



**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING OF ODIHAM PARISH COUNCIL HELD  
IN THE LIBRARY ROOM, THE BRIDEWELL, THE BURY, ODIHAM, RG29 1NB  
ON WEDNESDAY 6<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2024 COMMENCING AT 9.30am**

Present: Cllrs A McFarlane (Chair), L Cornall, C Seabrook, and P Verdon.

In attendance: A Mann (Parish Clerk) and two members of the public.

**177/24 Apologies for absence**

Received and accepted from Cllrs Bell, Greensides, Sanger, Tate, Tyler and Woods.

**178/24 Declarations of interests and requests for dispensation relating to any item on the agenda**

None.

**179/24 Chair's announcements**

None.

**180/24 Public session**

None.

**181/24 Odiham & North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan Review**

The Chair thanked everyone on the Steering Group for their hard work and handed over to Cllr Verdon to run through the proposed response to the Examiner.

i) A clarification note from the Examiner was noted, as presented with the agenda.

**RESOLVED**

ii) OPC's response was approved (Appendix 1) which would be forwarded to the Examiner through Hart DC later that day.

(Proposed by Cllr Verdon, seconded by Cllr Cornall, all in favour).

iii) A revised schedule of responses to the Reg 16 consultation was also agreed and would be included in the response to the Examiner (Appendix 2).

(Proposed by Cllr McFarlane, seconded by Cllr Verdon, all in favour).

**182/24 Payments Listing**

**RESOLVED**

The Payments Listing shown in Appendix 3 was approved and Cllrs McFarlane and Verdon were appointed to complete the payments process.

(Proposed by Cllr Cornall, seconded by Cllr Seabrook, all in favour).

**183/24 Date of next meeting**

Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> November, 7.30pm.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.37am.

Signed..... Date.....

## ODIHAM AND NORTH WARNBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

### Response to Examiner's Clarification Note

This note sets out the Response of Odiham Parish Council to the Examiner's request for clarification on some matters (in the same order as in the Examiner's note).

In some cases, this response cross-refers to the Schedule of Responses to the Reg 16 Consultation.

### The Examiner has asked two questions about Policy 2v

**Has the Parish Council discussed the revisions to the policy with the landowner/potential developer, and is it satisfied that the development as now proposed in the revised policy will be both deliverable and financially viable?**

#### Discussions

The Parish Council has discussed this site in the past with the landowner/developer (see the agreement originally reached with them about the site in Appendix 6 of our current Consultation Statement). Prior to the plan update, the Parish Council was approached by, and on several occasions held meetings with, a representative of the developer, who was at pains to explain that the Plan as made did not include a mechanism to provide the public open space. Although no discussions with the landowner/developer have taken place during the process of updating the plan, the position the landowner/developer was taking was already clear from these discussions and from the subsequent applications and appeal (21/01490/PREAPP, 22/00146/OUT and APP/N1730/W/22/3308614, and 23/02063/OUT and APP/N1730/W/24/3352142), which has subsequently been confirmed in their engagement with Reg 14 and Reg 16.

#### Deliverability and financial viability

By reference to the Government's definition, the clarified site policy is deliverable. The Council also considers it to be financially viable as per the original plan. If viability were to prove an issue at planning application stage, mechanisms exist to negotiate with the planning authority on affordable housing.

#### **Clarifying existing requirements**

Firstly, we would like to make clear through this response that the revisions to the policy are **clarifications to the existing plan** rather than introducing any new requirements on the developer/landowner.

The reason this site is being discussed at all is because this site (and only this site) was allocated specifically to bring forward the public open space at Policy 14. In doing so the community traded off some of the local gap, land outside the settlement boundary, in order to secure the public open space as a community benefit and give greater protection to the remainder of the local gap. We can point you to evidence of this if needed but it is clear from the site assessment work in the published [Locally Derived Evidence](#) for the made plan which states:

*"Land at Dunleys Hill (SHLAA 65) is an existing important open gap which helps to separate the two settlements of Odiham and North Warnborough. It is currently protected as a Local Gap by the Hart District Local Plan saved policy CON 21. The community felt that this continued protection to prevent coalescence of the two settlements to be important.*

*The community also expressed a desire to have a public open space similar to a village green. The land at Dunleys Hill is in a key focal location between the two villages of Odiham and North Warnborough and is currently not available for public use. As such it was considered to be a good location and opportunity to deliver a public open space for the whole community. To achieve this aim and to ensure the gap function of this site is maintained it was considered that a small part of the site only (up to 1ha) could be proposed for residential development provided the remainder of the site comprised a public open space.”*

Extensive discussions with the developer took place when the original plan was prepared (see Consultation Statement - Appendix 6 for full exchange). This culminated with the developer **explicitly supporting** the housing allocation at site 2v **including the requirement to provide the public open space** (see attached Summary of Submission responses prepared and published by Hart District Council in November 2016, ref 192 on page 19, now attached). With the support of the landowner and developer it was clearly regarded as deliverable and viable.

Through the update to the plan we are simply clarifying the plan which already states in the supporting text to Policy 14 at paragraph 3.78 of the made plan:

*“... In order to deliver and secure public ownership of the land for this purpose, the Neighbourhood Plan designates a 1ha area of land to the southern side of the site for housing, leaving the remaining 3.48 ha of the site as an open space to be transferred to community ownership under Policy 2 (v) of this Neighbourhood Plan.”*

This text was contained within paragraphs 3.48 and 3.49 of the original ‘submission’ plan supporting the proposed Local Green Space designation. When the Examiner recommended that the land changed from a Local Green Space designation to a site allocation for open space, he specifically recommended retaining these paragraphs, but to move them from the supporting text of the LGS policy to the supporting text of the new Policy 14. In doing so the Examiner required three very minor adjustments to the text, none of which affect the passage quoted above concerning delivery of the open space.

We take from this that the text quoted above was deliberately retained so that the plan said something on how the open space allocation would be implemented.

Since then, it has become apparent that the plan would be clearer if the means of implementing Policy 14 is explicitly stated in policy, rather than in supporting text. This is what we are seeking to remedy, not to introduce any new requirements on the developer.

#### **Effect on the plan as a whole**

Delivery of the open space with site 2v is crucial not just because that was the rationale for allocating site 2v in the first place, but also because the open space became central to the SPA mitigation required for the plan as a whole to comply with the Habitat Regulations.

For housing sites 2v, 2i and 2ii to be developed at densities that make efficient use of land (and as such comply with [NPPF](#) paragraph 128) Natural England has made it clear that SPA mitigation will be required, because together they total more than 50 homes. The Habitat Regulations Assessments supporting the original plan understood that the open space at Policy 14 would come forward with site 2v and as such serve as a key part of the SPA mitigation package. This is reflected at paragraph 3.23 of the made plan, which states:

*“3.23... The additional mitigation requirement for open green space is to be provided in any event in the form of public open space on land adjoining Site v (Dunleys Hill).”*

The need for mitigation only applies if together the three sites deliver more than 50 homes. However, if the sites are to comply with NPPF paragraph 128 and make efficient use of land, then together they will deliver more than 50 homes. If site 2v is delivered with 30 homes (as per the current application at appeal), combined with the 16 already built at site (ii), that would mean site (i) could only deliver 4 units instead of the indicative 9 units. This may serve as a disincentive to bring that site forward at all, and it would certainly make inefficient use of land contrary to the NPPF.

So, for the plan to meet national policy requirements regarding efficient use of land (which is relevant to the basic conditions), SPA mitigation is undoubtedly required and delivery of the open space with site 2v becomes central to deliverability of the three sites taken together.

Notwithstanding the Examiner’s recommended changes to the original submission plan, the link between Policy 2v and Policy 14 must have been deemed to remain in place otherwise the original plan that went to referendum and ultimately formally made by the Council would be inconsistent with the HRA supporting it.

To say now that the open space requirement with site 2v is a change in policy therefore misrepresents the reality, which is that the open space and housing was always understood by all parties to be a single package integral to the success of the plan as a whole, with sites 2i, 2ii and 2v to be delivered at densities that make efficient use of land in line with national policy.

When one understands the background to the plan, the site assessment work, the Habitat Regulations Assessments, and reads text in the plan at para 3.78 and 3.23 of the made plan, it is clear that the link between Policy 2v and Policy 14 **already exists**. The requirement to bring forward the open space with site 2v is not a new requirement on the developer.

#### Conclusions on deliverability and viability

The original proposals were clearly deliverable and viable as they had the support of the developer, and as explained above we do not seek to change the requirements on the developer.

Past work by Hart District Council has always shown strong viability for greenfield sites in Hart even with 40% affordable housing provision and SPA mitigation, particularly in the rural areas including Odiham. This may be something the District Council could verify.

Whilst the amount of public open space/SANG being sought with site 2v may be proportionately more than would usually be the case (given the unique circumstances of this site), it is also true that SAMM payments will be lower than usual (given the distance from the SPA beyond 5km), and Policy 4 on Housing Mix is proposed to be less prescriptive than it is in the current made plan (Policy 4 of the made Neighbourhood Plan requires 50% of the market houses to be 1-2 bedrooms – the new policy provides the potential to improve viability through the market housing mix).

It is also important to note that when making a planning application, it is open to the developer to make a viability case to the planning authority so that priorities for the Section 106 planning obligations including affordable housing provision can be negotiated. Specifically, Hart Local Plan Policy H2 Affordable Housing states:

*“Only when fully justified, will the Council grant planning permission for schemes that fail to provide 40% affordable housing, or fail criteria a) to g) above. Any such proposals must be supported by evidence in the form of an open book viability assessment, demonstrating*

*why the target cannot be met. In such cases the Council will commission an independent expert review of the viability assessment, for which the applicant will bear the cost. The Council will then negotiate with the applicant to secure the optimum quantity and mix of affordable housing that is viable and meets the identified housing need.”*

Hart District Council’s Viability Appraisals for New Development Supplementary Planning Document Adopted November 2023 states:

*“4.15 If it were found that a site was not viable with the full provision of affordable homes and other Section 106 requirements, it would be for the Council, through the determination of the planning application, to decide how to prioritise the requirements and secure the optimum mix and quantity of affordable homes that is viable.”*

We therefore consider site 2v in combination with Policy 14 to be deliverable and viable.

