



## **SUMMONS**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A MEETING OF THE HART DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, HARLINGTON WAY, FLEET ON THURSDAY 27 OCTOBER 2016 AT 7.00 PM

Joint Chief Executive

CIVIC OFFICES, HARLINGTON WAY  
FLEET, HAMPSHIRE GU51 4AE

---

## **AGENDA**

**COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE IN LARGE PRINT AND  
BRAILLE ON REQUEST**

### **1 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

To confirm the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 29 September 2016.  
**Paper A**

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

### **3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To declare disclosable pecuniary, and any other, interests.

### **4 PRESENTATION – SEBASTIAN’S ACTION TRUST**

### **5 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

To receive any questions from members of the public submitted pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 12.

*Note: The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 12 must be given to the Chief Executive not later than **Noon on Friday, 21 October 2016.***

## **6 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**

To receive any questions from Members submitted pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 14.

*Note: The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 14.3 must be given to the Chief Executive not later than **5.00 pm on Monday, 24 October 2016.***

*The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 14.4 must be submitted to the Chief Executive before **10.00 am on Thursday, 27 October 2016.***

## **7 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **8 CABINET MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **9 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT**

## **10 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

The Minutes of the following Committees, which met on the dates shown, are submitted.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.1, Members are allowed to put questions at Council without Notice in respect of any matters in the Minutes to the Leader of the Council or any Chairman of the relevant meeting at the time those Minutes are received by Council.

Meeting	Date	Page Numbers	For Decision
Overview & Scrutiny	20 September 2016	8-10	
Audit	27 September 2016	4-6	
Cabinet	6 October 2016	18-20	
Planning	12 October 2016	33-37	

## **11 MOTION TO COUNCIL**

The following motion to Council has been moved by Councillor Parker:

“That the Council resolves that through its Local Plan it will seek to meet Hart’s full, objectively assessed need for new homes, subject to the inclusion of an appropriate contingency to allow for any delays or the non-delivery of sites, and that it will also seek to accommodate any demonstrated unmet need for new homes from its Housing Market Area partners”.

**Date of Despatch: 18 October 2016**



## **COUNCIL**

**Date and Time:** Thursday, 29 September 2016 at 7.00 pm

**Place:** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

**Present:**

### **COUNCILLORS –**

Southern - (Chairman)

Ambler	Crookes	Neighbour
Axam	Dickens	Oliver
Billings	Forster	Parker
Blewett	Gray	Radley JE
Burchfield	Gorys	Renshaw
Butler	Harward	Wheale
Clarke	Kennett	Woods
Cockarill	Leeson	Wright
Collett	Makepeace-Browne	
Crampton	Morris	

Officers Present:

Patricia Hughes	Joint Chief Executive
Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Alison Cottrell	Committee Services

### **33 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Minute 28, Cabinet Member for the Environment, Councillor Forster's announcements should read – "CCTV - Yateley Town Council and Church Crookham Parish Council are looking at a new CCTV system".

With this amendment, the minutes of the meeting of the 28 July 2016 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### **34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bailey, Crisp, Kinnell and Radley JR.

### **35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations were made.

### **36 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

Questions had been received from Mr Chris Cornwell and Mr David Turver, details of which are set out in Appendix A attached to these Minutes.

### **37 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**

Questions put by Councillors are detailed in Appendix B attached to these Minutes.

### **38 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman had attended the following events on behalf of the Council.

12 August	Re-opening of Cricket Hill Pond, Cricket Hill Lane, Yateley
23 September	Mayor of Surrey Heath Civic Dinner at the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst
26 September	Hart Voluntary Sector Forum in the Council Chamber

The Chairman encouraged Councillors to pick up a copy of the Councillors and Staff booklet and explained that it contains a lot of useful information.

Members had a discussion on appropriate attire for Council meetings.

### **39 CABINET MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader of the Council, **Councillor Parker**, announced :

Devolution : The Hampshire County Council consultation on local government reorganisation overlapping with the additional matter of devolution closed last week. In all they received about 3000 responses from a population of 1.3m – less than .25%. They have yet to publish results. At about the same time, the Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils, together with the Isle of Wight closed their statutory consultation on their proposed devolution deal, achieving a proportionately larger response of about 2500, representing about 1% of their population. Again, they have yet to publish their result.

Today I chaired a Heart of Hampshire Leaders meeting which was updated on the progress of the work of Price Waterhouse Coopers to produce an analysis of the available options to inform the discussion going forward. This is scheduled to be submitted at the end of October and will help us determine how to proceed.

Local Plan : We held a useful Local Plan Steering Group workshop on generic policies on Tuesday, which our planning policy officers found helpful. Further detailed comments have been received from members since on which officers are working. Papers will be issued on 11th October for a series of meetings in the week commencing 17th October, following which we hope to start the Regulation 18 consultation on a draft plan, finishing in mid-December.

Meanwhile members will be aware that we have been working with colleagues in Rushmoor and Surrey Heath to agree the Strategic Housing Market Analysis. We have been particularly engaging with Rushmoor to seek to reduce any unmet need in

that borough which we might need to fulfil. I have today received a copy of a letter from them acknowledging that their current figures indicate that they will be passing no unmet need to Hart. Planning policy officers are reviewing this data but at first blush it appears robust.

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, **Councillor Burchfield**, reported :

First, as members know, as part of the 5 Council procurement arrangement, Lot 2 – Parking and Facilities Management was part of that outsourcing process which Vinci had won. Although our current provider does not expire until October 2017, there was some initial thought that we might start it earlier than that. However, after analysing the pros and cons of doing so, the Joint Chief Executive and I have decided that it is best to wait to move to the contract with Vinci until our current contract expires in October 2017. We wanted to make this announcement today to alleviate the uncertainty our current staff may have as well as allow the portfolio holders and officers to make plans to fill any manpower gaps we may have so that we can continue to provide the level of service that our residents expect.

Second, the PCC has requested a 5 year extension of its lease which was due to end in April 2020, but now will end in April 2025. As part of this process, we have agreed a break clause of one year after 2020 as well as an annual rent review starting in 2020. We are pleased that we have the high degree of income certainty for another 5 years.

Third, since October 2014, Hart District Council has taken 20 residents to court following the non-payment of Council Tax totally over £175,000. Of the 20 cases, 13 received a suspended sentence and 15 received additional court costs totally over £4,000. To be clear, these are residents who refuse to pay council tax, not those who cannot afford to pay it. Some of the biggest debt identified has been from properties with a band D, E or G where residents have refused to pay for Council Tax for a period of many years. The Council has been working with the court to arrange repayment schedules with all residents. To date, the Council has received nearly £25,000 back in repayments.

Fourth, we have applied for the LGC awards for Partnership of the Year and Innovative Service model of the year based on the unique/pioneering 5 Councils partnership. We are confident that our submission should be acknowledged as one of the best in their relevant categories. I have also asked the Joint Chief Executive to prepare presenting our new partnership at next year's LGA Conference in July as either a keynote event or a break out session.

