

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.1	<p>The current boundary should be re-drawn in line with the existing fence line on GROVE ROAD in front of properties HUNTERS END and BRACKENWOOD. At the moment the boundary shown cuts across the golf course leaving a large section available for development which would damage the area and wildlife</p> <p>Re reference Beacon Hill Settlement boundary opposite Fairways and along the bottom of Grove Road GU26 6PJ & GU266PH. There is a segment of land on the Golf Course that conflicts with various designations. The settlement boundary has not been excluded on land of AONB It also affects Steepways residents I want the settlement boundary to be re-drawn</p> <p>Numerous similar comments.</p> <p>I have reservations about the Beacon Hill settlement boundary (p20 - diagram 1c), as this appears to include land owned by Hindhead Golf Club – specifically, part of the 2nd hole adjoining Grove Road. A few years ago the golf club considered submitting a planning application to develop this plot - following protests by local residents, the club abandoned the proposal. Earlier in the plan (p13) the reason for setting a settlement boundary is defined as “... to clarify the situation for future planning purposes the Plan proposes formal, defined and recognised settlement boundaries that maintain and contain the current urban boundaries, to protect the character of the area and prevent unrestricted growth into the countryside.” With this definition in mind, surely the boundary should be re-drawn to exclude all of the golf course?</p>	<p>It was agreed that the settlement boundary should be changed to exclude the area of the Hindhead Golf Course identified.</p>	<p>Beacon Hill settlement boundary altered</p>
H1.1	<p>I would like to see the Haslemere Settlement area larger. The high density of buildings proposed within the settlement area will reduce the amount of green space, gardens etc. available to local residents. Ideally, all houses need at least a small garden and ideally, flat / apartment dwellers should have access to a patch of green which belongs to the property (or failing get that a balcony so that they can step out into and sit in the fresh air, when desired). The recent ‘lockdown’ has made it abundantly clear how important it is for people to have a space they can call their own to get out into, to sit in and if desired to work on, occasionally - i.e. in the form of planting, maintaining and beautifying the site. An important aspect of both mental and physical health.</p> <p>I don't think it's healthy to cram housing into small areas which is what is likely to happen if there is a firm settlement boundary. Dense building with little open space creates an unpleasant and unhealthy atmosphere for everyone. There ought to be some mechanisms to allow for flexibility and more green space around buildings.</p>	<p>Policies within the Neighbourhood Plan encourage the protection of green space within the settlement boundary (H13 Green Spaces) and encourage developers to include sufficient accessible green space if there is insufficient space in close proximity – as defined by the Accessible Natural Green Space Standard (H7 High quality external design). Higher densities ensure that less greenfield land needs to be taken to meet the housing number target.</p>	
H1.1	<p>The boundaries may have a redistributive effect, as they seem to protect high value properties but not those in other lower value accommodation that may be next door to new development.</p>	<p>The process of determining the settlement boundaries is described in Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper. The location of the boundary has been based on already defined boundaries for designated land such as Green Belt, ALNB and AGLV.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.1	<p>Essential to observe these boundaries, Haslemere being unusual for the amount of NT land</p> <p>Protection of the green areas outside the Settlement Boundary is vital to preserve the surroundings of the town.</p> <p>I do not accept the need to build outside the formal settlement boundaries on land designated AONB or AGLV</p> <p>You should never consider encroaching on the areas of outstanding beauty or areas of great landscape value</p> <p>There seems to be a large swathe of land undeveloped South of Haslemere - this should remain so. Extending the towns boundary is not in the community interest</p> <p>The formal Settlement Boundary provides the required edge of the urban area to prevent urban sprawl and should be retained.</p> <p>To me the most critical element of implementing the Vision is the unequivocal adoption of a formal settlement boundary, as outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan, which establishes a clear and strong presumption against development of new green land. Unless this effected the distinctive character of Haslemere and the value of having a 'Vision' at all will be lost.</p> <p>One of Haslemere's USPs is that it is a town surrounded by glorious National Trust land, AONB and green spaces. This is a big part of what attracts people to live here; we should not expand the town any further beyond the current boundary plan.</p> <p>Feel strongly that development should sit in the existing boundary. Higher density and more affordable housing will help local workers like me afford to live in town.</p> <p>There should be NO development outside the Existing Formal Settlement Boundaries. These Formal Settlement Boundaries MUST not be changed. To do so will destroy the existing beauty of Haslemere and change the nature of the town irreversibly. Previous Haslemere Town Councils along with Waverly Borough Council have continually ignored the local population and sought to develop around the outskirts of Haslemere's green and rolling hills, rather than address the existing infrastructure, champion the repair of the roads, water supply, security and retain the hospital and fire service.</p>	Noted	