In summary the policy clarifications are valid for the following reasons:

- Site 2v was allocated in the first place on the premise that the open space at Policy 2v would come with the development. This was with the positive support of the landowner/developer as well as the community. Appendix 6 of the Consultation Statement to the updated Plan includes the email from the developer on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2015 listing proposed improvements to be provided to the open space, and these were explicitly referenced in the final exchange of emails from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on July 24<sup>th</sup> 2015 and subsequent confirmation from the developer on July 31<sup>st</sup>. The developer/landowner then supported these proposals in the 2016 Reg 16 consultation, as shown in the attached Summary of Submission responses, reference 192). Please note that the full representations were never published by Hart, so OPC only has access to a copy of this summary report, downloaded at the time. It is possible that Hart may, if needed, be able to find a copy of the full representation.
- As the rationale for the site 2v allocation has not changed, we are simply clarifying the requirement that the open space must be provided. This is a clarification rather than a policy change (otherwise the current plan would be inconsistent with the HRA supporting it or it would fall foul of national policy to make efficient use of land). Consequently, deliverability and viability should not be an issue for the update to the plan, but if viability is shown to be an issue, the developer can make the case with a planning application.
- If site 2v were to deliver just the homes without the public open space, it would undermine public faith in the planning system. The community created and voted for a neighbourhood plan that delivered the open space with the housing at 2v as documented in paras 3.23 and 3.78 of the made plan.

**The final part of the policy (2v) comments that the proposed Dunleys Hills Open Space also serves as part of the SPA mitigation to deliver site i (Longwood) and site ii (land at Western Lane). In this context, what progress has been made on the delivery of the overall SPA mitigation package?**

The land at 4 Western Lane (Application 19/02541/FUL), has been developed and provides 15 houses. The permission includes a Deed of Agreement between Hart District Council and the

landowners which provides for payment of SAMM contributions when the cumulative number of dwellings on sites i, ii and v exceed 50.

Longwood (site i) has not yet been developed, though a recent pre-application request for advice has been submitted. Any permission will be subject to the same legal agreement.

These two sites are dependent the provision of the POS to achieve their nationally required density if 30 houses are to be approved on site 2v.

## **Policy 11: Local Green Spaces**

The Examiner has asked OPC to explain (a) the purpose of the second part of the policy, (b) the extent to which this part has had regard to national policy, and (c) the extent to which this part is realistic/deliverable through the development management process.

The second part of the policy states that

*“Local Green Spaces should be interconnected through a network of pedestrian routes where possible. This network should prioritise the use of existing pedestrian routes, Core Walking Zones and proposed Cycle routes outlined in the LCWI”.*

### Purpose

The purpose of this part of the policy is to maximise the extent to which the LGSs can operate as key elements of an interconnected network (so that the whole is more than the sum of its parts).

To reap the maximum benefits, footpaths to and from them should be kept open, consistent with:

- The vision for the parish up to 2032, which includes ‘improved footpaths and cycleways that connect settlements, amenities, green space and historic attractions in an environmentally sustainable way’ (page 18); and
- Item iv under Goals and Objectives, which is ‘to maintain and ideally improve recreational and sporting facilities and other community amenities including footpaths and cycleways’.

The approach of treating the LGSs as contributing to a connected network is also consistent with the new (2024) Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) produced by HDC and Hampshire CC (referenced at para 1.11 and elsewhere). Three of the proposed LGSs (11.i Beacon Field, 11.ii Chamberlain Gardens and 11.vi Community Peace Garden) and the proposed open space at Dunleys Hill (Policy 14) are within the LCWIP Core Walking Zone.

### National policy

The NPPF (December 2023) deals with LGSs in chapter 8 (Promoting healthy and safe communities). Three paragraphs are relevant to the second part of the Policy 11.

Para 102 states that ‘Access to a **network** of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support climate change’ [emphasis added]. It specifically refers to such spaces forming a **network** and this is reflected in the wording of the second part of Policy 11.

Para 104 underlines the importance of public rights of way and refers specifically to networks.

Para 106 sets out criteria to be satisfied for LGS designation, one of which (b) is that the space should be demonstrably special to a local community. The Plan notes (para 3.68) that many consultation responses referred to the importance of protecting public footpaths and para 3.120 records that ‘Odiham Parish has a good **network** of footpaths and bridleways, with opportunities for circular routes within easy reach of main settlements which are of **particular value** and amenity to local residents. Development that would have an adverse impact on views from such routes, or which would suburbanise their surroundings, will therefore normally be resisted’ [emphasis added].

#### Whether realistic/deliverable

The policy that Local Green Spaces should be interconnected through a network of pedestrian routes where possible is realistic and deliverable. The rights of way that connect them already exist and OPC has a working group that manages volunteers to keep footpaths clear to support the work of the Hampshire Countryside Service.

The development management process is the responsibility of Hart DC, who take account of the importance of public rights of way when dealing with planning applications (liaising with Hampshire as appropriate).

#### Specific proposals

##### *North Warnborough Football Club*

The particular local significance of this proposed LGS is its recreational value (as a playing field). North Warnborough FC has teams playing in the Basingstoke & District Saturday Football League; it also has a youth team. The site comprises a mown grass pitch and a brick-built club-house building. Other than pitches at Robert Mays School, Mayhill School and at the RAF base, it is the only football pitch available and accessible to the residents of North Warnborough and Odiham.

The site is publicly accessible and is also used by dog-walkers.

##### *Hatchwood Farm*

A permission in principle is not a planning permission. Section 70(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 refers to applications for planning permission and the separate Section 70(1A) refers to applications for permission in principle. They are therefore two different things - and a PiP is not a planning permission. Consistent with this, Section 70(2ZZB) states that ‘An application for technical details consent (TDC) is an application for planning permission’. An application for TDC has been submitted (24/01631/TDC) but refused so there is no planning permission for the development of the site. Another application was registered on 23 October.

**Please also see comments on the representation from Shorewood Homes in our complete Schedule of Responses to the Reg 16 Consultation.**

Little Park (Deer Park)

**Please also see comments on the representation from Michael Conoley Associates in our complete Schedule of Responses to the Reg 16 Consultation.**

OPC considers that criterion c) of NPPF para 106 is met and is grateful for the opportunity to expand further on why we consider that the Little Park is indeed 'local in character and not an extensive tract of land'.

Meeting criterion c) of NPPF paragraph 106

*'106. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:  
(c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'*

In meeting NPPF Sustainable Development objectives, this criterion should be evaluated having regard to both qualitative and quantitative considerations.

Local in character

HE notes in its representation to the Examination that such [Local Green] spaces are often integral to the character of place for any given area, and this is very much a theme in the Odiham & North Warnborough Conservation Area Appraisal.

The Little Park has shaped most of the eastern edge of North Warnborough, with pre and post war development up to its edge but not encroaching into it, and has likewise shaped the entire northern edge of Odiham. Michael Conoley Associates (MCA), for the landowner, correctly recognises that the Little Park connects Odiham to North Warnborough. The Little Park is at the very heart of the parish, and performs an unusual combined role of serving in planning terms as a local gap, while at the same time bordering and uniting the two settlements. Its social role allows residents to take a variety of rural off-road routes between them, with 9 different access points from the two settlements to the footpaths which criss-cross the Little Park.

As such it is very much local to both main settlements of the parish.

Not an extensive tract of land

**Research into history**

Some of the changed circumstances since the site was deleted from the Plan in the 2016 Examination include further historical research. This is presented as "Map History of the Little Park", on the Neighbourhood Plan page of the Parish Council web site, referenced in the Local Evidence Base and linked from it at the top of pdf page 27, and attached. This document shows both maps of the land in question and the results of searched records.



It was this research which prompted the name change of this proposed LGS site from Deer Park to Little Park, as the research and maps combined show that from at least 1683 this land was known variously as the *town lawne*, *the Little Park*, and *the Heither Park* to distinguish it from the *Further Park*. The map record and index from the Godson map of 1739 to the present clearly shows this land as an integral whole, with well-defined boundaries for at least the last 300 years – a pocket which has to this day shaped the development of both Odiham and North Warnborough, and which OPC does not consider to be “blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to [the] settlements”\*. The latter claim would be at odds with historical and present reality.

\*(PPG Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space, para 15, Reference ID: 37-015-20140306).

#### **Size vs “facilities”**


MCA’s comments compare the features and “facilities” of other large sites which have been accepted as LGS, but these are unrelated to whether the site satisfies criterion c). They claim that ‘It is clear that for a larger site to be accepted as an LGS, it needs to have more use/facilities than rough footpaths through the site which make them suitable to be designated as such’ (although the PPG, para 17, Reference ID: 37-017-20140306, points out that LGS may be designated with no public access at all).

However, MCA conflates two different matters – criterion b), which addresses recreational value, and criterion c), which addresses local character and size. They helpfully quote from the Cranleigh Examination report, which says:

**“7.49: However, each LGS needs to be assessed on its individual merits and direct comparisons between LGS’s cannot be readily made”**

Thus while direct comparisons with other sites in other Plans with different characteristics may not be helpful, comparisons of size alone show that the Little Park would by no means be the largest, with the Long Aston Ashton Park Estate example of 329 ha; Laverstock and Ford Castle Hill Country Park 55 ha; and others not far removed in size from the Little Park such as The Heath at Petersfield 36 ha and Great Ridings Wood in Effingham at 23.55 ha.

Google satellite picture of the entire extent of the full Deer Park



The Council therefore concludes that the Little Park meets criterion c) on both counts:

It is within easy walking distance of, and local to, the most populated part of North Warnborough and the east-west breadth of Odiham.

Far from vanishing over some distant horizon, this relatively narrow strip of land rises gently and ends cleanly with a hedge, clearly visible from footpaths and on this aerial map. It is bounded on three sides by the two settlements.

Among its multiple paths, an inter-connecting footpath runs directly between the two settlements along its northern edge.

Thus it connects the two settlements socially through its many footpaths, while providing a green lung separation zone in planning terms as local gap.

The Little Park has been a single entity for over 300 years; it has very clearly defined boundaries and is not regarded as an extensive tract of land, but rather as an historic and cohesive place integral to this rural parish.

#### Further changes since the 2016 Examination

Apart from the additional research into historic records already mentioned, there have been two main types of changes: planning applications and works to improve the footpaths.