Fifth, I would like to congratulate Susanna Hope as she has been one of the very few selected to take part in the District Councils Networks Staff Development Programme.

Lastly, although an exciting summer of sport is over, I would like to express my congratulations to both the Olympic and Paralympic teams for their outstanding performances. We even had one of the Olympians, Alex Danson, officially open the refurbished Frogmore Leisure Centre as part of a family fun day this month. However, I would like to express special congratulations to local Hart hero, Justin Rose, for his gold medal winning performance in the men's golf event, the first one in

over 100 years. The dedication these athletes show and the results they have achieved should be an inspiration to all of our youth in Hart.

The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, **Councillor Crampton**, announced :

Obesity, smoking and inactivity costs the NHS £11 billion a year and contributes to significant morbidity and mortality. Hart is committed to prevention of illness caused by all three factors and has invested £1.5 million into refurbishment of the Frogmore Leisure Centre with Everyone Active contributing £330,000.

On 19 September, the refurbished Frogmore Leisure Centre was opened. The day began with our star guest, Alex Danson who is a member of the gold medal winning Hockey Team in the Rio Olympics, being shown around the purpose built cycling studio, the spa area, the extended by with new equipment, the hot yoga studio, the new changing area and the crèche area.

After the ribbon cutting, Alex who comes from Odiham, had a question and answer session with visitors in a packed sports hall. She told us that after practicing taking penalties over and over again, she was confident we would win the match and take the gold medal. She praised the high quality facilities now at Frogmore and told us of the importance in her life of Harts leisure centres.

The day continued with taster classes, a bouncy castle, gym demonstrations and a prize draw.

Thank you to all the staff especially to one who came dressed as a bee and another dressed as a banana. It was a thoroughly enjoyable and successful day.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, **Councillor Crookes**, reported :

Entries for the annual Inspire Business Awards closed at the end of August. Together with representatives of the other Event and Category Sponsors, I attended the shortlisting judging on September 8th. We reviewed a great number of varied and excellent entries and shortlisted 3 entries in each category. Ten Hart based companies are shortlisted. In the next two weeks I shall be participating in the final judging to select the winner in each category. Winners will be announced at the annual recognition dinner in November.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, **Councillor Forster**, announced :

CCTV has been successfully supporting the police over the last couple of months and that as a result, crime levels have reduced. The CCTV had even assisted in locating a missing Hook teenager.

Fly Tipping – prosecutions are now being pursued and we have the evidence to support these prosecutions which will hopefully prove to be successful.

There is nothing to report in relation to on street parking, but I would like to pick up on South West Trains, having attended a stakeholder meeting recently. The franchise is being renewed imminently and South West Trains are pursuing a number

of improvements. To this end, platforms 1 to 4 at Waterloo Station will be closed from the 5 to the 28 August 2017 and this will cause severe disruption across the whole network. This information will need to be well publicised.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, **Councillor Gorys**, reported :

I am really pleased to announce that the Housing Service has recently been successful in achieving 7 out of the 10 Local Challenges that were set by government in the "Making Every Contact Count: A Joint Approach to Preventing Homelessness Report" in August 2012. The challenges were set out by government for local housing authorities, who were encouraged to embrace the continuous improvement of front line housing options services. Members will remember that Hart was an early adopter of this very positive, government funded, initiative. We were the very first local authority in England to undertake a Diagnostic Peer Review process in accordance with the scheme, which opened up the opportunity to apply for "Gold Standard". For a small district, like Hart, to be able to lay claim to being just one of 5 local authorities, out of 326 nationally, to achieve 7 of the 10 Local Challenges, is quite an achievement for us - and all undertaken while delivering the day job! I would like to acknowledge the hard work of the whole housing team and with a special mention for Kelly Watts and the Housing Options Officers, who have all been involved in getting us to where we are, either through directly delivering housing services to our residents, or through policy work ensuring our processes and approaches have been meeting the highest possible standards. Vicky Atkinson and Claire Leivers have also been involved in supporting this work - so it's been a real team effort! In fact, teamwork has even extended beyond the Housing Service to involve wider services in demonstrating a partnership approach that has been vital to our success. We have already submitted our completed application for the 8th Local Challenge and anticipate - all being well (!) - achieving the national Gold Standard either within this financial year or early on in 2017/18.

Phil Turner has been invited back to present to a national conference on allocations and homelessness, following a presentation he delivered last year in which he discussed housing allocations and affordability in the context of a non-stock holding district council. This is another great example of the Housing Service contributing to our reputation in a very positive way, with our local approach to Housing contributing to national good practice on a stage which will be shared by eminent commentators from across the housing world.

Housing company draft business plan has been prepared and will go to the Overview and Scrutiny committee for comments and I hope all members of this Council will support this initiative which will have a great and beneficial effect on our residents in Hart.

The Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services, **Councillor Kennett**, reported :

On 23 September there was an Awards Ceremony organised in Aldershot by Safer Northants and Hampshire Police to honour both civilians and members of the Police Force in Hart, Basingstoke and Rushmoor who had shown great bravery or given outstanding service in the cause of Community Safety.

On 24 September I attended an Awards ceremony in Winchester, hosted by the Lord-Lieutenant of Hampshire, honouring outstanding members of the South East Reserve Forces and Cadets Association (SERFCA).

Lastly I am pleased to inform members that, for the fifth consecutive year, our Council has been awarded the RSPCA 's highest award for its stray dog programme. This will be presented to the Dog Warden team, Ayeesha and Carrie on 30 November at a ceremony in London. It was to have been a platinum award but very late in the day the RSPCA discontinued these so that they could relaunch them next year. Since this is the fifth consecutive year the Hart has received a gold medal we are fairly confident that when platinum is relaunched we will get one.

The Cabinet Member for Town and Village Regeneration, **Councillor Morris**, reported:

#### Regeneration

HART Regeneration Board comprising Officers and Councillors is being set up to plan and budget for Town and Village regeneration projects. The Brownfield sites feasibility study being carried out by Eastleigh District Council will be a very useful tool for this board, when the study is completed and fully understood.

#### Meetings Attended

The RAF Odiham Annual Reception was attended by myself, Cllr Parker and Joint Chief Executive Daryl Phillips. Further engagement between RAF Odiham is planned including a proposed visit by Councillors to a Helicopter Squadron.

I recently chaired a Military Covenant meeting held at Hart Civic Offices and as well as normal Covenant business, I was able to remind all attendees of the aims of the Covenant.

A Meeting with the Chairman of Blackwater Business Forum gave the opportunity to continue the dialogue between Hart and the Blackwater retailers and although the forum is in its infancy it promises to be an effect voice.

I was pleased to be asked to attend a meeting with Fleets Business Forum where discussions included the Business Improvement District process and the proposed changes to the parking service.

