issues will be discussed with the consultant, Aecom.	No action at this stage.
	Human rights requirements – an equalities impact assessment may be required to assess the impact of the Neighbourhood Plan on persons with protected characteristics.	This will be done as part of the Basic Conditions Statement.	No action at this stage.

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	ACTION
	The Basic Conditions Statement should be subject to an NPIERS healthcheck.	This was carried out in March 2016.	Suggested amendments and alterations have been incorporated into the Submission Neighbourhood Plan.

Part 2 – LPA detailed assessment of the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documentation

This section provides a more detailed assessment of the BNP and supporting documents in relation to the ‘basic conditions’ requirements. This includes an assessment concerning how the BNP would operate in practice once it is ‘made’. Annex A to this response provides some additional factual observations. In most cases, the objective and intent of the policy is, in principle supported, but the suggestions are aimed at ensuring that the policies achieve the objective for which they are intended.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	Section 1: Introduction		
Contents page	The contents page refers to a ‘foreword’ and ‘attributions’. However, these have not been included in the BNP.	These sections were listed in the Contents page because it was the Parish Council’s intention to provide them.	Foreword and attributions sections now included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
Paragraph 1.08	It is unclear what ‘area’ is being referred to in this paragraph.	This paragraph has been misinterpreted. The word “area” is being used to convey a general point of planning principle, and clearly is not intended to refer to Bramley or any specific location.	First sentence amended to read “In planning the future development of their areas local planning authorities must set out the level of growth in housing and employment, which will take place over the next 10 to 15 years.”
‘The Planning System in England’ figure between para 1.09-1.10	The diagram refers to ‘Local Development Framework’.	Delete reference to ‘Local Development Framework’.	Diagram amended.
‘The main stages in producing Bramley neighbourhood plan’ figure between para 1.09-	The second pink box in the figure refers to ‘Allocate sites’. The draft BNP does not allocate sites.	Delete reference to allocating sites.	Diagram amended.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
1.10			
'A Short History of Bramley', Paragraph 2.06	Reference is made to a 'late 19 th century map' but there is no link to where the reference can be viewed.	Include reference to relevant document.	Paragraph 2.06 amended to say "...which can be viewed in the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area Appraisal document. (See Appendix A.)"
Para 2.17	The rural character of Bramley and the importance of the open spaces and vegetation within the village could be reinforced by additional references to these in this paragraph. Bramley Green is not the only significant open space in the village, as shown in Illustration 6e. There are a number of other open spaces, which combined with the network of older hedgerows, gardens and woodland within and surrounding the village result in a strong green infrastructure network that help to define the rural character.	Extra references to other areas of open space added to the paragraph to help to reinforce the rural character of Bramley.	2.18 amended to include general reference to the areas of open countryside which surround the village which are important in maintaining the rural character of the area.
Para 2.18	Paragraph refers to "...Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation..." It should read 'Sites of <u>Importance</u> for Nature Conservation...' This paragraph notes that the neighbourhood area 'also' contains SINC and ancient woodland, rather than the habitats being considered as integral part of the landscape, the setting for the built environment or as green infrastructure.	Amend to say "Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation." Extra references added to the paragraph to help to reinforce the biodiversity assets in the neighbourhood area.	Amendment made. 2.19 amended as suggested.
Para 2.24 - 2.37	These paragraphs helpfully explain the main issues from the June 2013 household survey. The end of this section could benefit from a summary of the main issues.	Paragraphs 2.24 to 2.36 <u>are</u> the summary.	2.25 amended to make clear that the main issues are summarised in 2.26 to 2.38.
Para 2.30	This paragraph could be expanded to reinforce the importance of Green Infrastructure in Bramley, as well as providing a suitable framework for future development. This paragraph also talks about preserving, but perhaps could be extended to include 'enhancing and extending' as well.	This paragraph is part of a factual summary of the actual community feedback received and should not be adjusted to say what planners might want it to say.	No action.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 2.33	The paragraph states that "There is a lack of facilities for teenagers in the village". This paragraph could refer to the new youth facility at Clift Meadow, Bramley.	See previous comment.	No action.
Para 3.07	Objective 1A refers to "...the emerging Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2014-2029." The plan period for the emerging Local Plan is 2011-2029.	Correct plan period and title to be provided.	Objective 1A amended to say ".....required by the Submission Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-29."
Para 3.08	This paragraph refers to strategic aim 'BAS2'. This is a typo and should read 'BSA2'.	Correct typo.	Amendment made.
Aim BSA4	Within the vision BSA4 is welcomed in particular objective 4c. However, aims should be aspirational. Objective 4A and 4C of aim BSA4 discuss the need to retain and enhance, whereas the aim BSA4 talks just about protecting the rural setting – it should include 'protection and enhancement'. Opportunities should be considered to recreate habitats and establish linkages between distinct areas of habitat.	BSA4 and associated objectives to be amended to include "enhance".	Amendment made.
Para 4.06	This paragraph states "...to promote gains in biodiversity."	Amend to reflect wording in the National Planning Policy Framework.	4.06 amended to say "...promoted net gains in biodiversity."
Para 4.08	The final sentence of the paragraph states "...However, the Borough Council is currently preparing a new Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared with the emerging Local Plan in mind." This approach to preparing the BNP is supported.	Reference to the emerging Local Plan to be replaced with "Local Plan 2011-2029".	4.08 amended to refer to the new Local Plan 2011-2029.
Para 4.09-4.19	Paragraphs refer to the Basingstoke and Deane Pre Submission Local Plan. The Local Plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in October 2014.	See comment above.	Amend to say "Local Plan 2011-2029".
Para 4.10	Paragraph refers to the Revised Draft Local Plan which envisages providing 13,464 new dwellings over the plan period. Following a proposed main modification to the submission Local Plan, 15,300 new dwellings are now envisaged over the plan period.	Current housing growth figure to be used.	4.10 amended to say "The Local Plan 2011-2029 envisages providing 15,300 new dwellings across the Borough of Basingstoke and Deane over the plan period."

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 4.16	<p>Paragraph refers to the affordable housing thresholds of policy CN1 (Affordable Housing) of the Submission Local Plan. The BNP should refer to Policy C2 in the Adopted Local Plan as this forms current strategic policy.</p> <p>The LPA will be proposing further modifications to the Submission Local Plan to take account of the changes to the NPPG regarding affordable housing thresholds. NPPG advises that there should be no affordable housing obligation (other than in designated areas, which Bramley is not) for 10 houses or less.</p>	Amend to make reference to the relevant Adopted Local Plan policy and any proposed policy changes in the Submission Local Plan.	4.16 amended to refer to former Local Plan and relevant additional requirements being introduced in the Local Plan 2011-2029.