#### **Planning applications**

Since 2016, seven applications for planning permission have been made to HDC relating to the Little Park (part of the Deer Park):

16/02213/FUL - Change of use of agricultural land to managed public and private open space, creation of new vehicular and footway/cycleway access to Dunleys Hill; access from car park off Deer Park View to a new extended car park and erection of a community building, erection of eight dwellings and residential curtilages, formation of two new paths and diversion of two others, cycleways, Park fencing and a deer shelter, repairs to existing Deer Park wall at Palace Gate, restoration of historic fishponds together with new landscaping, tree planting, overhead wires placed underground and a managed deer herd on the land at the Deer Park, Odiham - WITHDRAWN 11.10.2016

16/02214/LBC – as above - WITHDRAWN 11.10.2016

16/03247/FUL - Change of use of agricultural land to public and private open space, formation of new vehicular access to The Birches and revised vehicular access off Dunleys Hill with associated new footpath and cycleways, fencing, tree planting and landscaping to

the public and private open spaces. Construction of car park extension off Deer Park View car park with associated access from the existing car park, single storey community building, paths, earthworks and landscaping. Construction of 8 dwellings and formation of residential curtilages with access driveways, fencing and landscaping. Repairs to the listed Deer Park wall adjoining Palace Gate. All on land off Dunleys Hill and Deer Park View, Odiham - WITHDRAWN 03.07.2017

16/03248/LBC - Repairs to existing Deer Park wall at Palace Gate - WITHDRAWN 03.07.2017

17/03029/FUL – Change of use of agricultural land (part of ‘The Deer Park’) to public and private open spaces with associated new footpath/cycleway; revised vehicular access off Dunleys Hill with adjoining new footpath/cycleway; fencing, tree planting and landscaping to the public and private open spaces. Construction of 7 dwellings with residential curtilages and access driveways, fencing and landscaping; all on land on north of Dunleys Hill, Odiham – REFUSED

21/01490/PREAPP - Change of use of agricultural land (part of 'The Deer Park') to public and private open spaces with associated new footpath/cycleway; revised vehicular access off Dunleys Hill with adjoining new footpath/cycleway; fencing, tree planting and landscaping to the public and private open spaces. Construction 13 residential dwellings focused around a courtyard area and including 4 affordable units. Access driveways, fencing and landscaping; all land on north of Dunleys Hill and Odiham – OPINION ISSUED

22/01034/PRIOR Erection of an agricultural barn Land On The North Side Of Dunleys Hill – APPEAL ALLOWED 05.10.23

### **Footpath improvements - formation and impact of Conservation Volunteer Group**

From Spring 2020 to the ending of restrictions in Spring 2022, the Covid years brought into sharp focus the value of local green space in all our communities for mental and physical health and wellbeing. There had also been a huge public outcry and vote of no confidence in former Parish Councillors over plans to build in the Deer Park, which highlighted the importance of the land to the community.

Recognising this, in 2022 one of the new OPC councillors for North Warnborough began scoping a parish Conservation Volunteer Group, liaising closely with Hampshire Countryside Services (HCS) and local ramblers' groups. By March 2023 a volunteer task force had been mobilised with a main focus of keeping rights of way clear. Since then, regular Conservation Days have taken place involving over 30 volunteers. Heavily supported financially and with expertise and labour from HCS, their work has included two days building new wooden bridges over ditches and culverts in the centre of the Little Park (footpath 17/18), so making "the rough footpaths" (MCA) more accessible especially for people with mobility issues. The volunteers have also cleared several footpaths which interconnect Odiham and North Warnborough and the canal, improving access and accessibility for all and generating significant public support for the (new) parish council and its volunteer group.

For all these reasons OPC considers that the Little Park is indeed deserving of designation as a Local Green Space.

### **Policy 14**

#### **Is the Parish Council satisfied that the use of land at Dunleys Hill as proposed in the policy (and in paragraph 3.132) continues to be capable of delivery in the Plan period?**

There is clearly an appetite to develop site v, as seen by the recent applications and appeals: 21/01490/PREAPP, 22/00146/OUT and APP/N1730/W/22/3308614, and 23/02063/OUT and APP/N1730/W/24/3352142.

The Parish Council is satisfied that if the plan is clarified accordingly, the open space will be delivered with the housing at site 2v as per the original understanding with the developer.

The developer has since sought to take advantage of the change to the plan whereby the requirement to provide the open space was 'relegated' to supporting text. Understandably the landowner and developer would prefer the plan not to be clarified in the way we seek. But that should not prevent the clarification from being made.

We appreciate that two developments have taken place without contributing to the maintenance of the public open space (site 2ii and 2iii). However, as we say above, if viability is shown to be an issue as a result of this, there is scope to negotiate other section 106 requirements at the planning application stage if required, including affordable housing.

Ultimately it comes back to the reason why the housing site was allocated in the first place. The housing should not be allowed to take place without the open space. Odiham Parish Council has taken the opportunity presented by this update to seek this clarification so that the plan reflects the wishes of the community, which after all must be the whole point of neighbourhood plans.

## **Representations**

Please refer to the separate document, Schedule of Responses to Reg 16v Consultation in which the Parish Council has commented on all the representations submitted including those by the following parties as identified in the relevant schedule:

- Michael Conoley Associates (Representation 6);
- Shorewood Homes (Representation 11);
- LRM Planning (Representation 20); and
- Avant Homes (22).

## **Attachments:**

2016 Hart Summary of Submission responses

Map History of Little Park, (with 2 additional historic records appended in response to Examiner's request for clarification).

6th November, 2024


Odiham Parish Council,  
The Bridewell,  
The Bury,  
Odiham,  
RG29 1NB



# FURTHER DETAILED INFORMATION ABOUT THE LITTLE PARK, INCLUDING HISTORIC MAPS

## ODIHAM DEER PARK

1739: WILLIAM GODSON MAP FOR PAULET ST. JOHN



Copy of Will Godson's Map of the Manor of Odiham in 1739, from All Saints Church, Odiham, showing clearly the entire Deer Park.

## Historically defined space: Odiham's Towne Lawne

The land south of today's Footpath 21 represents the Little Park, formerly the Hither Park of Will Godson's Survey Map of Odiham Park for Paulet St. Johns Esq of 1739. The Tithe Map field boundaries correspond to Godson's fields, of which 2 were sub-divided between 1739 and 1843. The route of today's Footpath 21 represented the division of the Hither Park, as Place Gate Farm, from the Further Park, as Lodge Farm, in 1777.

Godson's measured area was 96 acres 1 rod & 24 perches – at a time when the theodolite had only just been invented.

The Tithe Map is 102 acres, 2 rods and 37 perches. At 103.73 acres this converts to 41.978 hectares.

According to estate deeds of 1683 from the Surrey History Centre, 'that part of Odiham Parke called the Towne Lawne' was estimated to cover 'some 100 acres'.

Hence, today's area proposed as Local Green Space is unchanged from the original area identified as the Towne Lawne over 300 years ago.

## TRANSITION OF THE LITTLE PARK OR TOWNE LAWNE SINCE 17C DISPARKMENT; PLACE GATE FARM TO LOCAL GREEN SPACE.

1. 1739: Extract of William Godson's Map showing the Little Park



Please see appended to the end of this document, and added in response to the Examiner's request for clarification, the accompanying index to the Godson map, showing the "Heither Odiham Park" with its total acreage.



2. 1815: Confirmation map showing the division of Place Gate Farm (The Little Park) from Lodge Farm.




PLAN OF DOGMERSFIELD ESTATE – PLACE GATE FARM 1815 (HRO 6M50/24)

3. 1843 Tithe Map from Odiham High St. to the canal






4. 1920: Sale of Palace Gate Farm




FROM LAND REGISTRY RECORD OF PALACE GATE FARM: MILDMAY TO THOMAS 1920

5. 1988: S.52 Agreement on development of Palace Gate area by Saunders.





6. 2018: Historic Odiham map for Odiham Parish Council, showing all the southern part of the Deer Park that is within the Conservation Area – i.e. larger than the Little Park.



7. Google maps satellite view of the whole Deer Park 24.4.24



## Footpaths

Listed in order anti-clockwise from Odiham High Street, these numerous access points to Deer Park footpaths directly connect the principal settlement areas of Odiham and North Warnborough.

- A. Odiham High St. & Palace Gate area: via the gateway of a Tudor wall FP 17 via an avenue of lime trees mapped by Godson in 1739
- B. Odiham High St from north of George Hotel (now Bel & Dragon) FP 17,18,19
- C. London Rd and Angel Meadows area via FP 20 to FP's 17 & 20
- D. London Rd. & Addison Gardens to FP 17
- E. London Rd. & path to Valentine Farm via FP 21 to FP's 17 & 21 (inc. vehicular traffic)
- F. Lodge Farm area, bridge & canal towpath via FP 18
- G. Bridge Rd. (NW) FP 21 to FP 17 and cont. of FP 21
- H. Whitewater Rd. & estate roads: via FP 17 & 70 to cont. of FP 17
- J. Dunley's Hill: via FP 70 to FP 17.

As an example of the size of the space, it took walkers 6 ½ minutes to cross the Little Park in poor conditions along footpath 18 from the access north of Bel and the Dragon to footpath 21, approximately 500m.

## History:

Since Odiham and North Warnborough's Neighbourhood Plan was made in 2017, the historic significance of the Deer Park has been further enhanced with research into historical records and an archaeological dig:

Surrey History Centre 1499/14 includes the following extract from the handwritten record for the 25<sup>th</sup> Sept. 1683 of Zouch estate deeds:

*'That part of Odiham Park called the **Town Lawne** by est. 100 acres and the barn and plot thereunto belonging in Odiham aforesaid'.*

The Zouch in question was James Zouch Esq. known as 'of Odam Manor' and also as 'of Woking' where he also resided. He died in 1708 after losing much of his estate into Chancery in 1702, from which Odiham Manor was purchased in 1742 by St. John Paulet, who had commissioned Will Godson's map in 1739. Division into the extant field pattern is consistent with disparkment in the period 1708 - 1739.

Hampshire Archive Centre's Mildmay files 15M50/996 include a counterpart lease of 2nd May 1698 showing that James Zouch leased land at Odiham to Gabriel Yonge of Warfield Berks: *'Counterpart of demise for 99 years of land called **Little Park or town Lawne**, 100 acres and a barn called Lower Barn in Odiham, with a half acre plot of ground, formerly in the occupation of William Chudleigh and Christopher Sone and 74 acres of arable in the common fields of Odiham, 37 acres in Bury field, 14 1/2 acres in Long Dean, 12 1/2 in Snatch Hanger and 10 1/2 in Hordell, also Dunings lease, 28 acres'.*

**King Henry VIII** Henry VIII had ordered the now lost Odiham Place to be built in 1531 as a 'proper house' (John Norden's Gazetteer for Odiham, 1595) when hunting in the park with Anne Boleyn. The adjacent timber-framed Cross Barn dated to 1532 is now the village hall, with the boundary wall of Odiham Place to the park, although in disrepair, authoritatively confirmed as Tudor.