#### Car Parks

In August an upgraded car park ticket machine demonstration took place in the civic office foyer. Those who attended were able to see the new Post Payment (pay when you leave) facility first hand. Many meetings and conversations with the ticket machine manufacturers have taken place to ensure the machines are user friendly. Once all the machine formatting has been resolved the intention is to roll out upgraded machines across the district from mid-January 2017. Victoria Road and Ghurkha Square car parks will be the first to have machines installed and for the first week the machine manufacturers will be in attendance to help the public. New information signage both directional and tariff boards will also be fitted around the car parks.

In other Districts the public have been fooled by criminals taping over telephone numbers on the tariff boards and replacing these numbers which has resulted in funds illegally taken from credit card accounts. Once the new upgraded ticket machines are fitted the pay by telephone number will only be displayed within the screen of the digital display and cannot be tampered with.

A car parking survey was recently carried out and the public responses have been collated and presented in picture format on Harts website.

Generally the public responses show that the car parking service is considered a good service and charges are fair. A member of the enforcement team was recently given a bunch of flowers from a member of the public for her diligent response to a problem in one of Harts car parks clearly showing how community spirited our enforcement officers are.

Finally, Aeromobility are a charity based at Blackbushe airport who facilitate for both disabled civilian and military personal the gift of level flight. Some are only able to be passengers but others are learning to fly by means of modified aircraft controls. This is a worthy charity which I hope the Military Covenant Committee can help in the future. I intend to invite the charity to talk at a near future Full Council meeting to enlighten Councillors of their worthwhile work.

#### **40 JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVES' REPORT**

The Joint Chief Executives' report is attached as Appendix C to these Minutes.

#### **41 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Joint Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee</b>	<b>29 June 2016</b>

Councillor Collett asked - only 5 out of the 9 members of the Committee had attended and that the date of the meeting appeared to have been chosen for the convenience of a member who was not in Hart and then agreed without consultation with other members. Is there not a better way of choosing meeting dates?

Councillor Kennett responded – I apologise and will ensure that future dates are canvassed in advance.

Councillor Collett asked - our practice, which is a good practice, is that our Minutes list which officers are present at the meeting – the minutes of this Committee are opaque referring to people who may or may not have attended. Can this be changed?

It was agreed through the Chairman that this would be taken on board.

Councillor Collett indicated that a large part of the meeting concerns levels of crime, drug and alcohol abuse, and that more robust information would give a better indication of crime within the area and that in the future the CSP may wish to consider how and what statistical data would be recorded in the future. There

are a lot of key issues raised, but there is nothing in the minutes to suggest that there will be another meeting in less than a year's time.

Councillor Kennett indicated that he would prefer to give a written answer to this.

### **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**19 July 2016**

Councillor Crookes – indicated that he had attended the meeting because of financially based items on agenda.

### **Cabinet**

**4 August 2016**

Minute number 36 –Council Tax support Scheme.

Councillor Collett asked – bearing in mind the promise you made during the Budget discussions in February this year that you would not go down this path, why have you broken that promise?

Councillor Parker responded – what I do whilst doing the 2016/17 budget relates to that budget. I will make decision in relation to 2017/18 in due course but don't actually recall giving a firm commitment. The new financial year brings new challenges and all options need to be reviewed. It is a decision to consult only.

Councillor Collett asked – bearing in mind that the households that rely on Council Tax Benefit are a small minority of all households in Hart, and that those households which qualify for Council Tax Benefit to cover between 80 and 100% of their council tax bills are an even smaller minority, how fair do you believe this consultation will be and what are you hoping to get from it?

Councillor Parker responded – the short answer is that no one knows what response we will get until the response is in. In terms of that, it is a qualitative consultation. We will get the responses and take a view part of which will be to look at who responded and what their situation is. There may be less interest from an address in the blue triangle but a similar response from a less favoured part of the district.

Councillor Collett – bearing in mind that the only people who will be affected by the proposal being consulted on here would be those who financial circumstances are most dire, why are you targeting them?

Councillor Parker responded – there are always other options to reduce the service in all sorts of areas, but this is a consultation exercise and one of a number of things we will be taking into account. We will review the responses and take a view as to how we then proceed.

### **Cabinet**

**1 September 2016**

No questions asked.

## **Minute 48 – Local Authority Mental Health Challenge**

The Recommendation was proposed by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor Crampton.

### **RESOLVED**

That Cabinet approval for the Council to join the Local Authority Mental Health Challenge be endorsed.

## **Minute 52 – Request to Serve Article 4 Direction**

The Recommendation was proposed by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor Burchfield

Members discussed:

- The implications to the Council as a whole.
- Whether there could be any misuse.
- That the amendment would ensure that we keep within the law.

### **RESOLVED**

- 1 The Hart District Council Constitution Delegation to Individual Cabinet Members be adjusted to read “To make Directions under Article 4 of the Town and County Planning General Development Order (or any Order revoking or re-enacting the Order).
- 2 The Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Group Leaders, be authorised to make adjustments to the Constitution which are necessitated by decisions taken by the Council; which remove inconsistency or ambiguity; which are minor; or to effect changes in the law.

**Planning Committee**

**10 August 2016**

No questions asked.

## **16/01064/FUL - Stapeley Down Farm, Long Lane, Odiham**

The application was brought to Committee as a **Departure** from the Local Plan as it would constitute the provision of new residential development in the open countryside outside of any defined settlement. As such, approval of the development would be contrary to the requirements of 'saved' policy RUR2 of the Local Plan. The proposal does however relate to the redevelopment of previously developed land (a Brownfield site) and is considered to constitute a sustainable form of development and taking account of other material planning considerations it is considered that the application could be approved.

The Planning Committee considered that although a **DEPARTURE** to the Local Plan and approved policy, there was no overall harm to the open countryside and that the proposal complies with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Statement.

Since no request to debate had been received this Departure to the Local Plan was deemed to be **ACCEPTED**.

**Planning Committee**

**14 September 2016**

No questions asked.

**16/01662/FUL - Stapeley Down Farm, Long Lane, Odiham**

The application was brought to Committee as a **Departure** from the Local Plan as it would constitute the provision of new residential development in the open countryside outside of any defined settlement. As such, approval of the development would be contrary to the requirements of 'saved' policy RUR2 of the Local Plan. The proposal does however relate to the redevelopment of previously developed land (a Brownfield site) and is considered to constitute a sustainable form of development and taking account of other material planning considerations it is considered that the application could be approved.

The Planning Committee considered that although a **DEPARTURE** to the Local Plan and approved policy, there was no overall harm to the open countryside and that the proposal complies with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Statement.

Since no request to debate had been received this Departure to the Local Plan was deemed to be **ACCEPTED**.

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm.