H1.1	<p>This policy appears very sensible and pleased to see that the settlement boundary has been drawn so as to exclude any of the land proposed to be redeveloped on the south side of Scotland Lane.</p>	Noted	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	<p>I fully support the formal adoption of the Settlement Boundary as laid out within the map, voted for unanimously by Haslemere Council, and the principle of protection against development of our green spaces, AONB and AGLV. The Settlement Boundary has been drawn to protect green spaces and wildlife corridors within the town's vicinity vital to preserve Haslemere's cherished environment and to protect biodiversity.</p>		
H1.1	<p>You need to apply some flexibility, this can be an aim but not a certainty</p> <p>The plan should support the sites allocated for development by Waverley Borough Council so that more housing can be built to allow key workers to live in Haslemere.</p> <p>It must be possible to adjust the boundaries in light of changing circumstances during the life of the Plan.</p>	<p>The settlement boundaries as drawn should enable Haslemere to achieve the housing target set for the period through 2032. Waverley Borough Council are currently preparing LPP2 and may determine that changes need to be made to the settlement boundaries set in the Neighbourhood Plan. This is explained in the Context and Reasoned Justification.</p>	
H1.1	<p>I do support the idea of a boundary but the planned boundaries protect the existing large houses and do not protect or seem to consider the actual development for the areas within the boundary. One rule for everyone in Haslemere, really?!</p>	<p>As noted above the process used to set the settlement boundaries was not based on the size of existing properties. As the Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating sites (WBC will do that in LPP2) site briefs have not been included in the NP for the sites. However, there are Opportunities (numbers 1,4,5,& 8) relating to the development of site briefs for areas and sites and these projects would involve the community.</p>	
H1.1	<p>I support the proposed settlement boundary but have strong reservations about the number of loopholes and relaxations that would allow large numbers of houses to be built on AONB/AGLV land, often without consultation. A smart developer could simply build one 49 house development after another. The boundaries should stay firm for anything other than subdivision or the occasional infill until all the available brownfield and change of use opportunities within it have been exhausted. By definition anything outside the boundary is less suited to all the other policies in the plan around affordable housing, road use, access public transport / walking, high demand for 1/2 bedroom dwellings etc. Almost all possible developments outside the settlement boundaries are going to be 'Executive' homes that do nothing for the local community - but they will make a great deal of money for the land speculators sitting on those parcels for this very reason.</p> <p>Any rural land shouldn't be developed, there are plenty of free sites unused between Haslemere centre and Weyhill.</p> <p>Leave the formal settlement boundaries as is. Focus on re-developing the Brownfield Sites or those sites that have existing buildings that could be modified to accommodate</p> <p>We need to ensure it is crystal clear development on AONB land will not be supported for development. The targets for brownfield should be achievable and not in a period of time that developers will 'sit' on land waiting for the targets not to be met. Developers won't develop on brownfield if they have AONB as an option...it makes them more money.</p>	<p>Policy H4 (now H8) Consultation requirements received many comments asserting that applying it to 50 homes or more was too high a threshold. The policy has been amended to apply to 10 homes.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has not allocated sites but through policy H1.1 and H1.2 aims to encourage development on the brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is possible for development to happen outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. Further information about this has been added to the Context and Reasoned Justification of Policies H1 and H3.</p>	<p>Policy H4 (now H8) amended</p>

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	<p>I support this policy providing the Settlement Boundary is as laid out in the map and be defined as a formal boundary. This must not be breached by development simply to fulfil the housing numbers when increased housing density in the Town is more beneficial.</p>		
H1.1	<p>I DO NOT agree with building on green field sites. I fundamentally disagree with changing the boundaries in a backhanded way as was done at Red Court. I want the boundaries to be left as they are and Do not support building of houses on land designated as AONB (which Red Court is).</p> <p>The settlement boundary was agreed some back and then changes were made in what appears to be an attempt to thwart development at Scotland Park (Red Court). This appears to be have done at the behest of the independent town councillors who both live adjacent to the land in question. Surely they should not have had any input into this given their own interests seems to have been paramount.</p> <p>I whole-heartedly support the adoption of the Settlement Boundary as defined in the maps of the Plan. This was endorsed by unanimous vote by the re-formed HTC at end 2019 in order to properly reflect the recommendations of Haslemere Vision, as well as CPRE, Surrey Hills AONB, and other relevant bodies consulted by WBC. It was adopted on the basis that it protected AONB/AGLV that had previously been drawn into the provisionally suggested boundary by WBC. It was established that this provisional boundary went against the majority of Haslemere residents' views and subsequently, the Settlement Boundary outlined in this Neighbourhood Plan was unanimously approved.</p> <p>THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY ISSUE NEEDS TO BE REVISITED BY THE HTC AND THOSE COUNCILLORS WITH A PECUNIARY INTEREST BARRED FROM ANY INVOLVEMENT. THE COMMUNITY HAS NOT SUPPORTED HASLEMERE VISION'S LATE SUBMISSION OF CHANGES TO THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY (HTC FULL MEETING 28TH NOVEMBER 2019). ONLY THE HV EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THEMSELVES SUPPORTED THE CHANGES. A LEGAL CHALLENGE IS INEVITABLE.</p>	<p>In an earlier draft of the NP the Red Court site was included within the settlement boundary, however, this was then altered in November 2019 to exclude the site as it is in AGLV/AONB. Haslemere Town Council adopted this version of the NP and it went forward for the Regulation 14 consultation. Following analysis of consultation responses the Red Court site remains outside the settlement boundary. Should WBC allocate the site in LPP2, however, it is likely that they will include it within a revised settlement boundary for Haslemere that will supercede the Neighbourhood Plan boundary.</p>	