**Queen Elizabeth I** Further evidence of the significance of the park is that on the last of her six visits when staying at her Odiham house, Queen Elizabeth I attended an event in her honour at



Elvetham in 1591, when the Earl of Hertford: "with his traine well mounted, to the number of two hundred and upwardes, and most of them wearing chaines of golde about their neckes, he rode toward Odiham, and leaving his traine and companie orderlie placed, to attend her Majestie's comming out of Odiham Parke, three miles distant from Elvetham: himselfe wayting on her Majestie from Odiham House." (John Nichols, 1745-1826).

The earliest records of **Place Gate and Lodge Farms** held by the Hampshire Archives Centre are as follows:

[69010 - Mildmay of Dogmersfield and Shawford - 1531-1931](#)

142: Lease, articles of agreement, with regards to farmhouse called Place Gate Farm with lands (field names), Odiham. 1790.

143: Counterpart lease of messuage and lands called Odiham Lodge Farm, Odiham. 1797.

**ADDED** in response to the Examiner's request for clarification, October 2024

		447-2-05	457-1-07	
<i>... of the farms including house, Barnes Garden and yards</i>				
<b>Heither Odiam Park</b>				
B:1	Burnt Close			
B:2	Great field	09-0-35	09-2-19	Arable
B:3	Bowling Green Close	23-3-22	24-2-04	Arable
B:4	The Upper part of Fish pond Close	16-7-22	16-3-07	Arable
B:5	Little fish pond Close	04-2-08	04-3-08	Arable
B:6	Upper Gapsens	01-2-06	01-2-26	Arable
B:7	Lower Gapsens	11-0-31	11-3-15	Arable
	The Sum of the Inclosed Arable	08-2-00	08-3-27	Arable
B:8	Loans Park	75-2-04	78-0-26	
B:9	Home Close	20-1-06	22-1-00	Pasture
B:10	The Meadow part of fish pond Close	13-2-16	13-2-30	Meadow
B:11	Further Old Meadow	06-2-19	06-3-30	Meadow
B:12	Heither Old Meadow	06-0-29	06-2-00	Meadow
		06-1-05	06-3-05	Meadow

		a	R	P	a	R	P	
		16	3	23	17	2	21	Pasture
B:13	Gapsens Moore	69	3	18	74	0	06	
	The Sum of the meadows and Pastures							
	The Total sum of heither Odiam Park	96	1	19	100	2	04	
	The Sum of the Closes	145	1	22	152	0	32	

The total sum of heither Odiam Park 100 acres, 2 rods, 04 poles

## Odiham Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2032

### Response Summary

Summary of representations received by Hart District Council (HDC) as part of Regulation 16 and submitted to the independent Examiner.

Consultation period: 10am August 26<sup>th</sup> 2016 – 4pm October 14<sup>th</sup> 2016.

The table below is only a summary of the comments – a copy of all representations have been provided to the Examiner in electronic and paper formats.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>
001	Ken Crookes	Would like to be notified of the decision. Supports the Plan.
002	Andrew Martin Verdon	Would like to be notified of the decision. Supports the Plan. Believes community involvement has been truly comprehensive. Pleased the Deer Park has been classed as a green space.
003	W E Wilson	Would like to be notified of the decision.
004	Sarah Jane Pearson	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Comments relate to para 3.24 – Policy 3 Essential to ensure the gap between the villages is protected.
005	Timothy Simon	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Comments relate to para 3.24 – Policy 3 Essential to ensure the gap between the villages is protected.
006	Helen Jane Sullivan	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Comments relate to para 3.24 – Policy 3 Essential to ensure the gap between the villages is protected.
007	Dr George Robert Caird	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Comments relate to para 3.24 – Policy 3 Essential to ensure the gap between the villages is protected.
008	Tracey Schuil-Brewer	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Would like to see the plan in force as soon as possible.
009	Christopher Dudgeon	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.
010	The Earl of Malmesbury	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Would like to ensure the gap between the villages is protected.
011	Sport England (See also rep 66)	Highlights the need for neighbourhood plans to reflect national policy for Sport in the NPPF. Should also reflect guidance produced by Sport England.
012	Mrs Patricia Elgar	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps and in particular between North Warnborough and Greywell.

013	Nicholas Rupert MacAndrew	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps and in particular between North Warnborough and Greywell.
014	Mandar Jog	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps and in particular between North Warnborough and Greywell.
015	Sunila Jog	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps and in particular between North Warnborough and Greywell .
016	Paul Harrison	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining a local gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
017	Vivien Harrison	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
018	Mark Bleathman	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps and in particular between North Warnborough and Greywell.
019	Jane Jewkes	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
020	James Treadwell	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
021	Cara Treadwell	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
022	Elaine Rose	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
023	Martin Rose	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
024	John Devon	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan. Does not agree with any development especially on greenfield sites as proposed between North Warnborough and Greywell.
025	Julian Stanley	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
026	Jane Jewkes	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps between North Warnborough and Greywell.
027	James Pearson	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps, in particular between North Warnborough and Greywell.
028	Jane Burnside	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps, in particular between North Warnborough and Greywell.
029	Richard John Coleman	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Disappointed in the delay in submitting the plan, would like it

		“approved” as soon as possible.
030	Christine Fowler	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
031	Michael O’Neill	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps. Especially concerned about the bat habitat.
032	Susan O’Neill	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps Especially concerned about the bat habitat and protecting countryside walks between the two villages.
033	Mrs Ruth Anna Coombs	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
034	Robert Tizard	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. An excellent job in producing a well-balanced plan. Policies 3, 6 & 7 capture accurately the important distinctiveness of this neighbourhood  Also supports Policy 11 especially vi. Supports the inclusion of all the local green spaces, and considers the Royal Deer Park is of greatest importance being important for wildlife, local families and walkers.
035	A Tizard	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.  Also supports Policy 11 especially vi. Supports the inclusion of all the local green spaces, and considers the Royal Deer Park is of greatest importance being important for views, wildlife and walkers.  Strongly supports Policies 3, 6,7 and 8.
036	Elizabeth Ann Sebborn	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
037	Simon Eagan	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
038	Nina Eagan	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.
039	Philip Graham Plumbe	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. The Steering Group has done an excellent job to a high standard and the plan has community backing.  Policies 3 (Local Gaps) and 11 (Local Green Spaces) are welcomed.  The Deer Park is considered most important as has heritage significance, is part of a local gap, has good public access and notable views.  Supports the objective of protecting Conservation areas through Policies 6 and 7.
040	Alexander Homan	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps.

		<p>Expressed concerns re: flooding, sewage and potential contamination.</p> <p>Would like help preserving the footpaths through Deptford Lane Field and access to the canal.</p> <p>As a parent of young children would like to see vehicle access limited as there is little pedestrian cover between front doors and the road.</p>
041	Susan Sampson	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
042	Paul Davies Jones	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
043	John Champion	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.</p>
044	Caroline Boyle	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports maintaining the local gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
045	Lewis Roy Scard	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
046	Linda Joyce Scard	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell which is important for footpath access and wildlife.</p>
047	David Warsop	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.</p> <p>Support preserving the green spaces in Policy 11. In particular, the Deer Park is of great value to the local community.</p> <p>Open space is a great benefit to many of the community</p> <p>Also supports Policies 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, and 12.</p> <p>The plan has identified the most sustainable and appropriate sites for development whilst respecting the natural environment.</p> <p>The Plan has been produced with significant local engagement and reflects community views.</p>
048	Richard Trueman	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
049	John Coffey	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Creation of the plan has been highly inclusive, representing a strong body of opinion in the parish.</p>
050	Jessica Davis Jones	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
051	Deborah Markham	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.</p>



		Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
052	John Michael Gervase Markham	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
053	Hugh Westrope Bolland	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. The plan has been created by intense consultation and represents the wishes of the community.  Policy 11 – There is a strong need to preserve green spaces within the neighbourhood.
054	Marian Wendy Bolland	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. The plan has been created by widespread consultation and represents the wishes of the community.  Policy 11 – Supports all the Local Green Spaces proposed.
055	Paul Hancock	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.  Supports the rigorous and democratic process it has taken to complete this plan.
056	Teresa Gonet, Highways England	Have no comments.
057	Andrew Holmes	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
058	E Collingborn	Would like to be notified of the decision.  Object to the designation of land at Hockleys Farm (Policy 11 iii) as Local Green Space. Alternatively, the designation should be reconfigured to allow areas suitable for development or change of use. There is no value in designating this field as green open space and it is more suitable for residential development.
059	Carolyn Rowe	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
060	Collin MacCallum	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
061	Michael Barter	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 in maintaining the local gaps.
062	Alison Jayne Barter	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 in maintaining Local Gaps.
063	David William Scullion	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Highlights excellent communication within the Parish and represents a fair way forward.
064	Peter Vernon Fletcher	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.

