



Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Reg16 Representations

September 2024

Representation Number	Name and Organisation	Summary of Representation
001	Edward Hugh R. Thomas	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
002	Surrey County Council	No comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan
003	Winchfield Parish Council	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
004	Patricia Davies	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
005	Sport England	Sets out a generic response confirming that it is essential that neighbourhood plans comply with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with reference to paras 102 and 103. Reference is made to Sport England's role as a statutory consultee and in protecting playing fields and to Sport England guidance. Neighbourhood Plans can use up to date evidence prepared in support of Local Plans or where this does not exist then proportionate evidence should be prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan. Reference is also made to the need to ensure new developments are designed so that they provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.

006	Michael Conoley Associates	Objects to Land at Little Park, Odiham (Site 11.xi) being designated as Local Green Space in Policy 11, as the designate would not meet the criteria in national policy and guidance.
007	Historic England	Sets out a generic response with guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans. The response identifies that paragraph 190 of the NPPF sets out that Plans, including Neighbourhood Plans, should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. The response also identifies a number of advice notes drafted by Historic England which are relevant.
008	Rushmoor Borough Council	No comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
009	Thames Water	<p>Identifies comments made at the previous consultation that had not been acknowledged in the draft plan including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision to ensure that there is adequate wastewater and water supply infrastructure to serve all new developments. Suggests the inclusion of the following text: <i>“Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades. The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/wastewater company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of Development.”</i> • Supports para 7.4. and proposes the inclusion of the following text: <i>“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”</i>

		Also provides development advice for developers.
010	Hampshire Swifts	<p>Supports Policy 12 with the inclusion of the following text:</p> <p><i>“Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in all new-build developments including extensions, in accordance with best-practice guidance such as BS 42021:2022 or CIEEM. Swift bricks are a significantly better option than external boxes due to their long lifetime, no maintenance requirements, improved thermal regulation, and aesthetic integration. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where an ecologist specifically recommends it.</i></p> <p><i>Existing nest sites should also be protected and retained, as these are not given any value by the DEFRA biodiversity net gain metric calculation. Building-dependent species such as swifts return to the same traditional nest sites year after year and find it difficult to locate a new site if they lose their original nest site.</i></p> <p><i>Swifts are an important species in Hampshire with a substantial number of older buildings for nesting and suitable areas for foraging. The RSPB Swift Mapper website (https://www.swiftmapper.org.uk/) and the Hampshire Swift survey (https://www.hampshireswifts.co.uk/copy-of-hampshire-swift-survey) demonstrate that they are recorded nesting throughout the county. Other birds which will inhabit swift bricks are also present, such as house sparrows.”</i></p>
011	Shorewood Homes	<p>Objects to the Hatchwood Farm site being located outside of the settlement boundary in Policy 1 and Section 5 Policies Map (with Insets), which conflicts with the Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2032 where the site is included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Also objects to the Hatchwood Farm site (Site 11.ix) being designated as Local Green Space in Policy 11, as the designate would not meet the criteria in national policy and guidance.</p>
012	Gladman	Raises concerns that:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vision restricts development and potentially create a barrier for needed development and growth in the Neighbourhood Plan area • Policy 1 is not consistent with the NPPF and is not flexible enough to react to changes in circumstance over the plan period • Policy 2 should allocate more small to medium sized sites south of Odiham and North Warnborough or implement a flexible response to settlement boundaries • Policy 3 is not supported by evidence and should be deleted • Policy 4 is not supported by up-to-date evidence and reference to a mix of dwellings should be deleted • Policy 5 is too subjective for future application • Policy 12 should include wording to explain that where it is not possible to provide on-site biodiversity net gain, off-site contributions should be accepted
013	National Grid	Confirms that no assets (high voltage electricity assets and other electricity infrastructure) are currently affected by the proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
014	Jeremy Fellows	Suggests removing Site 11.xiv Recreation Ground and Site 11.xii Montfort Place from Policy 11 so that both sites can be reassessed for community use.
015	Charles Peal	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
016	Edwin Sheppard	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan and provides observations in relation to Policy 11 - Site 11.xi Little Park.
017	David Kirkpatrick	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
018	Derek Spruce	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
019	Hamish Bullough	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
020	LRM Planning Ltd	Objects to the Football Club (Site 11.viii) being designated as Local Green Space in Policy 11, as the designate would not meet the criteria in national policy and guidance.