Section 5	<p>This section provides significant comparison of Bramley with the nearby village of Overton and Whitchurch Town.</p> <p>The information in section 5 is also included within supporting document titled 'Data analysis related to Bramley's expansion (1981-2029). In light of this section 5 could be significantly shortened, for instance through summarising the key points. The key points should be based on evidence and the BNP should avoid statements of opinion.</p> <p>Focusing on providing the background to Bramley rather than comparing the neighbourhood area with Overton and Whitchurch. This is more appropriate and will also help to shorten this section.</p> <p>What are the conclusions of the comparison of Bramley with Overton and Whitchurch? It is not clear what this section is implying for Overton and Whitchurch who are currently developing their own neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The section is written negatively and you should be aware of the requirements of paragraph 16 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Whitchurch is a town and this should be reflected in section 5.</p>	<p>This section aims to marshal the evidence that the Parish Council wished to present on the relatively rapid rate of development in Bramley over recent decades. The key point is that Bramley has taken more than its fair share of development over this period and the only way to prove that is by showing that similar areas have developed at a much slower pace. Hence it is one of the Neighbourhood Plan's main purposes to highlight the need to be much more sensitive to the preservation of the character of Bramley than has been demonstrated hitherto, when proposals for new housing development are considered. Comparisons with nearby settlements of a similar size are required to prove this point. The Neighbourhood Plan is not negatively written with regard to new housing development, but requires such development to be limited in size and sensitive to the historic and rural character of Bramley.</p>	5.04 amended to say "...the village of Overton and the town of Whitchurch...."

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 5.05	<p>The paragraph states “The evidence in the paragraphs that follow shows that between 1991 and 2011 the rate of growth in Bramley has been very significantly higher than that in comparable settlements in the Borough, but has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in the capacity of local infrastructure. Furthermore the strategic housing allocations contained in the emerging Local Plan will continue this trend...”</p> <p>It is recommended that the second sentence of the paragraph is deleted as this represents an opinion and the Submission Local Plan includes higher levels of housing for both Overton and Whitchurch than Bramley.</p> <p>The Submission Local Plan is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which details the infrastructure requirements for the allocated sites.</p>	<p>The actual numbers provided by BDBC demonstrate that the strategic housing allocations in the emerging Local Plan will indeed continue this trend, so this is a factual statement not an opinion.</p>	<p>5.08 provides the figures given in the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 on which this projection is based. 5.05 amended to explain the concern over the rapid expansion of Bramley more clearly.</p>
Para 5.11 and 5.12	<p>These paragraphs about % of levies to be paid to the parish – which is promoted as positive (essentially because if a neighbourhood plan is in place the % receipt will increase to 25%) however paragraph 5.12 states CIL will not be in place until after adoption of local plan. Perhaps this could be highlighted more obviously – i.e. levies will only ever be sought once the emerging local plan in place and CIL charging schedule has been adopted.</p>	<p>Clarification of the process for introducing CIL to be provided.</p>	<p>5.12 amended to say “ CIL contributions will be determined by the Borough Council’s CIL charging schedule, which will be brought into force after the Local Plan has been adopted. “</p>
Para 5.12	<p>The paragraph states that “CIL contributions are paid by developers to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council...” The Council’s CIL is not yet in place and therefore this sentence should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>There is no mention of the current use of Section 106 agreements to secure mitigation until the CIL Charging Schedule is adopted or the fact Section 106 agreements can still be used for site specific infrastructure outside of the CIL Regulation 123 list.</p>	<p>Clarification of the process for introducing CIL and role of Section 106 agreements to be provided.</p>	<p>See action above. Reference to Section 106 agreements made in 5.11.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 5.23	<p>Paragraph states "...in order to be prepared for further proposals for new housing development in the future..."</p> <p>This sentence could be reworded to refer to "potential" further proposals.</p>	Suggested change in wording would improve accuracy.	Amendment made.
Para 5.25	<p>The LPA notes this paragraph and the parish council agreement.</p> <p>This paragraph could emphasise that the BNP policy approach provides a suitable levels of flexibility (whilst meeting the BNP aims and objectives).However it is recommended to not refer to the housing numbers going up.</p>	The paragraph's purpose is to present and explain the adoption of a flexible approach to allow a proportionate potential increases in the strategic growth allocation. It does not support or encourage such an increase.	5.25 amended to emphasise that the aim is to provide flexibility to accommodate "a modest and proportionate increase in the strategic growth allocation".
Para 5.27	<p>This paragraph confirms that the parish council considered the impact of new housing developments of 100 or more dwellings and decided that development of this size would have significant effects. It is noted that that the SEA has appraised a high growth option (more than 50 homes per individual development).</p> <p>However an option of new housing development of 100 or more has not been appraised through the SEA. If it is considered new housing developments should not be more than 100 units, then you should consider if the SEA should appraise reasonable alternatives of 50-100 and/or 100+.</p> <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to this issue and it is recommended that your SEA consultant advises you on these points.</p>	The SEA consultants (Aecom) were satisfied that the alternatives of low growth (50 houses or less) and high growth (more than 50 houses) would provide a suitable methodology for assessing the environmental impact of the Neighbourhood Plan.	No action.
Para 5.27-5.29	<p>These paragraphs do not refer to the SEA which concludes the preferred option is low growth close to existing settlement boundaries. The draft BNP currently only refers to the SEA in Appendix A (List of evidence and sources).</p> <p>Indicating how the SEA has informed the plan</p>	The SEA is now available and its main conclusions have been incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan.	Amendments made to paragraphs 5.19 to 5.30 to reflect SEA and the greater certainty about future housing growth following the adoption of the new Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>preparation may help to further justify the approach for the size of individual housing developments.</p>		
<p>‘What Kind of Development’, para 5.30</p>	<p>Paragraph refers to the affordable housing thresholds of policy CN1 (Affordable Housing) of the Submission Local Plan. The BNP should refer to Policy C2 in the Adopted Local Plan as this forms current strategic policy.</p> <p>The LPA will be proposing further modifications to the Submission Local Plan to take account of the changes to the NPPG regarding affordable housing thresholds.</p>	<p>Amend 5.30 to reference the former Local Plan policy C2.</p>	<p>Amended to refer to policy C2 in the former Local Plan.</p>
<p>Where Should New Development Go, Paras 5.34-5.37</p>	<p>These paragraphs (along with Appendix I – Site Assessment) try to influence where new housing development should be located in Bramley. Paragraphs 5.36 and 5.37 summarise the potential of the 19 sites and conclude that 4 sites could have potential for some development.</p> <p>In light of the BNP not allocating specific sites for development you should consider whether it is appropriate for these paragraphs to be included.</p> <p>This section is also more specific than the conclusions of Appendix I (Site assessment).</p> <p>Paragraph 5.36 states that 4 sites have some potential for development, but all scored negatively in the site assessment. Paragraph 5.37 then concludes that “Nevertheless the proposed approach leaves scope for a reasonable level of new housing development in various locations adjacent to the Bramley Settlement Policy Boundary, whilst protecting the historic character and rural setting of the village.” If the 4 sites scored negatively, do they realistically offer the reasonable level of new housing development that is being highlighted in paragraph 5.37? Also, what is the status of these 4 sites as the BNP seems to suggest that they are suitable for development and yet does not allocate them?</p>	<p>As the Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites it is considered that reference to development potential of individual sites should not be included in the plan.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 5.34 to 5.37 amended to refer to 21 sites investigated. References to individual sites removed from the Neighbourhood Plan. 5.37 acknowledges that a small number of the sites assessed may have some development potential, but the burden of proof for this rests with the prospective developer.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>You should also consider taking into account all the BNP policy requirements and consider if a reasonable level of new housing development in various locations adjacent to the Bramley Settlement Policy Boundary is achievable.</p>		