		Supports Policy 11 and considers that the Deer Park should be protected from development.
065	Julie Kentish Barnes	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
066 (see also Rep 11)	Sport England	Highlights the need for neighbourhood plans to reflect national policy for Sport in the NPPF. Should also reflect guidance produced by Sport England.
067	Roger Flynn	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports the high level of public involvement creating the best NP for the community.  Supports policies:  3 – Local Gaps  6 – Odiham Conservation Area &  11 – Local Green Spaces, in particular the Deer Park.
068	David Kenneth Collins	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan & has comments on paragraphs 2 and 7.  Expresses concerns against developments of open green spaces between current developments and the impacts of increased traffic
069	Veronica Mary Mander	Would like to be notified of the decision, has comments on the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
070	Thames Water	Makes comments on Sewerage/wastewater infrastructure and suggests some words to be included in the NP.
071	Emma Flynn	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3- Local Gaps and Policy 11- Local Green Spaces.
072	Louisa MacCallum	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
073	Philip Riley – Basingstoke Canal Society	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan.  Opposed to any development on land at Hook Road, North Warnborough. Believes the 10M conservation margin is insufficient to protect adjoining properties.  Policy 8 - Would like to see an additional positive objective added relating to enhancement of the canal environment.
074	Antony Nicholson	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Product of a great body of work.
075	Ryan Bunce	Objects, as the co-owner, of the Kitchen Garden being designated as LGS. Makes clear that the site is private land with no public rights of way and challenges other reasons for

		designation.
076	Denise Christine Heald	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Excellent exercise in local democracy.</p> <p>Policy 11 - Specifically recommends the policy on local green spaces.</p>
077	Claire Inglis Dogmersfield Parish Council	Fully supports the plans objectives, policies and conclusions.
078	Mrs J Liddiard	Pleased to see the green spaces the residents wanted protected in the proposed LGS site list.
079	Nell Nicholson	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Would like to see it adopted as soon as possible.</p>
080	Richard Cooper	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Especially support the policies relating to Local Green Spaces and Gaps.</p>
081	Claire Cooper	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Especially support the policies relating to Local Green Spaces and Gaps.</p>
082	Simon Neate	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan, with modifications.</p> <p>Policy 11. Does not agree with all the spaces proposed, supports the Deer Park and Dunleys Hill. The Close Meadow and Hockleys Farm do not fill the same purpose.</p> <p>Does not agree the Kitchen Garden or Beech Cottage are worth of LGS.</p> <p>Policy 2 vii- Boundary needs better justification.</p> <p>Policy 3. Comments about the northern boundary of the local gap between Odiham and North Warnborough.</p> <p>Policy 5 Should require development to be in accordance with the village design statement and conservation area appraisals. Referred to but not in policy.</p> <p>Policy 6. Should require development to be in accordance with the village design statement and conservation area appraisals. Referred to but not in policy.</p> <p>Policy 7 Should require development to be in accordance with the village design statement and conservation area appraisals. Referred to but not in policy.</p> <p>Policy 8 Should require development to be in accordance with the village design statement and conservation area appraisals. Referred to but not in policy.</p> <p>Para 4.12 Notes cyclists and walkers already use the towpath.</p> <p>Para 4. 13 Should also refer to the newly built canoe club facilities.</p> <p>Policies Map insert 1 - Should show the two developments at</p>

		<p>Hatchwood Farm and land behind Hatchwood Cottage to provide a complete picture.</p> <p>Policies map insert 3 – Northern boundary should be the same as that for the LGS designation.</p>
083	Patricia Neate	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan, with modifications. Consultation exercise was well done.</p> <p>Policy 11 Does not agree with all the spaces proposed, supports the Deer Park and Dunleys hill. The Close meadow and Hockleys Farm do not fill the same purpose.</p> <p>Does not agree the Kitchen Garden or Beech Cottage are worth of LGS.</p> <p>Policy 2, sub para vii: Crownfields – supports development here but does not think the site has been well thought out.</p>
084	Andy Wilson	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan, with modifications.</p> <p>Para Number 5 – Dunleys Hill – property backs onto Dunley Hill and has had no communication with developer.</p> <p>Boundary changes could directly affect his large garden, would like to include part of garden for development.</p>
085	Natural England	<p>Pleased to see protection and enhancement of protected sites addressed through Policies 12 &amp; 2. Support inclusion of SuDs and allocated greenspace and the protection of watercourses from the impacts of development.</p>
086	Mr P Nash	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports designation of the Deer Park as a Local Green Space.</p>
087	Mrs A Nash	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports designation of the Deer Park as a Local Green Space.</p>
088	Mr J Nash	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports designation of the Deer Park as a Local Green Space.</p>
089	Miss C Nash	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports designation of the Deer Park as a Local Green Space.</p>
090	Mr R Dixon	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports designation of the Deer Park as a Local Green Space.</p>
091	Richard William Cole	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
092	William John Pocock	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p>
093	Katie Pocock	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and</p>

		Greywell.
094	Joy MacAndrew	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gaps (Policy 3) especially between North Warnborough and Greywell for historical and ecological reasons.
095	Christine Gallop	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
096	Graham Gallop	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
097	Victoria Steele	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
098	Richard Steele	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
099	Rhona Blagden	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
100	Michael Hughes	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gaps and retaining the identity of the villages and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
101	Robin Sergeant	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
102	Ruth Anna Coombs	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
103	Patricia Davies	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan and those who diligently worked on the project.
104	Gill Harden	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. No additional comments.
105	Christopher Froehlich	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. No additional comments.
106	Caroline Froehlich	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. No additional comments.
107	Colin Hooper	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.

		Agrees with the special features that make Odiham special. Strongly supports the local gaps.
108	Anita Cole	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3 on Local Gaps and in particular the designation of the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
109	Elaine Alderton	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Appreciates the democratic process. Hopes the wishes of the local community will be respected.
110	Julie Brown	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan. Feels that development on the Deer Park would ruin the whole feeling of the area. Does not like the changes proposed to the footpaths. Believes the changes are for the land owners benefits.</p> <p>Does not see the need for an additional Community Hub.</p> <p>Believes the deer would be a “pet herd in the landowners front garden”</p> <p>Supports the plan to bury domestic wires.</p> <p>Future development – believes building now would increase the chance of future developments being given permission</p> <p>Does not believe public opinion has been fairly reflected, with too much developers influence given</p> <p>Believes the project will turn the Deer Park into a private estate.</p>
111	Paul Brennan-Benson	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports the local gaps (Policy 3) and particularly between North Warnborough and Greywell.
112	Beth Harding	Campaigning against the Crownfields developments –concerns relating to the process of identifying the site, traffic, car parking, height, and type of care.
113	Brendan McDonagh	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gaps and Deer Park.
114	Brendan McDonagh DUPLICATE SUBMISSION	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gaps and Deer park</p> <p>DUPLICATE SUBMISSION</p>
115	David Millard	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
116	Sir Nicholas Somerville	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
117	Lady Jenifer Somerville	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.

118	Nicholas Lambert	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 3, Local gaps.
119	James Pound	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
120	Ellis Smith	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports the Local Gaps Policy 3.  Supports Policy 11 and in particular designation of the Deer Park.
121	Charlotte Ridgwell	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gaps policy and the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
122	Mark Faulkner	Would like to be notified of the decision, does not agree with the inclusion of a care home in the Plan.
123	Waverley Borough Council	No comments but would like to be assured that the cross boundary issues from the level of developments have been taken into consideration.
124	Sally Scott	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. The steering group created an appropriate plan for the neighbourhood.
125	Vail Williams on behalf of Chester Lane Ltd	As the Local Plan is at an early stage, considers little reliance should be placed on previous 'working assumptions' of how many new homes may need to be accommodated. The NP should recognise that there may need to be an early review.  Concerned that there was insufficient engagement with landowners and to consideration of previous representations.  The allocation of the site at Hook Road, North Warnborough (Policy 2vi) is supported. However considers that the number of indicative new homes is too low and the final number can only be determined by detailed design.  Policy 2 vi) a is unnecessary and should be deleted. Amendments proposed to criteria 2 f and l.
126	Melanie Harper	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.
127	Alan Hugh Spruce	Would like to be notified of the decision. Opposed to housing sites I, ii and iv as they will encroach on the strategic gap.
128	M G Pullan	Supports designation of the Deer Park as a LGS.
129	Noreen & Simon Quarrell	Would like to register support for the plan especially the Deer Park as a Local Green Space.
130	Geoff Galliver	Supports the Submission Plan.
131	David Travers Smith	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Preservation of green areas is important.
132	William Flynn	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local gap and local green space designation for the Deer Park.

133	Tom Flintham	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the local green space Policy 11.
134	William Eagle	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the Policy 11 and designation of the Deer Park as LGS, although against the idea of introducing deer.
135	Katie Bleathman	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports the local gaps Policy 3, particularly the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
136	Mrs Judith Burfoot	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports Policy 11 LGS.
137	Mathew Burfoot	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Believes important local green space should be enjoyed and protected.
138	Carl Scott	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports the local gaps – Policy 3. Plan produces a balanced and desirable outcome.
139	Anselm Joseph Paul Fonseca	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 11 and the designation of the Deer Park as a LGS.
140	Margaret Sarah Fonseca	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. A well balanced and thought out plan. Supports Policy 11 and the protection of the deer park from development.
141	Alan Hugh Spruce	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports the deer park is designated a LGS.
142	David Millard Greywell Parish Council	The policies provide a strong basis for managing the future development of Odiham Parish. Pleased to see Policy 3 protecting gaps. Supports the plan.
143	Marilyn Bleathman	Supports the plan. The land at the Deer Park should be protected from development.  Greywell local gap policies map insert 2 - This area should be protected from any development.
144	Norman Bleathman	Supports the plan but has comments, The land at the Deer Park should be protected from development.  Greywell local gap policies map insert 2 - This area should be protected from any development.
145	D L I Kirkpatrick	Supports the plan and agrees with the selection of development sites.  Agrees with the designation of the Deer Park as a LGS.
146	Hart District Council	Generally supportive of the Plan and Plan preparation process.  Seek inclusion of a settlement boundary around Archery Fields.  Seek clarification of reference to public rights of way in Policy 2.



		<p>Raise concerns specifically on flooding issues with sites 2iii and 2iv, and emphasise the need for landscaping at site 2vi.</p> <p>Seek flexibility in Policy 4: Housing Mix and raise some minor points on the Aims and Proposals.</p>
147	Mary & Alan Turner	Supports with emphasis on maintaining the Deer Park.
148	Edward Hellings Odiham & Greywell Cricket Club	Would like to be notified. Disappointed the plan missed an opportunity for leisure provision.
149	John Graham Bell	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports Policy 11 and the protection of the Deer Park.
150	Tony Weaver Odiham Health Centre	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan. The Health centre does not have the resources to support a Care Home.
151	Sonia Hall	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports a footpath from the village to Dunleys Hill and the protection of green spaces.
152	Graham Clutton	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan with modifications.</p> <p>Para 4.12 Does not believe the plan has addressed the use of the canal by the boating community adequately.</p>
153	John Trevor Carter	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Fully supports Policy 3 Local Gaps.
154	David Woolf	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Aware an extensive consultation has taken place.
155	Geoffrey Francis Fisher	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Strongly supports all six local Green space designations.</p> <p>Appendix two, issue raised with clarity of the list of listed buildings.</p>
156	Penny Cole	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Is concerned by the threat to the rural feel and supports the proposal to protect the open green spaces.
157	John Ranson	Would like to be notified of the decision, has comments on the plan. Support needs to be improved for the canal users.
158	Richard Bickerton	<p>Consider that the North Warnborough gap should be no more than that required to prevent the coalescence of the settlements. Consider that if it remains it should be redrawn to exclude Adams Farm (SHLAA site 330). The development of this site would have no impact on the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.</p> <p>Questions the consistency of the site assessment approach and considers that Adams Farm is lower down the ranking than it should be.</p>