H1.1	<p>We need a defined settlement boundary but there are some curious anomalies in the detail path that the boundary takes. In the spirit of trying to move the topic forward I have decided not to object to these odd localised anomalies.</p> <p>I support the adoption of formal settlement boundaries. However, some of the boundaries seem arbitrarily drawn along roads. For example Stoatley Hollow. why not capture the remaining houses up Farnham lane or other developed areas. No reference (that I noticed) talked about the neighbouring areas, for example, Camelsdale which is effectively part of Haselemre but not covered. Is there sufficient coordination between different areas?</p>	<p>The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains the process for setting the settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Camelsdale is within Chichester District Council and does not have its own Neighbourhood Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 26 encourages joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.1	<p>I support this policy, but it appears that Waverley doesn't. The current development "The Gables" in Tilford Road is outside of the settlement boundary, so how serious is the council in believing this policy?</p> <p>I still have not fully understood the difference between land inside and outside the boundary since you talk of still allowing building on land outside the boundary. What is the point of having a boundary if you can build outside it anyway? Does it mean that houses inside it can be horrible but house outside have to be attractive? It was not clear to me.</p>	<p>It is possible for development to happen outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. Further information about this has been added to the Context and Reasoned Justification of Policies H1 and H3.</p>	<p>Context and Reasoned Justification H1 and H3 altered.</p>
H1	<p>Don't agree with this policy because all the elements of H 1 are interlinked and H 1.2 is not a policy just a presumption and there are far reaching implications of H1.3 and in effect both allow the potential development of land outside the settlement boundaries. In addition I don't agree with the way the boundaries have been drawn which cuts right through my property so part of it is within the boundary and part is not.</p>	<p>Many respondents were concerned about Policy H1.3 on reserve sites and it has been removed. The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains the process for setting the settlement boundaries.</p>	
H1	<p>The policy covers three entirely different points, it is open to broad interpretation and lacks the tight definition and specificity of a policy. H1.2 Is not policy, a "presumption" gives licence in conjunction with H1.3 for building to take place outside the settlement area. This is not a policy point. For this reason I do not support this policy at all.</p>	<p>It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. Further information about this has been added to the Context and Reasoned Justification of Policies H1 and H3.</p>	
H1.1	<p>We support the formal definition of a settlement boundary around the built-up area of Haslemere. However, the map at Figure 1a appears to depart from this principle in one respect. It seems to include Sturt Farm within the urban area whereas the land is AONB/AGLV and currently farmland and woodland outside the urban area. We assume this departure arises from WBC's approval of a project at Sturt Farm in 2015 before WBC's Local Plan was approved. If this assumption is correct, we believe the project should be regarded as "an exceptional prior approval outside the new settlement boundary" and the boundary should be re-drawn to correct the anomaly. If, for any reason, the present Sturt Farm project does not proceed, any future project that might be proposed for the site should therefore be classified as one on AONB/AGLV land outside the formal (urban) settlement boundary and considered in accordance with the now current planning requirements, including the terms of the Neighbourhood Plan. We believe these treatments would be reasonable and in line with the terms and spirit of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The obvious mistake on the settlement boundary is to include Sturt Farm inside the boundary. The Sturt Farm & Longdene House area need to be respected as one of the most important and most central "green fingers" in Haslemere, the planned development at Sturt Farm needs to be withdrawn to allow Haslemere to remain a green, healthy place to live. When you look at a map of Haslemere, this area is the biggest, widest, deepest green finger into Haslemere, it is mad to decide this does not need to be protected against development.</p>	<p>The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains the process for setting the settlement boundaries. Even if this site were removed from within the NP settlement boundary it is likely that WBC will include it within their LPP2 settlement boundary which will superceded any boundary set in the NP.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.1	<p>There are some possible areas just outside the boundary which would more appropriately accommodate addition homes, where there is better access and more space. Over building within the Settlement area would cause more congestion. Obviously development is going to happen within the boundaries, BUT it is essential the numbers for the site and its size are very carefully monitored.</p>	<p>Policy H4 (now H8) requires that every planning application for developments of 10 or more homes will provide a travel plan. The density policy H1.5 (now H2) has been amended to ensure consideration is given to the site’s setting and topography.</p>	<p>Policy H1.5 (now H2) amended</p>