## **COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12**

### **QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

#### **Question from Mr Chris Cornwell**

##### **Question 1**

Does the leader of the Council think that it reflects well on his administration, when the Minutes of the Hart Transport meeting held on Friday 15 April, that I obtained the venue for; proposed the agenda for; and talked to all invitees to ensure that what was going to be discussed was relevant to them; were only released when I threatened to ask for them at a Full Council meeting and that, since then, there has been no update from Hart District Council concerning the Action Points arising from that meeting?

##### **Response**

The Hart Transport Meeting held in April this year was an exploratory meeting, and the first of what I hope to be a series of 6 or even 12 monthly or annual meetings which Hart will look to co-ordinate with the many and varied interest groups and operators.

I can confirm that there was a delay in circulating the notes from this meeting which is truly regrettable: Mr Cornwell knows the reason for this as it was stated when the minutes were sent out. I can confirm that notes from any future meetings will be circulated in a much more timely manner. With regards to the agreed actions an update on progress with these will be sought from those organisations to which they were assigned at the next meeting.

I am pleased that Hart is able to help with the co-ordination of community transport and hope to see improvements in this sector as a result; it is however, worth remembering that Hampshire County Council are the authority with responsibility for Transport, and I am pleased that they have listened and just recently confirmed their continued funding of both buses in Hart & local Community Transport services. Hart DC will continue to work with all parties to improve services and routes, and to encourage increased usage.

##### **Mr Cornwell asked a supplementary question:**

John Foggo retiring did impact on the preparation of the Minutes of the Meeting, although one could argue that, as there was 6 weeks between the meeting and him retiring at the end of May, he should have been reminded that they were required before he left. However we are now 5 months on and there has been no feedback on the Action Points from the meeting.

Because the meeting on 15 April was Fleet-centric, finished early and did not cover adequately all the items on the agenda, particularly the Community Transport and Care Group issues which affect the rural parishes disproportionately, and since then there has been no update on the Action Points despite reminders being sent, many of those who spend the most time dealing with transport matters, have no confidence in the Cabinet Member for Environment and Technical Services' ability to perform a Community Leadership role on transport, so would the leader of the Council consider transferring

responsibility to the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, who I think I am right in saying has the overwhelming, if not total, support of the community for the way in which she manages the Ageing Well in Hart meetings and the action points that arise from them?

### **Response**

The organisation of the Council is carried out by the Leader and he has assigned people to do that task.

### **Questions from Mr David Turver**

#### **Mr Turver asked:**

#### **Question 1**

Given that the Brownfield Register published by the Council in July did not contain any of the brownfield sites identified by the council in the recent housing options consultation, nor many other brownfield sites in the SHLAA or those identified by WeHeartHart, can you give your latest estimate of brownfield capacity in the district now you plan to increase the provision of SANG land?

### **Response**

The pilot exercise on Brownfield Register followed a guideline to test a Government hypothesis. It was useful in the context of a pilot but less so as an examination of brownfield sites.

On the assumption that the current likely SANG becomes available, after an allowance for our sister authorities in Surrey Heath and Rushmoor, our SANG capacity is 1500 dwellings. This will have to meet the needs of office conversions as well as those other, usually smaller, developments including brownfield ones which cannot for a variety of reasons provide their own SANG. The problem with PDR office conversions is that no necessary infrastructure is provided. Thus the transport capacity rightly highlighted by the questioner's lobby group and others will not benefit from mitigation by PDR conversions.

#### **Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:**

Not all brownfield sites need to be redeveloped under PDR conversion rules – section 106 and other funding could be available. What do you think will be the brownfield cap of the district?

### **Response**

The problem we have is limited to a maximum of five sites – that is where you have a problem with the provision of infrastructure.

#### **Question 2**

Can you please set out the findings of the recent “Brownfield Study”, carried out in conjunction with Eastleigh DC that was supposed to show the art of the possible with urban brownfield sites and tell us when it will be published?

## **Response**

It is a complex piece of work that is not yet complete. It will be published once finalised and at a time when we are satisfied that it addresses the terms of the brief.

## **Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:**

Are you planning to introduce any policy measures that would restrict the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the district?

## **Response**

No.

## **Question 3**

Can you tell us when the revised SHMA will be published and can you set out the revised housing target for Hart, taking account of any shortfall we might be expected to build for Rushmoor and Surrey Heath?

## **Response**

The revised SHMA is still being finalised in co-operation with our HMA partners, taking account of new information on economic growth forecasts and recent migration flows between the housing market area, surrounding areas and the south east. It is important that this piece of evidence provides a robust basis for purposes of defending Hart's, Rushmoor's and Surrey Heath's local plan housing requirements at examination. The authorities are making progress towards this end. The timetable for the study has necessarily been extended to ensure that it is as robust as possible; the risk being that otherwise the Council may not have been in a position to successfully defend its local plan at examination even given the figures are correct. Please note that the delay is not a concern for plan-making, as officers have confirmed that the most up-to-date demographic and household projections do not in themselves imply that a meaningful change has occurred in the HMA's housing situation since the 2014 SHMA (published and available on the Council's website). In addition to considering estimates of the OAHN, our HMA partners will also have to consider the likely available supply of housing over the period to 2032 within their areas. Should Rushmoor and Surrey Heath consider that they have a robust basis for determining whether or not they can meet their OAHN, we can expect further discussions at an officer level. Such discussions will inform both the forthcoming draft local plan and the subsequent pre-submission local plan in 2017. The proposed housing requirement in these documents will set out what we might need to build, taking account of any supply issues for Rushmoor or Surrey Heath.

## **Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:**

The draft local plan is due to be published in a couple of weeks – can you share with us the housing number assumptions that East Hants are using to prepare the plan?

## Response

No.

## Question 4

The NPPF makes clear that appropriate infrastructure should be delivered alongside housing, so can you explain how rail capacity will be increased given that a [senior executive of South West trains said in August](#) that mainline services to London are already 20% overcrowded, with a 60% capacity shortfall expected by 2043; there are no plans for more trains stopping at local stations; no plans to extend station platforms; no plans to introduce double decker trains nor to increase parking capacity and that network rail would not be responsible for the costs of widening any road tunnels under the railway?

## Response

The Local Plan will be supported by an up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will use available evidence to support the provision of necessary infrastructure.

There was no supplementary question asked.

## Question 5

The current LDS, declares that the plan will comprise of two development plan documents, the Strategy and Sites DPD to be adopted by the summer of 2017 and the Development Management policies to be adopted by August 2018, but we are behind schedule; can you give an update on the current proposed overall timetable for both sets of documents and revised LDS?

## Response

The Part 1 Local Plan will be submitted to Cabinet and Council in October seeking authority to undertake a Regulation 18 Consultation, to run for six weeks to mid-December. The agenda for those meetings will include an updated LDS showing the timeline required to get the Part 1 Plan to submission as soon as practically possible in the first half of next year. The LDS will in turn identify the Part 2 Plan timeline. However, adoption following submission is dependent on the Planning Inspectorate's Examination in Public, and whilst we can estimate the adoption date in practice we have to wait upon the Inspector's pleasure.

## Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:

After the recent decision about Moulsham Lane what does this revised timetable mean for Hart's ability to effectively constrain developers in the meantime?

## Response

Moulsham Lane appeal did not do damage to the 5 year land supply assertions – it will be assisted when we get a new plan in place as this will help address our affordable housing targets. I am not aware of any other planning appeals that will raise that issue between now and next spring.

## **Question 6**

How will the council go about undertaking an overall transport study for the district, taking account of all of the current and proposed developments in and around Fleet, Church Crookham, Yateley, Hartley Wintney and Hook?

### **Response**

Transport consultants Systra have been commissioned by Hart DC to undertake a Local Plan Transport Assessment using the North Hampshire Transport Model (NHTM). The NHTM was commissioned by Hampshire County Council in 2013.

The Local Plan Transport Assessment (TA) takes account of all completions and commitments (as of 31st March 2016) in the District. The TA is currently being finalised by the Consultants to support the Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation and it will test the impacts of all the likely development scenarios on the highways network by the end of the Local Plan Period. It will identify increases in vehicle flows, time delays and the operation of junctions in terms of their capacity as a result of each scenario tested.

### **Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:**

Will this transport study take account of new settlements after 2016 – ones that are mooted at Murrell Green, Pale Lane and Grove Farm?

### **Response**

It will take account of those settlements that are put forward for adoption in the local plan – we will not be doing it to cover developments that we are not proposing to include.

## **COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14**

### **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**

#### **Question from Councillor Shawn Dickens:**

##### **Question 1**

Some environmental activists have recently been promoting monthly refuse collection. Will the Cabinet Member for Environment reassure members that it is not intended for Hart?

##### **Response**

This change is not on the agenda. We are not moving to 4 (or 3) weekly black bin collections.

As part of the waste tender process currently underway we reviewed changes to the collection timescales for residual (black bin) waste. The review did not identify that this would be worthwhile, or acceptable to the majority of residents to do 4 weekly collections or 3.

Harts waste service is currently operating better than any period in the past 5 years, and the tender seeks to build on this, maintaining services broadly as current, whilst increasing recycling and also controlling costs. A working group is currently looking at ensuring the future contract (from 2018 for up to 20 years) specifies what we need now, but does still permit changes in line with technology and social needs in the longer term.

Currently if we moved to monthly collections an advantage might be a small rise in recycling rate which has been seen with councils which have moved to this regime. However, most if not all, the councils which have moved to these collections have introduced a weekly food waste collection. Some Councils have chosen not to separate the food waste out but as yet we have no information on how this has worked or not and for weekly black bin collections would likely cause problems with smell, vermin etc.

The cost of moving to four weekly collections would be lower than current costs for alternate weekly, as you would only be collecting from a quarter of the district every week. However, any savings (financial or environmental) would be cancelled out by the introduction of food waste collections as the costs would increase, along with carbon emissions as there would be more miles travelled, and we look at keeping a sensible balance of cost and quality of service when making decisions

Note that all residual (black bin) waste collected in Hart is currently sent to the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF). The environmental benefits of separating food waste from the residual waste are therefore questionable. Food waste is more effective being processed through the current Energy for Waste infrastructure which we have within Hampshire and if this waste was removed this could lead to these plants needing reconfiguration and minimal benefit.

Currently food waste collection is not a viable option across Hampshire as there are no facilities to process the waste except commercial sites which are costly.

Hart does encourage and provide low cost composting equipment for those residents who want to help the environment.

There was no supplementary question.

### **Questions received from Councillor Alan Oliver:**

#### **Question 1**

Will the Leader be instructing the East Hants Planning team to release to Members all the Hart SHLAA major site (>100 home) viability/sustainability/deliverability assessment information used to prepare the Spatial Strategy (to be released to Councillors on 11<sup>th</sup> October), including the criteria used by East Hants in their selection of sites in OUR plan?

#### **Response**

The instruction to our planning officers located in Petersfield is to recommend a sound draft plan. Part of that is to publish the evidence base including site viability, sustainability and deliverability. Another part is to use criteria derived from the NPPF and NPPG, which is required to produce a sound plan. The instruction requested is therefore already in place.”

There was no supplementary question.

#### **Question 2**

Will the Leader/Portfolio Holder of Planning please make available to all members the briefing/contractual information that specifies the work we have asked the East Hants planning team to undertake for us, in order to ensure Members that they have based their work on the wishes of Council that a long term infrastructure led spatial plan was to be prepared and not the short term/minimum housing number plan favoured by your predecessor?"

#### **Response**

I am not aware that the Council have resolved that ‘a long term infrastructure led spatial plan was to be prepared’. The instruction given to our planning officers located in Petersfield is to recommend a sound strategy based on our Objectively Assessed Housing Need as derived from the SHMA.

There was no supplementary question.

### Chief Executives' Report

- The JCE referred to the Who we are and what we do ..... booklet and encouraged members to pick up a copy. She also asked members to advise of any additions or amendments that should be made in the future.
- The JCE encouraged members to attend the Mental Health and Wellbeing Information Drop In taking place from 10.00 am till 2.30 pm on Friday 14 October in the Hart Centre, and encouraged members to get the message out on the importance of mental health.
- That the JCE had today spoken at the DCN Chief Executives Conference giving an update on devolution followed by the 5 Council's approach.
- That the 5 Councils would be organising the SOLACE South Conference for next year and that this would take place in the Hart area.
- That Patricia Hughes was signing up for Go Sober for October for Macmillan and would circulate around fundraising information.



Your reference

Contact Nick Irvine

Our reference

Telephone 01252 398739

Daryl Phillips  
Joint Chief Executive  
Hart District Council

Email [Nick.Irvine@rushmoor.gov.uk](mailto:Nick.Irvine@rushmoor.gov.uk)

Date 28 September 2016

Dear Daryl,

### Potential Housing Delivery in Rushmoor 2014-2032

Further to recent discussions, Rushmoor Borough Council can provide the following information in respect of anticipated housing delivery over the proposed Local Plan period.

By way of background, it is noted that in correspondence from 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014 (sent to Daniel Hawes), initial capacity work undertaken by Officers to establish the availability of land within Rushmoor to meet our own housing need suggested a likely shortfall of approximately 1,800 dwellings for the period up to 2032. This shortfall was established on the basis of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in 2014 and was subsequently reduced to 1,600 dwellings at the time of publication of the Rushmoor Local Plan Preferred Approach (June 2015).

You will be aware that the SHMA is currently being updated and we are now working towards a target based on the emerging findings of the 2016 version. A key difference between the 2014 and emerging 2016 version of the SHMA is a reduction in the annual requirement for Rushmoor Borough Council of 34 dwellings per annum.

The total requirement over the 18 year plan period is 7,848 dwellings. Completions to date (2014-16) account for 472 dwellings, leaving a residual requirement of **7,376** dwellings for the period 2016-2032.