		Consider that the Plan should include some support for self-build.
159	Frederick James Brailey	Would like to be notified of the decision, has no comments on the plan.
160	Frederick James Brailey	2 <sup>nd</sup> Submission Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan especially the designation of the Deer Park as a LGS.
161	John Flemming	Wishes to express support for the whole plan.
162 A/B	Strutt & Parker LLP Christian Holliday	<p>Consider that the proposed size limits for new housing development is overly prescriptive. The NP should be seeking to influence the strategic needs of the District, the current level of housing means that the District may have to allocate additional land.</p> <p>Promoting land to the South of Hamilton House (SHLAA site 79) for between 80 – 110 dwellings. Vision Statement submitted supporting this development.</p> <p>Support Policy 3 Local Gaps.</p> <p>Recommend that the settlement boundary of Broad Oak be redrawn to include Site 79.</p>
163	Richard Thomas	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan. Specific opposition to the Crownfields site proposal.
164	Antonia Wyatt, Simmons & Sons on behalf of Parsons Trust.	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports with modifications.</p> <p>Promotes land off Western Lane, Odiham as a housing site. Lies adjacent to sites in Policy 2 (i,ii and v) which are already identified.</p>
165	CALA Homes Thames	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan.</p> <p>Object to the Plan as it fails to meet the Basic Conditions, making insufficient provision for housing.</p> <p>The Plan makes provision for less than 40% of what is assumed in the emerging local plan, accordingly, the Plan cannot be regarded as in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area. It has failed to respond positively to either the national house building agenda or to local and wider housing needs and therefore fails to meet the Basic Conditions.</p>
166	Gladman Developments	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision.</p> <p>Has reservations about the Plan's ability to meet Basic Conditions relating to national policy and advice, the contribution to sustainable development, and conformity with strategic policies in the development plan.</p> <p>The Plan should have identified housing reserve sites in the</p>

		<p>context of the uncertainties of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy 1 – Spatial Plan - is recommended that the ONP takes a more flexible stance to development proposals on the edge of settlements in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Policy 2 – Housing Sites - Support the identification of sites but the Plan provides no certainty that the residual requirement can be delivered through windfall development located within the settlement boundary and therefore brings into question whether the Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Policy 3 – Local Gaps - It is also not considered appropriate to designate a new Local Gap. This is outside the role of Neighbourhood Plans. Would question the purpose of retaining an out of date gap designation, particularly if this would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing to meet the Districts housing needs.</p> <p>Support the intention of Policy 5 – General Design Principles however there is no clarification as to what are ‘appropriate’ energy saving measures.</p> <p>Policy 6 – Odiham Conservation Area – raise concerns in relation to reference to ‘important views’. Without further clarity on why these views are worthy of protection this policy may lead to inconsistencies in the decision making process. As currently drafted do not believe that Policies 5 and 6 align sufficiently with the requirements of para 113 of the Framework.</p> <p>Local Green Space Policy 11 - do not consider the designation of LGS is capable of meeting the tests required by national policy. The cumulative effect of the proposed LGS and Local Gaps results in what would amount to green belt by the back door contrary to national policy guidance. The whole Policy should be deleted.</p>
167	Jeremy Robson	Thoughtful realistic document, protecting the village and allowing for development.
168	Belinda Hallam	<p>Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan.</p> <p>Supports Policies 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12</p> <p>Deer Park is the most important LGS.</p> <p>Some amended wording to Appendix 2 - List of listed buildings proposed.</p>
169	Shirley Cummins	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan. Concerns about the increase in size of the care home.
170	Bernice Blanford	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports policies 1-10 and 12, 13 Also supports Policy 11.

171	Christopher Hallam	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports policies 1. 3, 6, 7, 8, 11. 12. Some amended wording to Appendix 2 - List of listed buildings proposed.
172	Denzil Lee	Would like to be notified of the decision, no comments.
173	Giles Blagden	Would like to be notified of the decision. Supports Policy 3 Local Gaps, particularly the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
174	Julia Winslet	Would like to be notified of the decision. supports the plan with modifications.  Appendix 2 – suggests Rye Common be included in the list of hamlets.  Para 4.2 – seeks clarification of ‘small number’ of houses.
175	Carol Kirkpatrick	Would like to be notified of the decision, has comments about the plan. The two strategic gaps are important but others should be considered. Could the plan consider the provision of more smaller properties.
176	Judith James	Would like to be notified. Supports Policy 3 – Local Gaps, particularly the gap between North Warnborough and Greywell.
177	Victoria Groves Bewley Homes	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes the plan.  Object to the reference to Close Meadow within Policy 6 as it overstates the heritage value and contribution of the site within the Odiham Conservation Area particularly in relation to significant views. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals 2008 document is out of date and a more up to date review is provided in support of the representations. All reference to Close Meadow should be removed.  Object to the designation of Close Meadow as a Local Green Space under Policy 11. It cannot be demonstrated that this land is special to the local community and holds particular local significance because of its beauty, historic significance or recreational value. Evidence is based on a document not publically available. The designation should be removed.  Object to the approach to Housing Sites in Policy 2 and question its consistency with national planning policy. Consider Close Meadow to be a sustainable location for a high quality housing scheme which will both respect the Conservation Area and provide much needed housing.
178	Rachel Mary Pumbe	Would like to be notified. Supports the Plan. Supports designation of the Deer Park as LGS.
179	Robert Lloyd-Sweet	Historic England – No comments other than commending the policies protecting the historic environment.
180	Mrs J M O'Rorke	Approves of the plan, is against development in the Deer

		Park. Supports its designation as LGS.
181	Hugh & Edwin	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the Plan. Specifically supports Policy 11 and designation of the Deer Park as LGS.
182	Antonia Peal	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports designation of the Deer Park as local gap and LGS, and Deptford Lane Field as local gap.  Would like the plan to be fast tracked to prevent additional applications to build being submitted.
183	Helen Fleming	Supports the plan & was a member of the Steering Group.
184	Charles Peter Peal	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports protection of Deptford Land Field from development. Supports designation of the Deer Park as LGS and gap.
185	Maggi Sheppard	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Especially Policy II – LG and in particular designation of the Deer Park.
186	Professor RJ Heald	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan. Supports the designation of Land rear of Beech Cottage as a LGS.
187 / A	Bewley Homes, Victoria Groves	Would like to be notified of the decision, opposes plan. Previous comments ignored.  Comments made as summarised under Rep 177.
188 / A	Val Coleby, Berrys on behalf of The Charities	Would like to be notified of the decision, supports the plan with modifications.  support Policy 2 and in particular parts i and ii and v however are concerned that a development of 24 dwellings with open space on sites i and ii will result in a higher density form of development out-of-character with the surroundings. Suggest that the sites cannot accommodate 24 dwellings.  Suggest that land to the north of the proposed allocation at Policy 2 i and ii could be utilised to extend the development area and allow for additional development as well as a layout that accommodates a rural character appropriate to the edge of the village. Consider that this would not be contrary to Local Plan Policy CON21, would still allow Local Plan Policy DEV9 to be complied with, would improve opportunities for landscaping and greening at the village edge, help meet the vision and objectives on the NP and still allow for recreational facilities at Robert Mays School.  The inclusion of this site would require an amendment to the Policies Map in relation to the Local Gap and to Policy 10 to exclude part of the education designation.
189 / A	Liz Alexander, Bell Cornwell	Support Policy 1 although seek additional wording relating to clarification of how settlement boundaries might be controlled

		<p>if the District does not have a 5 year supply.</p> <p>Support Policy 2 and in particular 2vii and the allocation of land next to housing. Suggest wording of sketch plan needs to be amended to be consistent in relation to dwelling numbers.</p>
190 A / B / C	Liz Alexander, Bell Cornwell on behalf of Landowner Mr R Revell	<p>Object to Policy 3 – Local Gaps as there has been no strategic and visual reassessment of the gaps carried out to justify the boundaries. Only the parts that would prevent the coalescence of settlements across that gap should be included, if at all. Revised boundary proposed.</p> <p>Object to the designation of the Deer Park as a Local Green Space. Raises concerns about where the proposal came from and whether there was public support for it through the consultation process. Considers there is no justification for the designation and its purpose is to prevent development. The site comprises a large tract of land, inconsistent with national policy and cannot be compared to other larger LGS which have been accepted in other Plans. Questions the outcome of the SEA appraisal.</p> <p>Seeks removal of the LGS and gap designations from the Deer Park.</p>
191 A / B / C	Mark Owen, Barton Willmore, on behalf of Hallam Land Management	<p>Promoting land north of Deptford Lane. Clarifies emerging proposals for the site including new village green, new/improved sports facilities/informal parkland/mix of new homes/care home. Detailed supporting information relating to the scheme and other aspects of the representation provided.</p> <p>Consider that the Plan fails to meet the basic conditions relating to consistency with national policy/guidance, contribution to sustainable development and conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.</p> <p>Has critiqued the current SHMA (Hart, Rushmoor, Surrey Heath, 2014) and concludes that the OAN for housing is higher and for Hart is 710dpa. Would support an early review of the NP to ensure it is in line with the new Local Plan. A review mechanism should therefore be built in to the NP either through a new Policy or addition to Policy 2.</p> <p>Policy 3 – Local Gaps – concerned that this is seeking to replace a strategic policy in the development plan. Consider that the gaps are not sufficiently evidenced or justified. Recommend Policy 3 is deleted.</p> <p>Do not consider that the Strategic Environmental Assessment has properly considered alternative options or provided justification for the contents of the Plan.</p> <p>Consider that an additional policy should be included relating to Sports and Recreational Facilities.</p> <p>Support Policy 4: Housing Mix</p> <p>Support Policy 5: General Design principles</p>

		<p>Support Policy 7: North Warnborough Conservation Area</p> <p>Policy 8: Basingstoke Canal Conservation area – as part of their site’s proposals are willing to make a contribution towards a Canal Infrastructure project as identified under ‘Aims and Proposals’.</p> <p>No objection to the designation of LGS in Policy 11.</p> <p>Support Policy 12: Natural Environment.</p>
<p>192 A / B / C / D / E / F / G</p>	<p>JB Planning Associates -Avant Homes</p>	<p>Para 2.2 – support the goals and objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Para 3.16 – recommend an amendment to include reference to viability.</p> <p>Para 3.26 – to introduce flexibility recommend that ‘Policy Requirement’ be amended to ‘Policy Objective’.</p> <p>Support identification of their clients land at Dunleys Hill under Policy 2v. Seek amendment of criterion c to replace reference to two storey to reference to appropriate scale, density and height and an amendment to the title of the sketch plan.</p> <p>Support identification of their clients land at Dunleys Hill as a local gap in Policy 3.</p> <p>Seek some amendments to Policy 4 Housing Mix including reference to viability.</p> <p>Support the identification of the remainder of their clients land at Dunleys Hill as a LGS under Policy 11.</p>

**ODIHAM AND NORTH WARNBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW - RESPONSES TO REG 16 CONSULTATION**

This schedule summarises the comments made in the responses received by Hart District Council during the Regulation 16 consultation stage (22<sup>nd</sup> July to 16<sup>th</sup> September 2024). It also includes, in relation to each of these representations, Odiham Parish Council's (OPC) response. In some cases, this response also cross-refers to OPC's response to the Examiner's request for clarification on a number of matters.