H1.1	<p>Just as housing allocation is not the purpose of the HNP, it is also not within the remit to alter settlement boundaries without reference from progress in Waverley Borough Council’s Part 2 Local Plan. As changes to the boundary can significantly reduce the town's ability to grow and evolve, this decision should also be discussed with local residents.</p> <p>I support the concept of settlement boundaries but these should be flexible to change and any changes must be subject to local democratic testing before implementation.</p>	<p>It is necessary for the NP to define settlement boundaries in order for the policies to be implemented. The Regulation 14 consultation has enabled residents to give opinions on the settlement boundaries. Should WBC wish to set different settlement boundaries in LPP2 these will supercede the boundaries in the NP. The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains how the housing allocated to Haslemere can be built with the settlement boundaries as defined in the NP.</p>	
H1.5	<p>formal settlement boundaries concept as drawn seems unnecessarily restrictive and will result in ever more people being crammed in a relatively small area. This will adversely impact the current balanced character of housing/space in Haslemere. Haslemere should not aim to emulate other characterless/overbuilt towns, particularly given the impact of increased housing in the centre of town on already limited road infrastructure.</p> <p>The density of the houses in this plan fails to maintain the character of the town.</p> <p>This policy should be amended so that it takes into account the topography of the land, the character of the area, as well as considering the interaction with existing policies such as the Haslemere Hillside policy It should be considerate of the neighbourhood and the impact building this ridiculous number of houses in such a small area will have on traffic, neighbourhood safety (think of children biking around the roads and the accidents that could potentially happen because of the number of cars on the road)</p> <p>It is too crude. Within a settlement boundary (e.g. 1 km from the station) a blanket approach to planning and development could cause untold havoc to people’s homes as highly urbanized new developments are shoe-horned in to the gardens of every house / piece of green space that potentially comes on the market.</p> <p>There is a need for more housing and pressure from Waverley to develop. Haslemere and the surrounding villages have a character which must be preserved. Developers will only be interested in maximum profit so will try to cram as many houses as possible into unsuitable areas . Squeezing blocks of flats into central Haslemere so that people can commute to London will create a mishmash of ugly buildings. Plots of land need to be carefully considered with consideration to the existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Many respondent supported building at higher densities to protect greenfield land. The density policy H1.5 (now H2) has been amended to ensure consideration is given to the site’s setting and topography.</p> <p>Policy H4 (now H8) requires that for developments of 10 or more homes a design brief including a travel plan should be provided to local residents before an application is submitted. The brief includes an explanation of the consideration and mitigation of any infrastructure issues raised by the proposed development.</p> <p>The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains how the housing allocated to Haslemere can be built with the settlement boundaries as defined in the NP. Some windfall development such as that on large gardens is expected but there are also several large brownfield sites which will deliver significant amounts of housing.</p>	<p>Policy H1.5 (now H2) amended</p>

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	<p>There seems little space for new development, the boundaries being rather tightly drawn around the existing settlements. Given the huge demand for housing, would it not be prudent to have included a little more land? To try to fend off all development, there may be the risk of being forced into releasing land later that would be very detrimental. (I note that there are other policies to cover this risk but the more the Plan restricts development potential, the greater force may be behind future applications.) I struggle with the concept of forcing more homes into an existing area - this will surely involve those in existing housing to receive a deterioration in the enjoyment of their home as the density increases.</p>	<p>All existing national and local policies apply to all development and need not be repeated in the Neighbourhood plan policy wording.</p>	
H1.5	<p>Needs proper definition of a maximum density of in-fill or replacement building within the boundaries</p>	<p>Policy H1.5 (now H2) sets density standards.</p>	
H1	<p>There will be some brown field sites outside the zones that could be considered.</p> <p>An almost absolute ban on development outside the settlement boundary is far too rigid and will be BAD for the economy and society of Haslemere. You only have to look at some of the decent and useful buildings that lie outside the boundary now that would not be permitted.</p> <p>it is not realistic to prevent housing development outside settlement boundaries when they are suitable opportunities. Sites should be assessed on merit and not governed by restrictive policies that inhibit delivery.</p> <p>Generally support, but there are houses outside the settlement area, and there should be allowance to knock down and replace old houses from time to time.</p>	<p>It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. Also WBC's emerging LPP2 has a policy for development on brown field sites outside settlement boundaries. Policies H1.2 and H3 welcome development on previously built land.</p>	