<p>Para 5.36</p>	<p>Paragraph states that “Site NP15 has potential to accommodate an expansion of the school and should be reserved for this purpose.”</p> <p>This reads as a policy.</p>	<p>Reference to the developability of specific sites removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Reference to the development potential of specific sites removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Para 5.37</p>	<p>It should also be noted that as per Illustration 6e (Local Green Space) it would appear that site NP18 is to be designated as a Local Green Space. As per policy RE3 (Protection of Local Green Spaces) no development should be permitted on this site. Site NP18 is therefore not a reasonable alternative for future housing development.</p>	<p>Reference to the developability of specific sites removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Reference to the development potential of specific sites removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Para 6.11</p>	<p>The second sentence is missing a word.</p>	<p>There is no word missing. One area (German Road) does not complement or respect the rural character of the village.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Para 6.13</p>	<p>This paragraph does not refer to the Submission Local Plan (policy SS3.8) allocated site at Upper Cufaude Farm for 390 dwellings.</p>	<p>Reference to this allocation in the Submission Local Plan should be included.</p>	<p>6.13 amended to make reference to the allocation at Upper Cufaude Farm.</p>
<p>Para 6.16</p>	<p>The role/benefit of green space within developments is not solely to integrate the development into the rural setting.</p> <p>Although the text describes contributions to local facilities there is no specific reference to the need to provide and/or enhance green space and play for the recreational use of new residents, i.e. multi-functional green space as described in the Council’s Green Space Standards.</p>	<p>Reference to the Borough Council’s Green Infrastructure Strategy should be made in paragraph 6.17 which states the purpose of policy H1, and in paragraph 6.16 which provides explanatory text for the policy.</p>	<p>Amendments made to 6.16 and 6.17.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Policy H1: New Housing Development	Paragraphs 5.34-5.37 try to influence where new housing development should be located in Bramley. Should the policy therefore include more detail on where future housing development is permitted?	5.34 to 5.37 re-written to remove reference to the development potential of specific sites. All sites assessed scored negatively, so there are no obvious candidates for development. However, prospective developers may propose mitigation measures which enable a small number of the slightly negative sites to become acceptable. The developer will have to prove this.	5.35 to 5.38 now completely re-written omitting reference to any specific sites.
	Policy H1 could result in high levels of development around the village. Have cumulative impacts been assessed? The policy could also lead to unintended consequences. For example if there is a site which has a potential capacity of 200 dwellings four separate planning applications for 50 dwellings could be submitted. As per the current policy H1 this would not be unacceptable. There are several sites that have been assessed that are either within or immediately adjoining the settlement policy boundary. Based on the site area and density assumptions for each site in Appendix I, several sites have the potential to deliver over 50 dwellings and it is recommended that further thought is given to the implications of this. You may wish to consider the potential consequences of publishing the site assessment work.	Paragraphs 5.35 – 5.36 reference some of the main criteria which would be used to assess the suitability of sites in and around Bramley village for new housing development. These criteria significantly limit the development potential of sites within or adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary.	Paragraph 6.19 makes reference to the criteria which will be used to assess the suitability of sites within and adjacent to the SPB.
	Further clarification is required on the policy requirement “...providing that such proposals can demonstrate they are meeting local housing needs...” as to what the applicant would need to do to demonstrate how they are meeting local housing needs and by which process this would be assessed. What is considered to be ‘local’? The borough or parish? This should be clarified.	Local housing needs are defined in the supporting text accompanying policy H2. Reference to H2 included in H1 for clarity.	Reference to policy H2 included in policy H1 for clarity.
	One of the ‘basic conditions’ is for the neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the Development Plan. The	Reference to new Local Plan 2011-2029 policies is now provided in policy H1.	Paragraph 2 in Policy H1 amended to read “...will only be supported if it is in accordance with the Local Plan 2011-

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>statutory Development Plan currently comprises the saved policies of the Adopted Local Plan (ALP). You will therefore need to consider how this policy sits with saved policy D6 (New residential accommodation in the countryside). Policy SS6 of the Submission Local Plan is not currently a strategic policy and you should consider whether this reference is necessary. A more generic reference to exception policies in the Local Plan may be more suitable.</p>		2029.”
	<p>The supporting text could clarify the policy trigger of 10 or more dwellings for proportionate contributions to the provision or improvement of local services and facilities, including the provision of public or amenity green space. This will help to explain why the policy would not apply for developments of less than 10 dwellings.</p>	<p>The supporting text should provide further justification of the 10 dwelling threshold for requiring green space, referring to the Government definition of “major development” – 10 dwellings or more. Minor development (defined by the Government as 1 to 9 dwellings) would be excluded from this requirement.</p>	6.16 provides the rationale for the requirement of policy H1 with regard to the provision of public green space for developments of 10 or more dwellings.
	<p>There is no clear definition of what would amount to “a proportional contribution”. It will be vital in negotiations with developers to have a clear definition of what level of provision and/or contributions is expected and how this is justified under CIL. Is the intention to use the council’s Green Space Standards and the Green Infrastructure Strategy to determine what is a proportionate contribution based on the number of additional residents and the identified need? If so this needs to be referred to explicitly in the text. Currently the policy makes no reference to council’s Green Space Standards, nor has any evidence been presented that the NPG has consulted with the borough councils Parks and Open Spaces Development Officer.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan should make reference to a recognised standard in determining what is a “proportionate contribution” for green space to be provided. Amend the policy to make reference to the BDBC Green Infrastructure Strategy, as the basis for determining what would be a “proportionate” amount of green space to be provided within new development.</p>	<p>6.16 includes reference to the Basingstoke and Deane Green Infrastructure Strategy as the appropriate benchmark for the provision of public green space.</p> <p>Include as reference document in Appendix A.</p>
	<p>The policy also mentions open space provision specifically in relation to on-site provision which could be misleading as off-site contributions will also be appropriate in some circumstances.</p> <p>The policy requires on-site provision of public or</p>	<p>The purpose of this policy is to ensure major development includes an appropriate amount of green space <u>within</u> the development, whether as accessible public open space or as landscaping providing visual amenity. This would not be achieved by off-site contributions</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.17 (Purpose of policy H1) amended to provide greater clarity of what is meant by public and amenity green space.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>amenity green space. Consideration should be given as to whether this will be possible on all sites and whether flexibility could be added to the policy. The description of public and amenity space is confusing and suggests that this could include gardens as well as public open space, if so this should not be an either/or.</p>	<p>to wider open space needs.</p>	
	<p>The policy should refer to 'Settlement Policy Boundary'.</p>	<p>Policy H1 should use the term Settlement Policy Boundary.</p>	<p>H1 amended to say "Settlement Policy Boundary".</p>
<p>Illustration 6a</p>	<p>Illustration 6a identifies the settlement policy boundary as currently defined in the ALP. Has consideration been given to amending the settlement policy boundary to incorporate the Minchens Lane site which has planning permission for 200 dwellings?</p> <p>It would be useful to provide a reference to the source of the map. For instance is the map sourced from the current ALP or the Submission Local Plan?</p> <p>The title should refer to Settlement Policy Boundary.</p>	<p>This possibility was considered and rejected, because Policy H1 would then enable sites further from the existing Settlement Boundary to be developed.</p> <p>Reference to the source of the map to be made.</p> <p>Update reference to 'Settlement Policy Boundary'</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>6.07 amended to say Illustration 6a shows the Bramley Settlement Policy Boundary as defined by Inset no 4 in the Bramley Submission Local Plan Policy Maps, October 2014.</p> <p>New Illustration 6a inserted with title amended as suggested.</p>
<p>Policy H2: Provision of Housing to Meet Local Needs</p>	<p>The LPA supports this policy. However, further clarification is required as to whether the policy applies to market or/and affordable housing and additional information is required on how the applicant would demonstrate that they meet this policy requirements.</p> <p>The reference to one bedroom apartments is also very specific and the policy may benefit from a more general reference to small one and two bedroom units.</p>	<p>The policy applies to both market and affordable housing, as there is no evidential reason to distinguish between the two in this policy.</p> <p>Greater flexibility in the wording of policy H2</p>	<p>H2 amended to say "All proposals for new housing development....."</p> <p>H2 also amended to refer to small units of</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
		would be beneficial	residential accommodation.