<b>Rep ID</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Parish Council Response</b>
01	Edward Thomas	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC thanks the resident for this support
02	Surrey County Council	No comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan	No comment
03	Winchfield Parish Council	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC welcomes this support from a neighbouring parish
05	Sport England	A generic response with guidance on how neighbourhood plans can make provision for sport and recreation.	<p>OPC believes it has adhered to the principles, policies and guidance set out by SE.</p> <p>In relation to formal provision, such as playing fields, OPC proposes to support their protection by proposing to designate the North Warnborough Football Ground (see also response to 020) and Odiham Cricket Club as Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>In recognition of the importance of facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities, the updated NP also proposes to designate other additional Local Green Spaces.</p>
06	Michael Conoley Associates	<p>The Land at Little Park does not satisfy criterion c) of NPPF para 106 so should not be designated as Local Green Space in Policy 11.</p> <p>No examples of failed or successful attempts at LGS designation elsewhere provide support for OPC's case.</p> <p>The site is in the conservation area and Recommendation 4 in the CAA provides a policy basis</p>	<p>OPC disagrees that criterion c) is not met and maintains that the Little Park is indeed 'local in character and not an extensive tract of land'.</p> <p><b>Please see response to Examiner's request for clarification for more on this.</b></p> <p>OPC disagrees and considers that the indisputable fact of acreage provides support for our case.</p> <p>This is only a recommendation and not a statutory limitation or policy. If LGS designation would not add any further protection, the landowner has no grounds for objecting to it. It would appear that the only reason to</p>



		<p>for resisting anything that would reduce its open, rural character.</p> <p>The site does not have a high recreational value, unlike other large sites, such as the <b>Ashton Court Estate</b>, the LGS at <b>Laverstock &amp; Ford</b> and the Heath at <b>Petersfield</b> which have high value in these terms (and allow public access beyond defined rights way).</p> <p>Applications to have the site included in the National Register of Parks and Gardens and registered as an ACV have failed.</p>	<p>object is that, though the proposal to designate is made for positive reasons, it would have the incidental effect of inhibiting development.</p> <p>It is not the case that ‘for a larger site to be accepted as an LGS, it needs to have more use/facilities than rough footpaths through the site which make them suitable to be designated as such’. Such an analysis conflates two different matters – criterion b), which addresses recreational value, and criterion c), which addresses local character and size.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact that recreational value is not a consideration in respect of criterion c), the scale and strength of public reaction to the refused planning applications demonstrate the appreciation locally for the Little Park in its current form. The proposal to enhance facilities in the Little Park did not enhance its value to the community.</p> <p>These applications relate to the site’s particular features and not to whether or not it is an extensive tract of land (ie the focus of criterion (c)) or suitable to be designated as an LGS</p>
07	Historic England	A generic response with guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into neighbourhood plans.	<p>In reviewing the NP (made in 2017), OPC believes it has adhered to the principles, policies and guidance set out by HE. In particular, it has updated the conservation area appraisals on which the made plan (was based with the much more recent Odiham &amp; North Warnborough Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted in November 2022).</p> <p>OPC notes the comment (p4) that the plan provides an opportunity to designate Local Green Spaces and that such designations are encouraged by national planning policy. (See also the response to HCC’s representations quoted in relation to 006 above).</p> <p>It notes that such spaces are often integral to the character of place for any given area, and this is very much a theme in the Odiham &amp; North Warnborough Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>OPC also notes the comment (p4) that the plan provides an opportunity to identify any potential Assets of Community Value. A number of such assets have been identified.</p>

08	Rushmoor Borough Council	No comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan	No comment
09	Thames Water	<p>Proposes the following new text dealing with water/wastewater infrastructure.</p> <p>“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.”</p> <p>“The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended 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.”</p>	Overall, the matters raised are largely for the local planning authority when dealing with planning applications. While OPC agrees with Thames Water’s proposals, it is not convinced that any of the proposed additional text (which is all generic and not specific to this plan) should be included in this plan, but will be guided by the Examiner.
10	Hampshire Swifts	<p>Proposes the following new wording to be added to Policy 12 to require the incorporation of swift bricks in new-build development:</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</i></p>	Agree that wording could be added if the Examiner thinks it would be appropriate.

		<p><i>swift bricks where an ecologist specifically recommends it.</i></p> <p><i>Existing nest sites should also be protected and retained.</i></p>	
11	Shorewood Homes (LGS)	<p>The settlement boundary in the vicinity of Hatchwood Farm/Place does not align with the boundary shown on the Local Plan mapping.</p> <p>The paddock at Hatchwood Farm should not be designated as LGS. Planning permission has been granted for residential development. The proposed designation is not consistent with the first or second parts of NPPF paragraph 105.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary does not have to align with that in the Local Plan. It is not a strategic policy (as defined in the Local Plan) but a non-strategic policy dealing with more detailed matters. In fact the proposed delineation in the draft plan is UNCHANGED from that in the made NP. (See Proposed Changes to Policies Map). The Local Plan Inspector proposed the modification so that it would align with that in the made NP, which included within the settlement only the new development now known as Montfort Place and not Hatchwood Farm/Place. The change actually made was therefore <u>not</u> consistent with the made NP as proposed by the Inspector.</p> <p>A Permission in Principle (PiP) is not a ‘planning permission’. The proposed designation is therefore not contrary to the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p><b>Please see response to Examiner’s request for clarification for more on this.</b></p> <p>Although OPC did not object to the PiP application, it did subsequently (in response to representations made at the Reg 14 stage), decide to reconsider the provision of LGSs and, in this context, identified the paddock at Hatchwood Farm as such a site within a network of connected open spaces (see paras 3.68-69 of the submission version). The proposed designation is not inconsistent with the first part of NPPF paragraph 105 – or the second part because the NP does allocate sites for housing (as addressed in paras 3.71-72 of the submission plan).</p> <p>The representation reviews each of the considerations noted in NPPF paragraph 106b) as if each one needs to be demonstrably engaged for designation to be appropriate but this is not correct as they are simply examples of considerations that might be relevant. OPC has not argued, for example, that ‘beauty’ or ‘tranquility’ are considerations relevant to the site fulfilling a role as LGS.</p>

			<p>The site is an important part of the green infrastructure of the plan area. Its role is not simply that a well-used footpath runs across it but that the site contributes to a series of green open spaces that are, collectively, of great recreational value (see submission plan para 3.72 explaining the concept of a ‘portfolio of sites’).</p> <p>The officer’s report on the refused Technical Details Consent (TDC) application notes a number of concerns about the scheme’s impact on the footpath.</p>
12	Gladman	<p>Several policies should be modified to allow more flexibility, for example in terms of development proposals relating to land outside the settlement boundary and the allocation of additional sites for housing.</p> <p>Policies 6 and 7 (Odiham and North Warnborough Conservation Areas) include repetition and should be combined into one Conservation Area Policy.</p> <p>Policy 3 (Local Gap) Is unjustified.</p> <p>Parts of the proposed gap can support residential development without unacceptable impacts and perceived coalescence between Odiham and North Warnborough.</p>	<p>The Parish Council fundamentally disagrees with certain policy changes proposed by Gladman - as follows:</p> <p>The Parish Council confirms that the draft plan has been prepared having full regard to the current (December 2023) version of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Parish Council strongly disagrees with the suggestion that two of the three separate Conservation Area policies should be combined. The current policies all reflect differences. Duplication of some text does not mean any of it is unnecessary.</p> <p>Evidence supporting the inclusion and extent of the Local Gap is contained in the Locally Derived Evidence for the existing made plan. A link to this information is provided in the current Regulation 16 Consultation Statement:</p> <p><a href="#">ONW-NEIGHBOURHOOD-PLAN-LOCALLY-DERIVED-EVIDENCE-JULY-2016-copy.pdf (odihamparishcouncil.gov.uk)</a> and the original Consultation Statement (dated July 2016) published by Odiham Parish Council as a supporting document for the Regulation 16 consultation on the existing ‘made’ neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The Examiner’s report (Dec 2016) on the existing made Neighbourhood Plan includes the following comments on Policy 3:</p> <p><i>“In 7.40 The policy has attracted considerable local support and landowner representation and objections. I have considered all the various representations in assessing the extent to which this policy meets the basic conditions.</i></p>

			<p><i>In 7.44 One of the representations comments that the local gap approach is contrary to national policy to the extent that it is clearly a strategic policy and outside the remit of neighbourhood planning.</i></p> <p><i>7.45 I am not convinced by these arguments. Firstly, the Odiham to North Warnborough Local Gap is plainly in general conformity to the strategic policies of the development plan. In any event the emerging strategy for the Hart Local Plan will address both the level of housing and other growth required in the District, its spatial allocation and the need or otherwise for the protection of gaps between settlements. In any event the continued retention of this local gap in the neighbourhood plan (as now proposed to be amended) is far from a ‘blanket policy restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements expanding’ in the reference to national policy to which my attention has been drawn.</i></p> <p><i>7.46 Secondly, I saw first-hand the sensitivity of the gap between the new settlements. The representations challenging the retention of the local gap provide no assessment of the impact of the deletion of the local gap policy in terms of the distinctiveness and identity of the settlements concerned. Thirdly the submitted neighbourhood plan has actively assessed the boundaries of the local gap and proposes a related package of Odiham and North Warnborough housing and open space in and around Dunleys Hill. This is innovative and proactive planning. Fourthly the longer-term retention of a local gap will not automatically frustrate the boost of housing supply in the Plan area. Several representations to the submitted plan have proposed other housing sites elsewhere in the neighbourhood area and unrelated to the local gap. These continue to be assessed as part of the emerging local plan.</i></p> <p><i>7.47 I am satisfied that the Odiham to North Warnborough Local Gap as identified in the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions.”</i></p> <p>The Parish Council believes the logic and conclusion of the Examiner at the time remain valid.</p> <p>Also note that Policy 3 has successfully been applied by Hart in their decision making on a number of (refused) planning applications – made within the context of both strategic and non-strategic policies in the Hart Local Plan.</p>
13	National Grid	Confirms that no assets are currently affected by the proposed allocations within the NP area	No comment