021	Hannah Bourne-Taylor	<p>Suggests the inclusion of reference to swift bricks similar to wording used in Brighton and Hove policy/guidance: <i>“New build developments of 5m or greater in height are required to incorporate swift bricks/boxes, with regard to the council’s Guidance note for provision of swift bricks. As recommended in the guidance, internal swift bricks that are integrated into the walls are preferred to external boxes, where feasible. Swift bricks/boxes should be secured at the following rate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Minor residential development should provide a minimum of 3 swift bricks, or two per residential unit, whichever is the greater.</i> - <i>Minor commercial development should provide 3 swift boxes, or one per 50sqm of floorspace, whichever is the greater.</i> - <i>Major developments should seek to secure similar provision and will be recommended by the council’s ecology advisor.</i> - <i>Householder extensions should also have regard to the Swift Guidance and provide a swift brick/box on any suitable development greater than 5m in height.</i> <p><i>All new build development and extensions to existing buildings are required to incorporate bee bricks at a rate of one bee brick per dwelling. Different requirements may be recommended for major applications. An appropriate amount is suggested as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Major development – the total ratio of swift bricks should be the same as the units using the British Standard Guidance BS 42021:2022</i> - <i>Minor development – 1 integrated unit per dwelling or 100sqm of floorspace.</i> - <i>Householders – 1 integrated unit.</i> <p><i>Further policy is being prepared through City Plan Part Two to positively support the incorporation of swift boxes/bricks in suitable new development. All new build, refurbishment, and renovation schemes should incorporate swift boxes and bee bricks where possible ensuring their installation follows best-practice guidance.”</i></p>
-----	----------------------	---

022	Avant Homes	<p>Considers that the amendments should be fully scrutinised by an Independent Examiner in a public examination as part of the process to modify the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Objects to Policy 2v and Policy 14, which set out a retrospective requirement for public open space identified in Policy 14. This is unjustified and is significantly more than what is required to be delivered by the other sites identified in Policy 2. The policies are overtly onerous and could affect the viability of the site.</p>
023	Natural England	No comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan
024	Michael Priaulx	<p>Suggests the inclusion of reference to swift bricks in the draft Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p><i>“Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species, and should be installed in new developments including extensions, in accordance with best practice guidance such as BS 42021 or CIEEM. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where recommended by an ecologist.</i></p> <p><i>Existing nest sites for building-dependent species such as swifts and house martins should be protected, as these endangered red-listed species which are present but declining in the district return annually to traditional nest sites. Mitigation should be provided if these nest sites cannot be protected.”</i></p>
025	John Pattinson	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
026	Jemma Moran	Suggests the inclusion of reference to swift bricks in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
027	Patricia Neate	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan
028	Piers Beach	Provides observations on redevelopment the Longwood site (Policy 1i)
029	Hart District Council	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan and suggests a number of minor changes to provide greater clarity, understanding or to better align the policies/text with local and national guidance. Also identifies concern with implementation of Policy 12 vi.
030	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Confirms that the MOD has an interest within the area covered by the Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan, as it contains areas that are washed over

		<p>by safeguarding zones that are designated to preserve the operation and capability of defence assets and sites. RAF Odiham benefits from safeguarding zones drawn to preserve the airspace above and surrounding the aerodrome to ensure that development does not form a physical obstruction to the safe operation of aircraft using that aerodrome. Additionally, RAF Odiham is washed over by a statutory birdstrike safeguarding zone, designed for birdstrike risk to be identified and mitigated.</p> <p>The MOD should be consulted of any potential development within the statutory technical safeguarding zones that surround RAF Odiham which consists of structures or buildings exceeding statutory safeguarding technical criteria, or any development in the statutory birdstrike safeguarding zone surrounding RAF Odiham which includes schemes that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation. This would include both on and off-site provision of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and any new waterbodies. Appropriate assessments may need to be carried out and, where necessary, requests for required conditions or objections be communicated.</p>
031	Hampshire County Council	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan and suggests several minor amendments to the policies/supporting text to enhance the outcomes with regards to active travel and responding to the needs of residents.