Table 6a: Assets of Community Value in Bramley	<p>There are open spaces listed which contain equipped play areas where the use is described only as equipped children's play area. These open space have a wider function and community value than formal play.</p> <p>Longbridge Road Green is listed as public open space but the LPA understands that this is privately owned land.</p>	<p>Improved descriptions now provided.</p> <p>Longbridge Road Green to be removed from the list of Community Valued Assets.</p>	<p>See Table 6a.</p> <p>Table 6a edited to remove reference to Longbridge Road Green as public open space.</p>
Para 6.33	<p>This paragraph states that the Parish Council has proposed that the buildings or recreational areas listed in Table 6a and defined on Illustration 6b are placed on the Register of Assets of Community Value held by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.</p> <p>However, there have been no nominations for Assets of Community Value in Bramley. The Council's Register of Assets of Community Value lists no current Assets of Community Value in Bramley.</p>	<p>The title of the Table, the map and the policy, and relevant supporting text changed to Bramley Community Valued Assets. Policy ACV1 becomes Policy CVA1.</p> <p>Policy CVA1 re-worded to include Community Valued Assets identified in Table 6a and also assets in the Register of Assets of Community Value held by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.</p>	<p>Policy CVA1, Table 6a, and Illustration 6b amended to reflect the change in title to Community Valued Assets.</p> <p>6.35 states that "The Community-Valued Assets identified in Table 6A and Illustration 6b will be reviewed by Bramley Parish Council and those that satisfy the statutory definition of an Asset of Community Value will be nominated by the Parish Council for inclusion in the Register of Assets of Community Value held by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council."</p>
Policy ACV1: Protection of Assets of Community Value	<p>Although the principle of the policy is acknowledged, the LPA is concerned that the policy and supporting text is misleading and could lead to confusion in planning application decision making. An alternative approach could be to identify a project, which sits outside of the neighbourhood plan, to nominate/ aspire to nominate the buildings or recreational areas listed in Table 6a and defined on Illustration 6b. You should ensure that all those listed in Table 6a are capable of meeting the criteria for an Asset of Community Value.</p> <p>Information on how to nominate Assets of Community Value can be found on the council's website at http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/rte.aspx?id=348.</p>	<p>Bramley Parish Council intends to nominate formally certain assets valued by the local community for inclusion in the Register of Assets of Community Value kept by the Borough Council, as a separate project.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.33 replaced with new paragraph 6.35 to clarify the Parish Council's intentions.</p>	<p>Policy CVA1 re-worded to include Community Valued Assets identified in Table 6a and also assets in the Register of Assets of Community Value held by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.</p> <p>New paragraph 6.35 added.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>Before making a nomination, you will need to nominate and find out as much as you can about their ownership.</p> <p>Illustration 6e designates Local Green Spaces in Bramley. This map clearly shows that several of the proposed Assets of Community Value will also be Local Green Spaces. You should consider if this double policy protection is required. There are also open spaces which are not defined in Illustration 6b but are included on the Illustration 6e which identifies Local Green Spaces</p> <p>Consider the wording of the policy. Could delete last paragraph but amend first paragraph as follows: "...must not result in the loss of, or have an adverse effect on, the asset or assets concerned <u>unless satisfactory alternative facilities are provided.</u>" The wording in policy EM5 (Green Infrastructure) of the Submission Local Plan may also assist.</p>	<p>Areas proposed to be designated as Local Green Space reviewed and list of these simplified.</p> <p>Policy wording streamlined as suggested.</p>	<p>Double protection retained where this is justified, i.e. Clift Meadow, Bramley Green (part), and Bramley Football Club.</p> <p>Policy CVA1 amended to say "Development proposals which affect Community-Value Assets identified in Table 6A, or in the Register of Assets of Community Value held by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, must not result in the loss of, or have an adverse effect on, the asset or assets concerned, unless satisfactory alternative facilities are provided. 6.39 amended to reflect the above change in wording.</p>
Para 6.39	<p>The paragraph lists potential community facilities identified through community consultation, however there is no reference to other data which may also help to justify them, for example the borough council's Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>You should ensure that all those listed in paragraph 6.39 are capable of meeting the criteria for an Asset of Community Value. Some of those listed in paragraph 6.39 might be better categorised as a community facility or infrastructure item.</p> <p>Further information on some of the items listed in paragraph 6.39 would be helpful, such as "Improvements to road network by-passing the village."</p>	The assets identified in 6.39 (now 6.41) are retitled Community Valued Assets, so no longer need to satisfy the legal definition of Assets of Community value.	Policy CVA2 is retitled "The Provision of New Community Facilities".

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 6.43	This paragraph describes the purpose of policy ACV2 as providing new community facilities in accordance with prioritised local community needs but there is no explanation as to how the needs have been or will be identified and prioritised.	Amend policy CVA2 to indicate how the need for new community facilities will be determined and prioritised; make reference to Bramley Parish Council as the body that will determine local needs and priorities for new community facilities.	Policy CVA2 reworded to say "...opportunities will be taken to provide facilities and amenities of community value, in accordance with priorities identified in this Neighbourhood Plan or otherwise determined by Bramley Parish Council in consultation with the local community. "
Policy ACV2: Provision of New Assets of Community Value	<p>Taking into account the LPA comments on paragraph 6.39, the title of policy ACV2 "Provision of new Assets of Community Value" may therefore cause confusion.</p> <p>An alternative approach could be to identify a project, which sits outside of the neighbourhood plan, listing potential new community facilities and infrastructure that could be funded through CIL. This project could provide further information on the items listed in paragraph 6.39.</p> <p>By stating in the last paragraph "...use will be made of the Community Infrastructure Levy..." does this mean just the 25% of the levy the parish council will receive for having an adopted neighbourhood plan or is it the overall CIL? A priority list for projects/infrastructure to be delivered through CIL would be a welcome addition to the plan.</p>	<p>Retitle policy CVA2.</p> <p>Possible projects outside the Neighbourhood Plan will be dealt with elsewhere.</p> <p>The use of CIL to help fund new community facilities will be determined on a case by case basis depending on circumstances at the time. It would be inappropriate to get into details about how proportions of the CIL would be used, as there is likely to be a need for some flexibility on this due to the different situations providing different opportunities.</p>	<p>Policy CVA2 retitled as "Provision of New Community Facilities".</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>
Para 6.42	This paragraph states that "It is a Local Plan objective to advance the health and well-being of local community..."	Amend to say "Local Plan 2011-2029."	6.43 amended to say "It is Local Plan 2011-2029 objective to advance...."