14	Jeremy Fellowes	Site 11 xiv Recreation Ground and Site 11 xii Montfort Place should be removed from Policy 11 so that both sites can be reassessed for community use. There could be problems in the future if residents or the Parish Council wish to do something else with the land.	The objective of LGS designation is to protect open green spaces going into the future. This is important both for residents to have access to green spaces and for biodiversity reasons. The fact that they are not used much is no reason to not have them designated as an LGS. The Steering Group considered all the proposed LGS sites against NPPF criteria and these sites were deemed to meet the criteria.
15	Charles Peal	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC thanks the resident for this support
16	Edwin Sheppard	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan and provides observations in relation to Policy 11 – Site 11xi Little Park	OPC thanks the resident for this support
17	David Kirkpatrick	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC thanks the resident for this support
18	Derek Spruce	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC thanks the resident for this support
19	Hamish Bullough	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC thanks the resident for this support
20	LRM Planning	<p>Site ii viii NW Football Ground Should not be designated as LGS because it is unnecessary to add a further layer of protection and unhelpful (because it could cause confusion).</p> <p>The ability to improve recreational facilities would be undermined by needing to demonstrate very special circumstances (as required by Green Belt policy).</p> <p>The criteria in NPPF para 106 are not all satisfied, although some of the criteria (ie that it is a playing field) are met.</p>	<p>It is not unusual for areas of land to be subject to more than one protective policy.</p> <p>The ability to improve recreational facilities would not be undermined because (per NPPF para 154) the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport is specifically excluded from the categories of development regarded as ‘inappropriate’ development (for which it is necessary to demonstrate very special circumstances).</p> <p>These criteria are examples only and policy does not require that all the possible grounds for designation as LGS are satisfied. OPC considers that it is ‘demonstrably special’ to the local community and ‘holds a particular local significance’ and, as such, meets the criteria.</p> <p><b>Please see response to Examiner’s request for clarification for more on this.</b></p>
21	H Bourne-Taylor	Proposes the incorporation of swift bricks in new-build developments.	See no. 10 above

22	Avant Homes (Dunleys Hill)	The proposed amendments to Policy 2v and the rewording of Policy 14, which require the public open space to be provided as 'planning gain' arising from the housing development delivered by Policy 2v, are disproportionately onerous.	<p>OPC entirely disagrees with Avant Homes' comments.</p> <p><b>Please see response to Examiner's request for clarification for more on this.</b></p> <p>HDC has suggested some minor rewording (of paras 1.35, 3.16, 3.19 and Policy 2) for clarification. This clarification addresses the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) in respect of the SPA. OPC supports the proposed changes suggested by HDC.</p>
23	Natural England	No comments on draft Neighbourhood Plan	No comment, but OPC notes that discussions took place with NE in relation to the requirement for SPA mitigation and the implications for Policy 2v and Policy 14 (see no. 22 above).
24	M Priaulx	Proposes the incorporation of swift bricks in new-build developments.	See no. 10 above
25	John Pattinson	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC thanks the resident for this support
26	J Morna	Proposes the incorporation of swift bricks in new-build developments.	See no. 10 above
27	Patricia Neate	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan	OPC thanks the resident for this support
28	Piers Beach	Pre-application discussions have taken place relating to the demolition of the existing property and its redevelopment together with site 2i of NP for a development of 34 apartments for older people.	The pre-application proposal does not comply with the policy in the made NP and the parish council has submitted its comments and objections to Hart District Council.
29	Hart DC	Supports the draft Neighbourhood Plan and suggests a number of minor changes to provide greater clarity, understanding or to better align with the policies/text with local and national guidance. Also identifies concern with implementation of Policy 12vi	OPC welcomes District Council support and agrees their minor proposed changes, if accepted by the Examiner.
30	Defence Org	Comments relate to safeguarding of aerospace with regard to biodiversity sites close to an airfield. Request when drafting policy and guidance which addresses biodiversity, ecology, and Biodiversity Net Gain to bear in mind that some forms of environmental improvement or enhancement may not be compatible with aviation safety. Where off-site provision is to provide BNG, the locations of both the host development and any other site should both/all be	OPC agrees to a change of wording in Policy 12 to address this issue which could be in the explanatory text.

		assessed against statutory safeguarding zones and the MOD should be consulted where any element falls within the marked statutory safeguarding zone.	
31	Hampshire CC	Supports objective 2.2iv, site 2vii (Crownfields), policy 4 – affordable housing, policy 11 – local green spaces	OPC welcomes HCC support for these policies.

6th November 2024

Odiham Parish Council,  
The Bridewell,  
The Bury,  
Odiham,  
RG29 1NB



## PAYMENTS LIST

Vouche	Code	Date	Minute	Bank	Cheque No	Description	Supplier	VAT Type	Net	VAT	Total
312	Subscriptions	28/10/2024		Unity Trust	312	GDPR protection act annual fee	ICO	Z	35.00		35.00
349	Caretaking Equipment	16/10/2024		Unity Trust	349	adjustable spanner	Viking	S	16.49	3.30	19.79
358	The Bridewell - electricity	16/10/2024		Unity Trust	358	Bridewell Electricity	nPower	S	250.72	50.14	300.86
359	PR & Pub inc newsletter	16/10/2024		Unity Trust	359	Newsletter Distribution	The Extra Mile Leaflet Distr	Z	165.00		165.00
360	Estate Agent Fees	25/10/2024		Unity Trust	360	Chapel cottage management fe	McCarthy Holden	S	149.15	29.83	178.98
361	Chamberlain Gardens (SC Trus	31/10/2024		Unity Trust	361	Overpayment of VAT - to be co	Larkstel Ltd	Z		212.40	212.40
362	Bank Charges	31/10/2024		Unity Trust	362	service Charge	Unity Trust	Z	12.90		12.90
364	Remembrance	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	364	Donation to Poppy Appeal	RBL	Z	75.00		75.00
365	Travel	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	365	Mileage HALC Conference	Andrea Mann	Z	39.60		39.60
366	IT Support and Back up	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	366	monthly subscription	Microsoft Ireland	Z	51.50		51.50
367	Toilets - Power and rates	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	367	electricity King street toilets	nPower	L	53.76	2.69	56.45
368	Rates	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	368	Bridewell business rates	Hart DC	Z	233.00		233.00
369	Rates	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	369	business rates Library and prer	Hart DC	Z	398.00		398.00
370	Cemetery rates and water	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	370	Cemetery rates	Hart DC	Z	200.00		200.00
371	Postage and consumables	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	371	viking supplies for Bridewell	Viking	S	26.43	5.29	31.72
371	The Bridewell - cleaning & mat	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	371	viking supplies for Bridewell	Viking	S	130.98	26.20	157.18
372	Travel	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	372	Clir Bell mileage to HALC AGM	Clir Bell	Z	30.60		30.60
373	Other Income	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	373	HALC Prize re-payment- Paid to	HALC	Z	100.00		100.00
374	The Bridewell - cleaning & mat	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	374	Bridewell cleaning (Oct)	YBC	S	559.58	111.92	671.50
375	Remembrance	04/11/2024		Unity Trust		advanced road closure signs	Alphabet Signs	S	180.00	36.00	216.00
376	Bridewell works	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	376	Instillation of new monitor and	DTE Electrical & Property	Z	682.74		682.74
377	The Bridewell - water	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	377	Bridewell water	Business Stream	Z	14.91		14.91
378	Christmas Trees and Lights	06/11/2024		Unity Trust		Christmas tree and delivery	Oxenford Farm Ltd	S	145.83	29.17	175.00
378	Christmas Trees and Lights	06/11/2024		Unity Trust		Christmas tree and delivery	Oxenford Farm Ltd	S	45.00	9.00	54.00
379	Chapel Building Maintenance	06/11/2024		Unity Trust		South Chapel - remedial works	DTE Electrical & Property	Z	150.00		150.00
380	The Bridewell - maintenance	06/11/2024		Unity Trust		The Bridewell - remedial works	DTE Electrical & Property	Z	390.00		390.00
381	Public toilets R&M	06/11/2024		Unity Trust		King St toilets - remedial works	DTE Electrical & Property	Z	660.00		660.00
382	Toilets - cleaning	04/11/2024		Unity Trust	382	Sanitary bins King St toilets	CJH Cleaning Services Ltd	S	12.50	2.50	15.00
383	Toilets - cleaning	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	383	Cleaning King Street Toilets	CJH Cleaning Services Ltd	S	476.37	95.27	571.64
384	Bridewell works	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	384	kitchen equipment for the Kitc	Andrea Mann	S	28.75	5.75	34.50
385	Remembrance	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	385	Remembrance poppies & statu	Keith Dodd	Z	363.00		363.00
386	Other amenity areas maintenar	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	386	Adhoc work at OPC's open spa	Keith Dodd	Z	600.00		600.00
387	The Bridewell - maintenance	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	387	Adhoc work at The Bridewell	FS Cleaning & Maintenance	Z	400.00		400.00
388	The Bridewell - waste disposal	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	388	Bridewell waste collection	Suez	S	76.24	15.25	91.49

PAYMENTS LIST

Vouche	Code	Date	Minute	Bank	Cheque No	Description	Supplier	VAT Type	Net	VAT	Total
389	Lighting - Maint and admin	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	389	Street lighting	HCC	S	2,266.06	453.21	2,719.27
389	Lighting - Maint and admin	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	389	Street lighting	HCC	S	181.28	36.26	217.54
389	Lighting - energy costs	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	389	Street lighting	HCC	S	1,107.40	221.48	1,328.88
389	Lighting - energy costs	06/11/2024		Unity Trust	389	Street lighting	HCC	S	33.22	6.65	39.87
								<b>Total</b>	<b>10,341.01</b>	<b>1,352.31</b>	<b>11,693.32</b>