Officers have revisited the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) over the last couple of weeks to update/clarify our current position in respect of housing delivery. The emerging SHELAA net capacity from sites that are considered to be deliverable is approx. **7,800 – 7,900** dwellings. This is broken down as shown overleaf:

Sites with planning permission (5+ units)	4,926
Sites with planning permission (1-4 units)	130
Emerging Site Allocations (excluding Wellesley)	1,530
Recent pre-apps (15/16) subject to positive feedback	688
Call for sites 2016	35
Windfall assumption (30dpa over 18 years)	540

The deliverability of the emerging SHELAA (2016) sites has been appraised by Planning Policy and Development Management Officers and there is a high level of confidence in their deliverability.

### Calculating a Contingency

In terms of building in flexibility to take account of any potential risks to housing delivery over the plan period, it should be noted that there is an historic precedent in Rushmoor for meeting housing targets. Between 2006 and 2010, 1,968 net new homes were built in the Borough, exceeding the 1,700 required by the South East Plan (excluding AUE) over the whole of the South East Plan period to 2026. Subsequently, in preparing the Core Strategy, the Council had to determine an appropriate housing target up to 2027 based on the most up to date evidence available at that time.

Within the Core Strategy, the target for delivery outside of the AUE is 2,100 dwellings between 2010 and 2027 at a rate of 124 dpa. In the first 6 years of delivery, a total of 1,343 net new dwellings have been completed resulting in a residual requirement of 757 dwellings between 2016 and 2027.

The Aldershot Urban Extension (accounting for 3,850 permitted dwellings) is with permission and under construction. Reserved matters applications have been approved for 3 phases so far – Maida (227 dwellings), Gun Hill (107 dwellings), and Cambridge Military Hospital (41 dwellings). The Council is in receipt of a Reserved Matters application for an additional phase – Corunna (270 dwellings). The latest phasing information provided by Grainger indicates completion of the site within the timeframe of the proposed Local Plan.

A review of planning permissions over the past 5 years demonstrates that the lapse rate in Rushmoor is very low – less than 3%.

As such, the in-combination effect of historic over delivery, a very low lapse rate and confidence in the delivery of sites identified within the emerging SHELAA suggests that only a small flexibility is required to be built into the housing delivery target. At present, the projected capacity represents an over-delivery of approximately 7% against the residual requirement and this is considered to be appropriate moving forward.

On the basis of the observations above and subject to the emerging findings being endorsed within the revised SHMA, Rushmoor Borough Council anticipates that it will be in a position to meet its own objectively assessed need over the Local Plan period.

Best Regards,



Nick Irvine  
Principal Planning Officer  
Planning Policy and Regeneration

## **COUNCIL**

**Date and Time:** Thursday 27 October 2016 at 7.00 pm

**Place:** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

**Present:**

### **COUNCILLORS –**

Southern - (Chairman)

Ambler	Crookes	Neighbour
Bailey	Dickens	Oliver
Billings	Forster	Parker
Blewett	Gray	Radley (James)
Burchfield	Gorys	Radley (Jenny)
Butler	Harward	Renshaw
Clarke	Kennett	Wheale
Cockarill	Kinnell	Woods
Collett (7.10 pm)	Leeson	Wright
Crampton	Makepeace-Browne	
Crisp	Morris	

Officers Present:

Patricia Hughes	Joint Chief Executive
Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Gill Chapman	Committee Services

## **42 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 29 September 2016 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **43 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Axam.

## **44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations were made.

## **45 PRESENTATION BY SEBASTIAN'S ACTION TRUST**

Jim Porter, Community Fundraiser, gave a presentation on the work of Sebastian's Action Trust, started by Sebastian's parents after losing him to cancer. The Bluebells, built and opened in 2011, is a place to allow families with seriously ill children to spend quality time together and do things together as a whole family. The Charity is self-supporting with no government money, funding coming mainly from fund raising

events, collection boxes, community events, raffles etc. At the present time 450 families are being supported, of which 10 are from the Hart area. Members suggested a grant application to Hampshire County Council, who may be able to help.

Members thanked Mr Porter for bringing the Trust's valuable work to their attention.

*Councillor Collett entered the meeting during this item.*

#### **46 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

Questions had been received from Mr Dermot Smith, Mr Phill Gower and Mr David Turver, details of which are set out in Appendix A attached to these Minutes.

#### **47 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**

Questions put by Councillors are detailed in Appendix B attached to these Minutes.

#### **48 CHAIRMANS ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman had attended the following events on behalf of the Council.

30 September	Hampshire CC Civic Day
1 October	Mayor Basingstoke Charity Variety Show, The Anvil, Basingstoke
2 October	Dean of Winchester Harvest Festival Service Winchester Cathedral
7 October	Yateley CAB AGM, Hartley Wintney
9 October	Winchester Mayor and High Sheriff of Hampshire Law Sunday Choral Matins Service at Winchester Cathedral
9 October	HDC Fundraising Dinner at Warbrook House
14 October	HCC Chairman's Concert, The Great Hall, Winchester
20 October	East Hampshire District Council Civic Day
22 October	Pelly Concert at Church on the Heath, Elvetham Heath

The Chairman added that there would be a Civic Service at St Johns Church, Hartley Wintney this Sunday at 3pm with refreshments afterwards. The Chairman's dinner at Warbrook House had gone very well and it was good to see Members attending. The next event would be a dinner to be held at Hartley Wintney Golf Club on 28 November 2016. Tickets were available.

#### **49 CABINET MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader of the Council, **Councillor Parker**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, **Councillor Burchfield**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, **Councillor Crampton**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, **Councillor Crookes**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, **Councillor Forster**, announced that new recycling bins would be installed in Hartley Wintney next week. Councillors had previously been informed innovative ideas were being sought to include in the waste tender, and Members were reminded to forward their ideas to enable improvement of the tender.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, **Councillor Gorys**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Regulatory Services, **Councillor Kennett**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Town and Village Regeneration, **Councillor Morris**, reported:

Indigo the outsourced parking management company recently carried out a shadowing survey of Harts enforcement officers along with parking management back room staff to facilitate a smooth transition when Indigo take over the already determined part of parking management.

Hart has requested help from East Hampshire District Council and Havant Borough Council to project manage the refurbishment of Church Road car park along with directional and internal signage and the introduction of updated car park ticket machines.

Two officers from Hart's parking management team attended a ticket machine software course in Tiverton Devon organised by Cale the ticket machine manufacturers. This course would give a valuable insight into interrogating and working with the new system.

Philip Sheppard, Hart's Infrastructure Manager was recently taken ill and I'm pleased to announce his welcomed return to work.

## **50 JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVES' REPORT**

The Joint Chief Executives had nothing substantive to report.

## **51 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Overview and Scrutiny</b>	<b>20 September 2016</b>
No questions asked.	
<b>Audit Committee</b>	<b>27 September 2016</b>
No questions asked.	