Policy D1	With regards to the second paragraph of the policy, the	The second paragraph in policy D2 ensures that	No action.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>requirements for a Design and Access Statement are already covered by regulation. The regulations are comprehensive in terms of which development proposals need a Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>It is not clear what scale of development the policy requirement would apply to. For example, for householder applications for say a porch, where a Design and Access Statement is not a requirement, could this be reasonable? Is that intended?</p> <p>The policy requirement may be misleading and onerous on particular applicants.</p>	<p>prospective developers are explicitly required to provide a written statement demonstrating how the relevant design factors have been taken into account in the design of the proposed development, whether this is as part of a Design and Access Statement or, where such as statement is not required by regulation, in another written statement.</p> <p>Further clarification of the level of detail to be provided for different types of development should be given, so that the requirements for minor forms of development are proportionate.</p>	<p>6.56 added to say “The amount of information provided in the statement will be proportionate to the scale and complexity of the development, with minor development requiring a relatively brief statement focusing on the relevant factors to explain the reasons for the proposed design.”</p>
Para 6.50	Is the first sentence referring to the adopted or Submission Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan?	Amend to make reference to both the Adopted Local Plan and the Submission Local Plan.	6.51 amended to say “Both the Basingstoke and Deane Adopted Local Plan and the Submission Local Plan provide a framework for securing high quality design in new development. “
Para 6.51	This paragraph refers to The Basingstoke and Deane Revised Pre-Submission Local Plan. The Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029) was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in October 2014.	Amend to say “Submission Local Plan.”	6.52 amended to make reference to the Submission Local Plan.
Illustration 6c: Protected views	The map has fewer views identified than the ‘Important Views’ identified in the borough council’s Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area Appraisal, which could lessen the importance of the Conservation Area appraisal views.	Illustration 6c retitled “Important Views”. The views identified in Illustration 6c to be limited to the important vista views and view points identified in the Bramley and Bramley Green Conservation Area Appraisal.	Illustration 6c retitled “Important Views” All views illustrated are from the Conservation Area Appraisal.
Para 6.55	In relation to the LPA’s comments on policy D1 consider deleting “...or in another written statement...” from the paragraph.	The purpose of this statement is to ensure that prospective developers are explicitly required to provide a written statement demonstrating how the relevant design factors have been taken into account in the design of the proposed development, whether this is as part	No action.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
		of a Design and Access Statement or, where such as statement is not required by regulation, in another written statement.	
Policy D2: Design of New Development	<p>The LPA supports the principle of this policy. However, currently some of the terms used in the policy do not provide certainty on what is expected and requires clarification. For instance, further clarification on the definition of ‘be efficiently managed’ would be useful in the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>Criterion e) is welcomed, however as well as making best use of existing habitats on sites, new developments should actively seek to create linkages and green corridors through and beyond the proposal site.</p> <p>Criterion f) of the policy could also seek to provide landscaping and green space that is sufficient to meet the needs of users.</p> <p>It is not clear if the requirement in criterion k) of the policy is related to the public and private spaces in criterion j) or the development proposal as a whole?</p> <p>With regards to the last paragraph of the policy please see the LPA’s comments in policy D1.</p>	<p>Explanatory detail on the meaning of “able to be efficiently managed” to be provided in additional supporting text.</p> <p>Further clarification of how criterion e) should be applied to be given.</p> <p>Criterion f) amended as suggested.</p> <p>As one item in a list introduced with the words “all new development must wherever possible...”, it is clear that k) relates to the whole development.</p> <p>See comments on D1 above. The aim is to secure a written statement of how the requirements of the policy have been addressed.</p>	<p>6.64 explains what is meant by “able to be efficiently managed.”</p> <p>6.64 includes an explanation which states that new developments should actively seek to create linkages and green corridors through and beyond the proposal site.</p> <p>Criterion f) amended to say “...attractive green spaces within the development which satisfactorily meet the needs of users;”</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p>
Para 6.63	<p>This paragraph describes one of the objectives for the rural environment as retaining and enhancing publicly accessible open space around the village. Increasing population and existing deficiencies may well also require new open spaces which needs to be recognised.</p> <p>In addition it is not clear what is meant by “around” the village, is this on the outskirts or within the village or</p>	Clarification of objective 4A to be provided.	<p>Objective 4A in paragraph 6.65 amended to say “To retain, enhance and, where appropriate increase, publicly accessible open space in and around Bramley village.”</p> <p>Corresponding changes also made in Section 3, paragraphs 3.12 to 3.14.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	both?		
Policy RE1: Reducing Flood Risk	<p>Whilst the LPA supports the intention of the policy, it questions what it adds to national policy guidance in the NPPF and NPPG on flooding/ flood risk. These both provide extensive guidance on development and flood risk and also when a flood risk assessment is required. The Submission Local also includes a detailed (EM7) policy on managing flood risk.</p> <p>The policy does not refer to the sequential approach or exception test to development in flood risk areas as set out in national guidance.</p> <p>The term ‘exposed unnecessarily’ in criterion a) of the policy is ambiguous and it is recommended that this term if replaced with alternative wording.</p> <p>Development proposals that require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) or a drainage strategy are also likely to include the provision of the details on appropriate mitigations or SuDS measures. Therefore, the NPG may want to consider whether the paragraph in the policy is updated to reflect this.</p> <p>Also, the NPG may want to consider whether there is a specific type of flood risk in Bramley that could be the main thrust of the policy.</p>	<p>The policy seeks to ensure that sites in areas at risk from flooding take proactive steps to mitigate these risks and reduce surface water run-off through the use of sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>Make reference to the sequential approach and the exception test.</p> <p>Criterion a) to be amended to improve clarity.</p> <p>Final paragraph in text supporting policy RE1 amended to make reference to Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) and drainage strategies.</p> <p>The scope of the policy should be reasonably broad, to enable it to deal with a range of situations.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>6.68 refers to the sequential test and 6.69 refers to the exception test as described in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Delete the word “unnecessarily” from criterion a).</p> <p>6.75 includes reference to Flood Risk Assessments and Sustainable Drainage Strategies .</p> <p>Bramley Parish Council to consider whether there is a particular kind of flood risk in Bramley that should be addressed in the policy.</p> <p>No action.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 6.70	The third sentence of the paragraph states that “The Flood Risk Assessment should make reference to the most recent Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment...” Flood Risk Assessment should take into account the SFRA rather than just make reference to it.	The wording of paragraph 6.75 strengthened as suggested..	6.75 amended as stated
6.75-6.76	Are these paragraphs referring to the adopted or Submission Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan?	Amend where relevant to say “Local Plan 2011-2029.”	Relevant paragraphs amended to say “Submission Local Plan”.