H1	<p>The maps on the plan are so small it is difficult to see where the exact boundary lines are proposed. New developments could therefore be allowed where currently we have open spaces/woodland at the edge of the village of Beacon Hill.</p>	<p>High definition versions of the maps are included in the revised NP</p>	<p>High definition maps</p>
H1	<p>This policy is OK in concept but as usual the devil is the detail and so it should not be set in concrete: ie whatever is in the settlement area is OK; and what is not is not OK. For example the Red Lodge area on Scotland Lane: there is development along the S side of Scotland Lane either side of this site and the settlement area currently follows the boundaries of these developments exactly whereas in fact it would be better to draw a straight line along the ridge at the back of the developments. This would then allow the parts of the Red Lodge site adjacent to Scotland Lane to be developed whilst still protecting the adjacent areas of AONB to the S. There must be other areas like this in Haslemere.</p>	<p>The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains the process for setting the settlement boundaries. The land you refer to is designated an area of great landscape value which is further designated as Countryside beyond the Green Belt, such designated land has been excluded from the settlement.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1	<p>I find myself questioning some of the detailed decisions taken regarding the development boundaries. haslemere and the surrounding areas s have consistent low density development that spread into the ANOB, Green Belt and the national park. As such its always going to be difficult to pick the precise line of where a 'developed area' ends but with the need to find sites for new homes and minimise any outside the development areas I would suggest that some development areas could be adjusted very slightly. For Instance, In Grayswood, the Horse Shoes Area, bounded by the land of Grayswood Manor - one side of the road is development, the other is not - this make no sense and a row of sustainable homes could easily be accommodated along that strip of land. Inexplicably the whole of central Grayswood is also excluded - the school area. This is clearly incorrect. There are other areas around the north western fringes of haslemere that seem to have been selected as the boundary on negligible criteria.</p>	<p>The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains the process for setting the settlement boundaries. Grayswood is washed over by the Green Belt and therefore only the built areas have been included. It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to Green Belt protections (para 145). Details of these exceptions have been added to the Context and Reasoned Justification of policy H3 – Sustainable development outside the settlement boundaries or on designated land.</p>	<p>Information added to Context and Reasoned Justification for policy H3 – Sustainable development outside the settlement boundaries or on designated land.</p>
H1	<p>The settlement boundaries set out in H1 are drawn too narrowly restricting possible building on potential sites that most would deem reasonable. For example the Beacon Hill boundaries include only one side of Tilford Road although there is long standing development on both sides.</p>	<p>The Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains the process for setting the settlement boundaries. The area you refer to is within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in the Green Belt. It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections.</p>	
H1	<p>I would like to see real input from those already living within the designated area. People need to really understand that their opinions count.</p>	<p>The Regulation 14 Consultation gave residents an opportunity to respond with views on the settlement boundary. 109 comments were received via the online survey and 415 respondents gave an opinion on the policy. The majority (67.71%) stated that they “support the policy fully.” This consultation statement provides details of the comments received and the action taken.</p>	
H1.2	<p>You need to apply some flexibility, this can be an aim but not a certainty, there might be landowners just outside boundaries that want to erect housing and this should be looked at on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. Policies H1.2 and H3 welcome development on previously built land.</p>	
H1.2	<p>I strongly object to the use of the word 'presumption'- this is far too weak and will expose the protected landscapes outside the settlement boundary to development. The NPPF is clear that AONB/AGLV is to be protected against development- there is no ambiguity. The wording of this policy must be strengthened, otherwise the settlement boundary is meaningless and the plan will not play the role that the community has so clearly stated desired- over 90% of the respondents did not want ANY large developments outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>While I agree with the sentiment, I cannot support this policy wording as there is ambiguity with the word 'presumption'. The wording of this policy should be made stronger and more definitive to emphasize that in order to protect our greenspace, land that falls outside the settlement boundary will only be considered as a last resort, once all other sites and options have been fully explored.</p>	<p>It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. As the NP must comply with the basic conditions and follow the NPPF guidance it is not possible to forbid development on designated land.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	<p>Wording is ambiguous, a firm commitment to only developing within the settlement boundary should be made.</p> <p>It has to be more specific than a "presumption" otherwise the land can easily be developed and I am not in favour of this. I would rather see: "In order to protect our green space there will be NO development of land outside the settlement boundaries."</p> <p>Numerous similar comments</p>	<p>See comment above.</p>	