**Cabinet**

**6 October 2016**

No questions asked

**Planning Committee**

**12 October 2016**

No questions asked

## **52 MOTION TO COUNCIL**

The following motion to Council had been moved by Councillor Parker:

“That the Council resolves that through its Local Plan it will seek to meet Hart’s full, objectively assessed need for new homes, subject to the inclusion of an appropriate contingency to allow for any delays or the non-delivery of sites, and that it will also seek to accommodate any demonstrated unmet need for new homes from its Housing Market Area partners”.

The Monitoring Officer reminded Members that any debate should not include speculation on any specific sites, but keep to the direction of travel and the principles of the Local Plan for Officers to bring forward.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Burchfield. Councillor Parker introduced his motion to Council. He iterated that it was for members to determine the strategy to be set for the Planning Policy Officers.

An Amendment was moved by Councillor Burchfield and Seconded by Councillor Parker. Councillor Burchfield move that the follow phrase be added to the substantive motion:

“And additionally provide for essential infrastructure for including a site for a secondary school.”

After discussion a vote was taken and the Amendment was CARRIED.

Councillor Oliver proposed an Amendment in addition to substantive (amended) motion, which was seconded by Councillor Radley:

“In order for the Local Plan to remain sound if challenged by an increase in housing requirement during the plan period, to prepare for the additional housing pressure which will come in subsequent plan periods and to ensure effective and efficient infrastructure provision, this Council mandates that our plan should include a new settlement to be started in this Local Plan period.”

Members discussed the issues including the need for a new secondary school, infrastructure, pros and cons of new settlements, pressures from neighbouring authorities, local housing pressures, and the need for all options to come before Members for consideration.

A Recorded Vote was requested:

Members FOR the amendment:

Ambler, Blewett, Butler, Clarke, Cockarill, Harward, Kinnell, Makepeace-Browne, Neighbour, Oliver, Radley (Jenny), Radley (James), Woods

Members AGAINST the amendment:

Bailey, Billings, Burchfield, Collett, Crampton, Crisp, Crookes, Dickens, Forster, Gray, Gorys, Kennett, Leeson, Morris, Parker, Renshaw, Southern, Wheale, Wright

With 13 Members for the Amendment and 19 Members against the amendment, the amendment was NOT CARRIED.

A vote was taken on the substantive (amended) Motion as follows:

“That the Council resolves that through its Local Plan it will seek to meet Hart’s full, objectively assessed need for new homes, subject to the inclusion of an appropriate contingency to allow for any delays or the non-delivery of sites, and that it will also seek to accommodate any demonstrated unmet need for new homes from its Housing Market Area partners, and additionally provide for essential infrastructure for including a site for a secondary school”.

The vote was unanimous and the Motion was CARRIED.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm

## COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12

### QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

#### **Dermot Smith - On behalf of Hook Action Against Overdevelopment**

##### **Question 1**

*Whilst pleased with the reduction in the number of new homes required to be delivered, residents are disappointed with the further significant delay to the Local Plan and concerned that the Government may intervene and impose a plan as threatened. Would you please detail the timescales for the remaining activities to get an approved plan and relate them to the threat by the Government to impose a plan if one is not in place by early 2017?*

##### **Response**

Mr. Gavin Barwell MP, the planning minister has released a recent statement saying that his “presumption is in favour of the locally-led system”. We have made significant progress with the Local Plan and supporting evidence over the past 6 months and are therefore confident that we are able to demonstrate that no intervention is necessary.

**Mr Smith** asked a supplementary question

*The housing minister told us directly that it is up to Hart to put a Local Plan in place to regain control of planning. Hart does now appear to be playing with fire by delaying the draft for consultation until the start of 2017. What evidence does Hart have to counter the fear that imposition is now more likely than not, making the consultation process totally irrelevant, indeed failing residents by losing all local influence on the Local Plan?*

##### **Response**

The Minister cannot just impose a plan, starting again would delay everything a lot further. He would have to implement all the processes in a plan that Hart does. A draft plan at this advanced stage would be evaluated and it would be seen that there is no benefit in intervention.

##### **Question 2**

*Councillors voted overwhelmingly to include a New Settlement at Winchfield in the Preferred Strategy for Housing Growth. When consulted, Hart residents emphatically backed the New Settlement at Winchfield as the primary means of delivering new housing. Taken together with universal concern that development is taking place without suitable infrastructure delivery, if a New Settlement is omitted from the Spatial Strategy will Councillors accept that they will lose credibility, have brought the Local Plan process into disrepute and have considerable difficulty justifying it to a Planning Inspector at the EIP?*

##### **Response**

To clarify, we decided to test a proposed settlement at Winchfield. I am not sure I would agree with your judgement of the results of that consultation. However, it may be best to wait to listen to the debate that is to be held later in this Council meeting

**Mr Smith** asked a supplementary question

*Residents are aware that the situation is changing but with fewer numbers to deliver within the plan period, the New Settlement can be smaller between now and 2032 making it more deliverable with lower risk yet still providing the groundwork for suitable infrastructure to carry development through beyond 2032. Do Councillors believe that the demand for housing will stop at 2032 and if not, how will further housing be delivered then? Isn't it patently obvious that a New Settlement is the only sustainable and forward looking option?*

### **Response**

This discussion will be for the debate later in the meeting.

### **Phill Gower – Treasurer, Fleet & Church Crookham Society**

*The FCCS supports the utilisation of brownfield land to assist meeting the necessary future housing demand, including the conversion of derelict office buildings. The Society is very concerned that no S106 infrastructure contribution is due on office conversions enjoying permitted development. Over 200 in Ancells alone, many more in Hook – no infrastructure contribution; no amenity space; no mix of dwellings (other than 1 or 2 bed flats), and in some cases, no windows. Does the council share the concern about the infrastructure gap created by this type of permitted development, and how will Hart intend to bridge this gap?*

### **Response**

The reasons why the Government brought in the Class J\* permitted development rights are well rehearsed. The primary objective is to increase housing supply at a time of national shortage. The ancillary aim is to bring underused office space back into use because nobody wants to see empty office buildings lying vacant at a time when housing needs would otherwise be met by building on greenfields.

The problem is that this sort of conversion work is not cheap – viability is a big issue and as a result take up of consents granted is very low. We highlighted this as a major issue in our recent Refined Housing Options Paper.

From the Government's perspective it is fundamental to the operation of Class J development rights that it should provide for a streamlined process by which consent can be obtained for changes from office to residential use in the most effective way. The prior approval regime under Class J is *deliberately* tightly drawn, so as to require prior approval only for those matters which, in the view of the Government, are most likely to give rise to significant impacts bearing in mind that these sorts of building already have an impact on their surroundings and often have already made a contribution to infrastructure provision.

The only issues that we are allowed to look at are transport and highways impacts, contamination risks on the site, and flooding risks on the site. These do not have an impact upon infrastructure.