Illustration 6d	The key does not indicate what the green hatched area is on the map. This green hatched area is not within the strategic gap and this land is in fact within the settlement policy boundary as proposed by Submission Local Plan Inset Map 4 (Bramley).	The land hatched green in Illustration 6d (German Road development) is shown on Inset No 4 Bramley, which is part of the Local Plan 2011-2029 and the most up to date version of this map, as not included within the Settlement Policy Boundary.	No action.
Policy RE2: Area of Separation	<p>The principle of this policy is supported. However, it would be useful to explain why the Area of Separation, which falls within the defined Basingstoke/Chineham-Bramley/ Sherfield on Loddon strategic gap in the Submission Local Plan, is needed in addition to the emerging strategic gap policy.</p> <p>It would be extremely helpful to explain the difference between an Area of Separation and a Strategic Gap (policy EM2 of the Submission Local Plan).</p>	Provide further justification for the policy and boundaries and explain the difference between an Area of Separation and a Strategic Gap.	The purpose of the Strategic Gap policy is explained at 6.80 and the purpose of the Area of Separation policy is explained at 6.82.
Para 6.79	<p>This paragraph reads as policy and is less flexible than the relevant policy. It should therefore be reworded.</p> <p>The paragraph notes that ‘in general’ development will not be permitted, and notes that there are exceptions. Therefore, should the text of policy RE2 be amended to reflect this flexibility in paragraph 6.79. You should also consider if this flexibility is consistent with the flexibility offered by policy EM2 (Strategic Gaps) and paragraph 6.14 of the Submission Local Plan.</p>	Amend relevant paragraph under the sub-heading “Application of Policy RE2” to be consistent with the wording in the Local Plan 2011-2029 regarding Strategic Gaps.	Paragraph 6.84 amended to be consistent with policy EM2 (Strategic Gaps) and 6.14 in the Submission Local Plan.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>As the Area of Separation defined in Illustration 6d adjoins the north western boundary of Sherfield-on-Loddon village boundary it is important that Sherfield-on-Loddon parish council and the neighbourhood plan group are consulted on the BNP.</p>	<p>Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council was consulted on the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan and stated that they are fully in support of its aims and policies.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>Para 6.80</p>	<p>This paragraph states The Ministry of Defence land south of Bramley is within the Strategic Gap between Bramley and Basingstoke as defined in the Submission Local Plan. The last sentence adds that if the land is given up by the MOD, this area should be maintained as open woodland and remain part of the Strategic Gap. You should consider how this requirement sits with the policy wording in policy EM2 and also the flexibility paragraph 6.14 of the Submission Local Plan which provides for small scale development in strategic gaps.</p> <p>The first sentence states "...between Bramley and Basingstoke and Deane as noted in the Local Plan." This should read "between Bramley and Basingstoke and Deane as noted in the Local Plan."</p>	<p>Amendments to paragraphs under the sub-heading "Application of Policy" made to ensure consistency with the Submission Local Plan policy EM2.</p> <p>Delete "and Deane" from the paragraph.</p>	<p>Insert the following words at the end of para 6.80 – "...between settlements and be subject to relevant Local Plan policies."</p> <p>Paragraph 6.85 amended to delete "and Deane" from the first sentence.</p>
<p>Illustration 6e: Local Green Space</p>	<p>Illustration 6e designates Local Green Spaces in Bramley. This map clearly shows that several of the proposed Local Green Spaces could also be potential Assets of Community Value (subject to successful nomination and agreement). You should consider if this double policy protection is required.</p> <p>Paragraph 76 and 77 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans can be used to identify special protection green areas which are of particular importance to them. However it must be noted that the designation should only be used in specific circumstances.</p> <p>Further justification is needed for the proposed allocation of Local Green Spaces in the parish in order to demonstrate that they are in line with paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The map key shows that the dark green areas are Local</p>	<p>The areas to be designated as Local Green Space satisfy the criteria in paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Further information on the Local Green Spaces added to Local Green Spaces section of appendix E of the BNP, including a description of the site and the reasons for the designation.</p> <p>Illustration 6e to be simplified to remove</p>	<p>Appendix E provides a table describing the proposed Local Green Spaces and explaining how they satisfy the criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Amend Illustration 6e.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	Green Spaces, however it is not clear what the other coloured hatched areas on the map are.	unnecessary information.	
Policy RE3: Protection of Local Green Space	<p>Although the intentions of the policy are noted, the LPA has the following concerns:</p> <p>The policy states that “Development on designated Local Green Space will not be permitted.” You should consider how this sits with paragraph 76 of the NPPF which states that “...By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development <u>other than in very special circumstances.</u> “ The policy wording would therefore appear to be more restrictive than the NPPF.</p> <p>The definition of development within the text of this policy is critical, as it says that it will not be permitted. For example, in the case of Clift Meadow, this is a focus for community facilities and therefore would development prevent the addition of new facilities such as Multi Use Games Areas, play equipment or new recreational footpaths? This also applies across other areas of open space in the village.</p> <p>The policy could also seek to enhance local green space as well as to protect it.</p>	<p>Reword policy RE3 to ensure consistency with paragraphs 76 and 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The meaning of development in policy RE3 is the same as the statutory definition. RE3 to be amended to only allow development that would complement or enhance, and not adversely affect the Local Green Space in question.</p> <p>Policy RE3 should support initiatives that would enhance the Local Green Space involved.</p>	<p>Amend policy RE3 to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework to rule out development other than in very special circumstances.</p> <p>Policy RE3 amended to say new development will not be permitted unless it can be shown that it will complement or enhance, and not adversely affect, the character of the Local Green Space concerned.</p> <p>Add an additional sentence to Policy RE3 to say “Opportunities will be taken to enhance and increase areas of Local Green Space where they arise.”</p>
Para 6.87	<p>The link to Green Infrastructure needs could be made more explicit in this paragraph.</p> <p>There are areas of nature conservation interest that may need to be protected from use by the local community to protect their intrinsic character. This could be noted in this paragraph.</p>	<p>The supporting text should make reference to the local green infrastructure network.</p> <p>This safeguard should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>6.96 amended to make reference to links to local green infrastructure.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.93 amended to say “...access as long as it does not affect their intrinsic character.”</p>
Para 6.89	It could be worth making explicit reference to the fact that ‘opportunities to improve biodiversity’ should be sought where possible within the Biodiversity Priority	Supporting text to policy RE4 should enable opportunities to be taken to enhance the biodiversity of the area.	Paragraph 6.99 amended to say “Opportunities for the conservation and the sensitive enhancement of the natural

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	Area.		environment, including the Biodiversity Priority Area, will be taken when they arise."
Para 6.90	Is the first sentence referring to the adopted or Submission Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan?	Amend to say "Local Plan 2011-2029".	6.95 amended to say "Local Plan 2022-2029".