H1.2	<p>This policy must not assume development will happen outside the boundary. The hurdle must be very high to have development there and certainly no new developments of more than a few (10) houses.</p>	<p>It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. Policies H1.2 and H3 welcome development on previously built land.</p>	
H1.2	<p>I would like to ensure that there is no presumption against the development of affordable housing of land that lies outside the settlement boundaries</p>	<p>There is not. The NPPF exceptions that permit development on AONB and Green Belt land include the provision of affordable housing.</p>	
H1.2	<p>There should be room for some flexibility. Obviously not wholesale encroachment on green spaces but done carefully and most importantly with low density and plenty of planting of trees.</p>	<p>It is possible for development to occur outside the settlement boundaries as the National Planning Policy Framework provides exceptions to AONB and Green Belt protections. Policies H1.2 and H3 welcome development on previously built land. The density policy of the NP should be applied to ensure best use of the land. If greenfield land is to be developed building at low densities will probably result in further greenfield land being developed in the future.</p>	
H1.2	<p>We support the intention to protect green spaces with a presumption against the development of land that lies outside the settlement boundaries. However, we believe the policy should distinguish between land designated as AONB/AGLV and other green spaces. AONB land has the highest level of protection under the Planning System, and this protection applies regardless of the allocation of settlement boundaries. The Neighbourhood Plan should acknowledge and reference the national and other protections, including the NPPF, WBC's approved Local Plan Part 1 and the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan.</p>	<p>Additional information added to Context and Reasoned Justification for Policies H1 and H3.</p>	<p>Context and Reasoned Justification changes - policies H1 and H3</p>
H1.2	<p>I think this is broadly sensible but too blunt as it stands. There is clearly a trade off: for example I would prefer development on a brownfield site outside the settlement boundary to on the Town meadow, which is within it. I therefore think we need to set out our order of preferences, which will largely but not completely be inside and then outside. I'd suggest that we'd prefer (highest to lowest): Inside on brownfield sites Outside on brownfield sites Outside on AGLV land Outside on AONB land Inside on areas of high amenity (e.g. Town Meadow, Lion Green).</p> <p>It is a very black and white policy - if there are brownfield sites that can be developed that are NOT AONB etc then I don't see why there is a presumption against. Also, we should encourage densification on existing footprints on existing brownfield sites.</p> <p>This presumption against development seems unnecessary. Rather make development / windfall on brownfields sites a potential.</p>	<p>Policies H1.2 and H3 aim to encourage development on previously built land outside the settlement boundary. There are very few greenfield sites within the settlement boundary and many of these are protected from development by policy H13 Green Spaces.</p> <p>Policy H5 (now H4) encourages windfall development.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.2	We should indeed protect our green space but at some point space to develop sufficient housing within the settlement boundary will become worse than expanding into the green space. Perhaps the policy should say 'Until it is judged impractical to meet the Waverley Local Plan allocation, the presumption is against' or some such wording.	Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains how the housing allocated to Haslemere can be built within the settlement boundaries as defined in the NP. Some windfall development such as that on large gardens or on sites outside the settlement boundaries are expected but there are also several large brownfield sites which will deliver significant amounts of housing.	
H1.2	If the housing need is not achieved then the land outside the boundary should be used to meet the numbers. I support the concept of resumption against the development of land that lies outside the settlement boundaries. However, there is land that falls outside both the settlement area and AONB (plus other special definitions). How is that land treated?	As all of the land outside the settlement boundaries is designated Green Belt or Countryside beyond the Green Belt the use of this land is restricted by the National Planning Policy Framework.	
H1.2	If we are to be true to the vision of protecting "what is best about the town and its surrounding environments" clearly this is our green spaces and specifically areas designated as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and these should be protected at all costs.	Noted	
	I support this fully. However, as stated in the opportunities section, HV and HTC should prepare fall back plans, for consultation with the community, for which sites outside the settlement boundary might be acceptable, for what type of development, to meet the 990 units needed if this need could not be met inside the settlement boundary	Haslemere Settlement Boundaries and windfall topic paper explains how the housing allocated to Haslemere can be built within the settlement boundaries as defined in the NP. However, WBC is allocating sites for development to meet the 990 housing target and will consult on their proposals in the Local Plan Part 2 consultation.	