\* Class J of Schedule 2 to the GPDO ("Class J") permits change of use of a building "to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order from a use falling within Class B1 (a) (offices) of that Schedule". Paragraph J2 provides that the developer must seek a determination of whether prior approval of the local planning authority is required in relation to (a) transport and highways impacts, (b) contamination risks on the site and (c) flooding risks on the site.

**Mr Gower** asked a supplementary question

*Whilst we accept that there is a shortfall of 1 & 2 bed dwellings we are acutely aware that there is also a large shortfall of 3 bed family homes. Does the council accept that a concentration of exclusively 1 & 2 bed flatted accommodation provided by office conversions in areas such as Ancells and Hook runs against the grain of a desire to create sustainable communities with a varied mix of dwelling types and sizes?*

**Response**

There is a need for all types of homes, and whilst brownfield sites give us flats, we do look to get the 3 bed houses elsewhere. We do struggle to describe multiple conversion sites such as Ancells as a balanced community, and this is one of the problems of this sort of development.

**David Turver**

**Question 1**

*Is it true that the mooted new town at Winchfield has failed testing and when will you publish the results of the testing of all of the strategic sites under consideration for the Local Plan?*

**Response**

No this is not true. A new settlement at Winchfield is being tested as one of the options. The work is ongoing and I do not have the output from this work. The results of this work will be published alongside the draft local plan.

**Question 2**

*Hart issued a press release stating Hart will now have to plan to build 1,500 fewer houses. Can you confirm that this means the OAHN for Hart in the new SHMA is 1,500 fewer than the 7,534 in the 2014 SHMA; if you cannot will you explain how you have arrived at the 1,500 fewer houses claim?*

**Response**

Hart's own OAHN is not materially changed from the 2014 SHMA. However, Hart is obliged to seek to meet the unmet element of the Objectively Assessed Housing Need from the other members of the Housing Market Area, when those other authorities are unable to meet their own need within their own geographies. To date we had been assuming an unmet need from Rushmoor of 1500 homes based on their projections in turn based on the output of the Strategic Housing Market Analysis from 2014. Their recent letter sets out the Rushmoor calculations derived from the 2016 SHMA now in late draft which demonstrates that their OAHN is reduced, and that their delivery is increased. Their final paragraph reads "On the basis of the observations above and subject to the emerging findings being endorsed within the revised SHMA, Rushmoor Borough Council anticipates that it will be in a position to meet its own objectively assessed need over the Local Plan period". Consequently the Hart requirement in terms of provision is consequently reduced by that 1500.

**Question 3**

*What level of contingency would you consider appropriate to allow for delays or non-delivery of sites in the Local Plan?*

**Response**

There is no set amount in Government guidance; it is dependent on the size of sites that make up the supply and any information we know about them which may highlight risks in their delivery. Since we will be relying on a small number of major sites for a large share of

our delivery, and that prior approval office conversions are currently delivering poorly, we may have to set our contingency at the high end of the range in order to be considered sound at Examination. Such an approach has been accepted as good practice by Inspectors at recent Local Plans examinations. The experience and judgement of the Planning Policy Team is that 15% of non implemented figures is a robust figure for Hart.

Whilst on the topic of contingency, I have received an email with unwarranted comments regarding East Hampshire District Council's Local Plan, which needs to be addressed. Their Joint Core Strategy is a joint plan between East Hampshire District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. The housing number of 10,060 covers the whole of the district. This is made up of a minimum of 492dpa in East Hampshire outside of the SDNP and a minimum of 100dpa within the SDNP.

The East Hampshire Housing and Employment Allocations Local Plan is not a joint document with the SDNPA and therefore meets the housing target for the planning area covered by EHDC only. As such there is a need to plan for a minimum of 8,366 dwellings. The Housing and Employment Allocations Local Plan sets out a total supply of 9,146 dwellings. This provides appropriate flexibility based on local circumstances.

**Mr Turver** asked a supplementary question

*The draft SHMA is due in a couple of weeks, can you share with us the housing number assumptions that East Hants are using to prepare the plan?*

#### **Response**

The Planning Policy Officers preparing the SHMA will ensure that the trajectory is good and will seek to ensure that we do not overdeliver.

#### **Question 4**

*The claimed reduction of 1,500 houses should now mean that our entire remaining housing need can be met from Pyestock (Hartland Village) alone. Can you confirm that the Council will now turn down further green field development and follow its stated brownfield first strategy?*

#### **Response**

The premise of this question is false. Whilst welcome, the meeting of Rushmoor's need within its own boundary still leaves a substantial number of homes to build within Hart to meet our OAHN. Brownfield land is a priority but unless unanticipated brownfield sites are brought forward, it will not be enough in itself to fulfil our need. The Government rules are very clear about what sites can and can't be included within our housing figures and many brownfield sites that have been quoted by others fail that test.

#### **Question 5**

*The claimed 1,500 reduction in housing need should lead to the need for a significant revision to the 5-year housing land supply, and effectively increase the number of year's available supply. When will the council update its land supply position to help fend off the numerous proposed developments across the district?*

#### **Response**

The 1500 reduction is solely relating to Rushmoor. Hart's five year housing land supply position therefore remains unchanged. In any event the Hart five year land supply remains robust at over six years.

**Question 6**

*What are the risks that the Government will step in to do the Local Plan for us, now that the draft Local Plan won't be published for consultation until early 2017?*

Mr Turver accepted that this question had been asked and answered earlier.

**COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14**

**QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS**

**Councillor Tony Clarke asked:**

**Question 1**

*A last minute re-think on the Local Plan could mean further housing development in Fleet and Church Crookham, additional to the 1,500 at Hartland Park. Calthorpe Park School is at 1,450 pupils; further expansion is planned, but there are practical limits. We will need an additional 1,600 to 2,010 new secondary school places by the end of the Local Plan period in 2032. Hampshire County Council have stated that a new secondary school could only be an option with a new settlement. What discussions have Hart District Council had with HCC, or with any other providers, to ensure adequate future school place provision - particularly for secondary?*

**Response**

Hampshire County Council is the education authority. It has the responsibility to secure the provision of school places and it will determine how the educational needs of the District are to be met.

I can assure you however, that all the planning policy team are considering the matter of planning for education as part of the local plan process in some detail and they are working very closely with HCC.

The fundamental issue is the quantum of new development in the catchment of a possible new secondary school to not only fund it but ensure its successful start-up operationally. They have had complex discussions with HCC on these matters and scheduled to having further discussions to understand this more fully.

**Question 2**

*During the 5 years the council has been working on a Local Plan, the housing numbers have varied a considerable amount and may continue to do so. Are Hart DC working on a real plan that looks forward that sets the direction for future generations, allowing holistic planning of infrastructure? Or do you intend to defer the long term decision that we will face with a 'bare minimum' approach, which brings limited hope of significant infrastructure?*

**Response**

That is the topic of the debate that is to be held later in this Council meeting.