Policy RE4: Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment	<p>Broadly welcome policy RE4, however by specifying certain habitat types (e.g. woodland, hedgerow and individual trees) it ignores the other important habitat types that occur within the neighbourhood area, such as wetlands and notably grassland habitats such as the German Road SINC. It is also noted that the policy does not note the protection of protected and priority species. Bramley parish is home to strong populations of Hazel Dormouse, Great Crested Newts and several species of Bats all of which are important at the European level, and numerous other species falling under Section 41 of the NERC Act as species of principle concern. It is therefore important that the protected species issues are adequately recognised.</p> <p>Some of the wording in the first paragraph of the policy is a statement and may sit better within the supporting text.</p> <p>It is important to ensure consistency and avoid conflict between this policy and policy EM4 (Biodiversity, geodiversity and nature conservation) of the Submission Local Plan. For instance, policy RE4 states that development that affects Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) will not be permitted. Whereas, policy EM4 states that development proposals will only be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no harm to SINCs. Criterion 2 of policy EM4 also refers to satisfactory alternatives and compensatory measures.</p> <p>The second paragraph of the policy refers to leaving root systems unaffected, it is considered that the views of the borough council's tree and biodiversity teams are</p>	<p>Amend wording of policy RE4 as suggested to include additional types of habitat and ensure consistency with the Local Plan 2011-2029 policies.</p> <p>The first sentence of policy RE4 connects the policy to the locations to which it applies, so should remain.</p> <p>Reword policy RE4 to ensure consistency with policy EM4 of the Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Supporting text to be provided to explain how the interpretation of the policy, as advised by the Borough Council's tree and biodiversity</p>	<p>Policy RE4 second paragraph amended to add protected species, important wetland or grassland habitats, or areas of geodiversity to the types of habitat mentioned in the policy.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Second paragraph of policy RE4 amended to reflect approach taken in the Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Paragraphs 6.100 and 6.101 added to provide detailed guidance on the protection of trees and woodland in the</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>sought on this point.</p> <p>The last paragraph could be amended to read: “When opportunities arise <u>If appropriate</u>, important trees...”</p>	<p>teams.</p> <p>Final paragraph of policy RE4 to be amended as suggested.</p>	<p>vicinity of new development.</p> <p>Amend final paragraph of policy RE4.</p>
<p>Illustration 6f: Trees, woodland and hedgerows</p>	<p>Plan 6F correctly identifies the hedgerow and woodland network; however it does not recognise the other important wetland and grassland habitats which the borough council would be happy to provide information on. It could also represent an opportunity to consider green corridors through the parish.</p> <p>This map needs to be at a suitable scale to ensure the location of the trees, woodland and hedgerows can be clearly identified.</p>	<p>The addition of other habitats to Illustration 6f would make the map more difficult to read.</p> <p>Illustration 6f to be presented at a larger size.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Illustration 6f presented at full page size.</p>
<p>Policy T1: Improving the Footpath and Cycle Way Network</p>	<p>The principle of the paragraph is supported.</p> <p>The first paragraph of the policy states “Illustration 6g shows the network of footpaths and cycle ways which will be established in Bramley.” This should be referenced in the supporting text rather than the policy. Also are there other methods, apart from being associated with new development, to ensure the network of footpaths and cycle ways defined in Illustration 6g could be delivered? If so this should be made clear in the supporting text. An alternative approach could be to identify a project, which sits outside of the neighbourhood plan, identifying the footpaths and cycle way network that will developed, improved and extended that could be funded by the parish council’s CIL monies or other funding.</p> <p>The intent of the final sentence is noted, however as currently worded it could be concluded that if a housing proposal indicated that it will enhance or extend a footpath and cycle way network it will be granted even though the principle of development may not be supported. This is unlikely to be the thrust of the policy</p>	<p>The first sentence of policy T1 connects the policy to the footpath and cycleway network which is proposed to be established, so should remain.</p> <p>Possible projects outside the Neighbourhood Plan will be dealt with elsewhere.</p> <p>The sentence refers to two situations: situations where planning permission is granted for development and other proposals which enhance or extend the footpath and cycle way network. These are separate circumstances and the policy does not imply that the latter</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Amend final sentence to say “Such opportunities include where planning permission is granted for development or....”</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>and it is recommended that wording is amended.</p> <p>It is recommended that the NPG liaises with Hampshire County Council (HCC), if not done so already, to establish how suitable the policy is in relation to public rights of way. A criterion to consult with HCC and the borough council on matters pertaining to public paths could be added.</p>	<p>situation would be a reason to grant planning permission by overriding other planning policies. Clarify wording to avoid specious arguments.</p> <p>Hampshire City Council have been consulted on the Neighbourhood Plan and made no comment regarding this policy.</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.117 added to say "Hampshire County Council and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council should be consulted on matters concerning public rights of way."</p>
<p>Illustration 6g – Bramley village footpath and cycle way network</p>	<p>It is not clear from the map what is an existing footpath and cycle way.</p> <p>It is not clear which footpath and cycle way and public right of way are those that are aspiring to be created, improved or extended. Paragraph 6.107 infers the map is showing both proposed and existing.</p> <p>The map would also benefit from being at a clearer scale.</p> <p>The map could also identify the National Cycle Network (NCN) 23 route between Basingstoke and Reading.</p>	<p>Amend Illustration 6g to distinguish between existing and proposed footpaths and cycle ways, and to show the National Cycle Network.</p> <p>Enlarge the map to aid clarity.</p>	<p>Illustration 6g amended and re-sized to improve its legibility.</p>
<p>Para 6.102</p>	<p>The final sentence of the paragraph states "The Parish Council has presented proposals for road crossing improvements and a 20mph speed limit in the vicinity of the level crossing to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in order to address these issues and create safe routes to school."</p> <p>It is understood that this is a proposal that has been put forward to Hampshire County Council (HCC), as the Highways Authority, and not Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and this should be reflected in the text.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph to substitute HCC for BDBC.</p>	<p>Final sentence of 6.110 amended to read "...level crossing to Hampshire County Council in order to address....."</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>It is understood from HCC that following a change in national legislation regarding 20mph speed limits, they are currently implementing a pilot programme to assess the benefits of lower speed limits for residents. It is envisaged the programme will be complete during 2016 and until then no further 20mph speed limits are being considered. In the meantime, a log of all interest in 20mph speed limits is being kept (by HCC) for consideration in future years.</p> <p>It is understood from HCC that any further schemes however will depend on a positive outcome from the pilot programme assessment and 20mph schemes being prioritised ahead of other traffic management schemes in the area.</p> <p>With regard to the status of the Bramley proposal, it is understood that this is an aspiration of the Bramley Parish Council and no work towards it has been completed.</p>		
Para 6.104	First sentence of the paragraph refers to “The draft Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan...” This could be amended to refer to the Submission Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan.	Amend relevant paragraph to refer to the “Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029”.	First sentence of 6.113 amended to read “The Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029says.....”