H1.2	If a development of a single family home can be proven to be environmentally restorative and 100% sustainable in energy terms then in some instances this should be allowable	Policy H3 encourages more sustainable building materials and designs for development outside the settlement boundaries which is thus within the Green Belt or Countryside beyond the Green Belt.	
H1.2	This policy is disingenuous in the extreme. It purports to against development of land that lies outside the settlement boundaries while allowing it to go ahead if WBC approves it. It is not realistic to prevent housing development outside settlement boundaries when they are suitable opportunities. Sites should be assessed on merit and not governed by restrictive policies that inhibit delivery. I consider it is possible to sympathetically develop green spaces outside of the boundaries if required, taking we are blessed with so many green spaces locally.	If sites outside the settlement boundaries are allocated by WBC then the NP cannot prevent their development. However, in order to allocate sites, WBC will consult on Local Plan Part 2 so that the community can express their views on the site allocations. The settlement boundaries in LPP2 will be altered if necessary so that allocated sites are not outside the settlement boundaries.	
H1.2	We must preserve Haslemere's green space and avoid urban sprawl.		
H1.2	It is vital to protect the green spaces. However, it is also vital to protect the area inside the settlement boundaries against overdevelopment. Haslemere does not need any new buildings over 2 storeys high, they would not be in keeping with the area and they would destroy the charm of the area.	Many respondents to consultations have supported increasing densities on brownfield sites to protect the designated land that surrounds the town. Increasing densities is likely to result in some buildings being built at more than 2 storeys but this will occur where it fits appropriately with the surrounding buildings.	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.3	Summary of survey results - Only 29.06% fully supported the policy (413 respondents). 183 comments were received to the survey on policy H1.3.	After consideration of all consultation responses this policy was removed. A selection of the comments are included here.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Please see my previous response. If an excellent proposal comes up for an AONB or AGLV site it should be considered, providing there is great sensitivity in the architectural, landscaping and ecological aspects of the plan. It could enhance the town/ local community. So many people want to feel that they are almost living in the countryside, whilst also having pedestrian/ cycling/ personal transport access to the town's facilities.	The NPPF protects the AONB and allows development only in exceptional circumstances. Policy H3 relates to building sustainably on such land should the exceptional circumstances be met.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	AONB and AGLV should never be used for new development projects, even if the housing number threshold is not achieved in already defined settlement boundaries. There should never be even the smallest chance for development to ruin the stunning country-side that attracts people to Haslemere and continues to make it a beautiful place to live and visit.	The NPPF protects the AONB and allows development only in exceptional circumstances. Policy H3 relates to building sustainably on such land should the exceptional circumstances be met.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	This policy is a very thin long wedge that plays to the developers game plan. AONB and AGLV areas should be off limits to any development, otherwise what is the point of having AONB and AGLV areas in the first place. Predicting housing need is just guess work at best. There should be some legal tool to force development of existing planning permissions granted but not built. If developers claim they will not make enough money if forced to develop existing permissions then they should have the permission cancelled or give it up and let somebody do the development. Granted permissions should also be time limited if implementation of construction is not commenced within the limited time frame. Developers should have to shoulder a lot more financial risk for their plans and not use AONB and AGLV land as a soft quick buck solution. Waverley need a lot more backbone on this issue !		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	No, I do not support this policy - I would like to see this policy removed as I see no value in including it. It could be misconstrued as supporting building on AONB land, which goes against the intent of Policy H1 "To preserve areas of high landscape quality, in particular AONB/AGLV sites ".		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	The focus should be in triggering improved incentives to get the development we need where we want it (brownfield, in-fill, change of use, near town centre) - not to relax the rules. If developers know they can just wait for the rules to be relaxed to build on AONB/AGLV land, they will do.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Build higher density within the boundary offering flats to fulfil the quota. Not at the expense of other valuable assets to community life or the town becomes a dormitory with fewer job opportunities. But housing where people could walk to their employment		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	I support the statement that development should not normally be permitted on AONB or AGLV sites. I am concerned that H1.3 will allow development on such areas. A clause should be added saying the council must give detailed reasons why sufficient houses within the settlement areas have not be delivered including details of numbers of applications and reasons for rejection.		Policy H1.3 removed