Policy T2: Improving Road Safety in Bramley	The policy relates to the known ‘traffic hazards’ which are identified in paragraph 6.108. As confirmed in paragraph 6.108 these were identified by the parish council through consultation and surveys and recorded in the report ‘Evaluation of Transport Effects on Bramley in the Prospect of Further Development’ and in the earlier Transport Survey. The report and survey are not listed in Appendix A of the BNP.	Add reference to Appendix F: Evaluation of Transport Effects on Bramley in the Prospect of Further Development.	References to Appendix F and Appendix G included in paragraph 6.118. Policy T2 amended to included reference to Appendix G which identifies specific traffic hazards.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>It could be useful to add further information on the known traffic hazards including what appropriate mitigation might be required to enable a proposal for significant development (in the vicinity of a known traffic hazard) to be acceptable. This is of particular importance for the identified level crossing traffic hazard because the report 'Evaluation of Transport Effects on Bramley in the Prospect of Further Development' summarises that if "...On the other hand, should BDBC still argue for further development in Bramley, it is suggested that they coordinate/ liaise with Railtrack, HCC, the Government and its Highways Agency in order to put together a programme which, on a medium to long term basis, will allow further development in line with our BNP as put forward with as a result, that traffic be diverted from the railway barriers by a bypass." The report summarises that this could be in the form of a 'virtual bypass' or a 'purpose built' bypass through MOD land.</p> <p>With regards to the requirement for a Traffic Impact Assessment in the first paragraph, you should consider potential conflicts with paragraph 32 of the NPPF which provides guidance on when a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement is required. The council's planning application guidance for when a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement is required is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Has it been considered what scale of development would trigger the need to provide the level crossing mitigation of this magnitude? Funding sources would also be a crucial factor in the delivery of such infrastructure.</p>	<p>Appendix G: Bramley Transport Traffic Hazards provides details of traffic hazards listed in the opening paragraph supporting policy T2 (paragraph 6.118).</p> <p>Amend Appendix F to refer to 'Network Rail' and not 'Railtrack', and to 'Highways England' and not 'the Highways Agency'.</p> <p>Policy T2 requires a Transport Statement to be provided with significant new development proposals in the vicinity of known traffic hazards, to ensure that the effect of increase in traffic likely to be generated on those will be assessed and appropriate mitigation measures can be taken. This approach is not inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Amend policy T2 to use the terminology consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework - "Transport Statement or Transport Assessment".</p>	<p>Include new Appendix G: Bramley Transport and Traffic Hazards.</p> <p>Appendix F amended to include Hampshire County Council's Road Accident Data for Bramley and to refer to 'Network Rail', not 'Railtrack', and to 'Highways England' and not 'the Highways Agency'.</p> <p>Policy T2 amended to add "...or development which may exacerbate the hazard concerned..." Final sentence of Policy T2 amended to say "...which have an adverse impact on known traffic hazards....." This ties the requirement more closely to development that will exacerbate the traffic hazard concerned. Policy T2 amended to use the terminology in the National Planning Policy Framework - "Transport Statement or Transport Assessment"; definition of these terms included in the Glossary of Terms.</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>The second paragraph relates to all proposals for “significant” new development. “Significant” is defined as 10 or more dwellings or 100m². Non-significant development could also impact on known traffic hazards. You may wish to re-consider trigger for the requirements in the final paragraph.</p>	<p>The possibility of a bypass is presented in Appendix F as a hypothetical option to deal with the traffic problems in Bramley village but, because of the scale of development necessary to fund it, the feasibility of this has not been investigated in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Development proposals which are not significant (as defined in 6.124) but which may have an adverse impact on known traffic hazards can be dealt with by omitting the word “significant” from the second paragraph of policy T2.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Second paragraph of policy T2 amended.</p>
Para 6.114	<p>The definition of “significant” included in this paragraph is welcomed and aids clarity.</p>	<p>This paragraph now numbered 6.124.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
Policy E1: New Employment Development	<p>With reference to criterion a) any development could have an adverse impact in terms of traffic, noise etc but may still be suitable - it is about the degree of adverse impact.</p> <p>With reference to criterion c) of the policy, it may not always be appropriate to re-use vacant or redundant historic buildings as part of a development due to the buildings historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. This should be reflected in the policy.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given as to how the policy is consistent and avoids conflict with policy E1 of the Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>You should consider if it is reasonable for a Connectivity Statement to be required even if it is not necessary for</p>	<p>Re-word criterion a) to say “..unacceptable adverse impact on...”</p> <p>Re-word criterion c) to say “...where appropriate, opportunities are taken....”</p> <p>The Local Plan 2011-2029 has no Policy E1. It has policy EP1 – Economic Growth and Investment, which concerns strategic employment sites, employment site allocations and employment at strategic housing sites, none of which apply to the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy E1 should be flexible enough to allow employment development which does not</p>	<p>Criterion a) amended.</p> <p>Criterion c) amended.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Final paragraph of Policy E1 to read “Where relevant, development proposals</p>

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>the business need (e.g. a self-employed carpenter, or a blacksmith, as opposed to a high tech office business employing several persons). Could this also affect the viability of a development depending on the connection?</p> <p>The LPA is aware of several recent appeal decisions regarding broadband for housing sites where Inspectors have found that such a requirement is not necessary to make the developments acceptable in planning terms. The LPA can provide further information the recent appeal decisions if required.</p> <p>With regards to the final sentence of the policy, should housing developments also be required to provide suitable ducting rather than just for employment development?</p>	<p>need fast broadband to proceed unhindered by this requirement.</p> <p>Broadband requirement for housing development cannot be inserted into an employment policy. This can be an additional criterion in Policy D2.</p> <p>Consider if the ducting requirement is also necessary for housing developments.</p>	<p>for new employment development must provide” The qualification should be explained in the accompanying text. 6.134 – second purpose of policy amended to say “...for relevant business users.” This allows users who do not have a need for good broadband not to provide it. 6.136 amended to say “...should be the aim for all new employment developments which have a need for this.”</p> <p>Policy D2 changed to include a requirement for a connectivity statement in the case of new development.</p> <p>See above.</p>
Appendices C-E	On the front page of each of these appendices it states “Supplementary Planning Document”. This a misleading title to use for these documents as they do not meet the definition of a “Supplementary Planning Document” as per the NPPF Glossary	Title of these appendices amended to remove the phrase “supplementary planning document”.	Amend the titles of Appendices C to E.
Data Analysis related to Bramley’s expansion document	<p>This document provides useful background information for Bramley. Section 1 highlights that the BNP should have a policy for future housing that limits the size of the development and refers to the community survey concluded that the majority favoured developments of a maximum of 50 houses on any one site. However, the data analysis as a whole seems to imply that additional housing development in the neighbourhood area is not positively supported.</p> <p>The document goes to great lengths to highlight that</p>	Clarification provided that the comparative data with the parish of Overton and Whitchurch Town are not intended to have any implications for policies in those settlements.	Paragraph 5.04 in the Neighbourhood Plan amended to make this clear.

Section/ Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>Bramley, in the view of the NPG, has taken a disproportionate level of expansion when compared to Overton and Whitchurch. As you'll be aware Overton and Whitchurch are designated neighbourhood areas and the suitability of development in these areas will be considered through this process. The BNP should focus on Bramley.</p>		