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.3	<p>The definition of formal settlement boundaries referred to in Policy H 1.1 offers an opportunity to recast Policy H 1.3 in a less controversial and more flexible way. This is considered preferable to the current wording for the following reasons: 1. The NPPF confers on AONB the highest state of protection against development. This was confirmed by Mr Justice Holgate’s ruling in the High Court (QBD Planning Court on 24/07/2019). 2. Non-designated land not so protected and adjacent to the H 1.1. boundaries may be more suitable for development. 3. The reference to the Local Plan Part 2 is inappropriate. This is a separate policy document, yet to be agreed and still subject to a separate public consultation. 4. The inclusion of Table I in a Policy declaration is inappropriate. This subject is better placed in Section 4 Monitoring the Plan. 5. In view of the forecasted “unprecedented” recession it is highly likely that both progress on new developments and demand will be severely limited. A full recovery to “normal” rates of development and demand could take years. In this situation a measure in 2023 of progress towards the 2032 target would be highly premature and unnecessary. Furthermore, the 2032 target is likely to need rescheduling. Proposed Restatement of the Policy H 1.3 Whilst acknowledging that the NPPF affords protection to AONB against development and notwithstanding Policy 1.2, some limited development outside the settlement boundaries may become necessary. This will only be permitted if WBC has demonstrated that the overall housing provision is not otherwise achievable over the Neighbourhood Plan period having exhausted all development opportunities inside the settlement boundary and taking into account reasonable estimates of the future rates of development opportunities on allocated and anticipated windfall development sites.</p>	See comments above	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	<p>I support this policy but it should not have the caveat "However, the Neighbourhood Plan recognises it may be necessary to allocate one or more sites that include land designated as AONB or AGLV, outside the Settlement Boundaries defined in this neighbourhood Plan. In my opinion, there should be NO development on areas outside the Settlement Boundary. I realise that this consultation is only dealing with Haslemere but, as a point of principle, ALL brownfield sites within Waverley Borough, not just Haslemere, should be developed before any consideration is given to using greenfield sites.</p>		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	<p>I think the policy should prevent development of designated AONB except for exceptional circumstances. The policy needs to be specific otherwise developers will find a way around it</p>		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	<p>Land designated as AONB or AGLV should be protected from development. Otherwise, once one site is approved for development, a precedent is set and more development will follow.</p>		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	<p>For the avoidance of doubt development outside the settlement boundary and on AONB/AGLV designated land should be avoided and most certainly in unit numbers greater than say 10.</p>		Policy H1.3 removed

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.3	I think the use of milestones is artificial and can allow development by the backdoor just because a target was missed, only to be met a short time later.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Prioritise developments of brownfield sites, in fill land and land of lesser landscape or ecological value, without lowering the hurdles to development on greenfield AONB and AGLV land either inside or outside the settlement boundary.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	We support the intention that "Development should not normally be permitted on AONB or AGLV sites". We believe this reinforces the case for consistency in the way the settlement boundary is drawn (Policy H1.1) and the need to distinguish between AONB/AGLV land and other green spaces in Policy H1.2. It would follow that WBC should delay allocating any AONB/AGLV sites in its forthcoming Local Plan Part 2 and should bring them forward for consideration only after other, less protected sites have been exhausted.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	I appreciate the severe constraints on availability of suitable sites in Haslemere but I do not agree that the Plan should consider allocations in the AONB or AGLV even in the limited circumstances indicated in Policy H1.3. Meeting a need in the circumstances outlined in the policy cannot be justified as exceptional circumstances for the purposes of the NPPF paragraph 172. It would also be contrary to the Waverley Local plan and the Surrey Hills Management Plan. I would therefore consider reducing the H1.3 policy statement to 'Development should not normally be permitted on AONB or AGLV sites'. This should be regardless of whether such a site lies inside or outside the settlement boundary. The caveats included in the rest of the policy statement that relate to what should happen if the delivery of homes falls short could perhaps then be linked instead to Policy H1.2		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	All brownfield sites to be developed in the first instance		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Why are you opening up opportunities for developers to make more profit. Simply state that AONB and AGLV sites will not be developed. If development is not taking place at the required rate, why should developers benefit and the town suffer? Simply have a review as to why development is not as quick as required and go forward.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	I think the policy is very sensible but disagree with the numbers presented. We have twenty years in total to meet the target of 990. This is circa 50 per annum, so by 2018 we only needed to have achieved some 250-300 sites. I don't see why the fact we have achieved more than this should mean we set higher targets for the future. I think a more reasonable approach would be set targets linearly, as below. 2013 - 50 2018 - 297 2023 - 545 2028 - 792 2032 - 990 Otherwise we risk being deemed to have failed to reach our goals when we are already ahead	The policy was removed because it was not supported by the community in their consultation responses.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	There should be even greater emphasis on protecting the landscape so that this caveat is very difficult to trigger and is subject to prioritising the use of brownfield sites outside the Boundary. Accept higher density development in the town centre - in order to support the Settlement Boundary's limit on development in AONB and AGLV.		Policy H1.3 removed

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.3	Given that we appear to be entering a severe recession, we may well see building stall over the next two or three years and the target for 2023 may well not be met. It would be unfortunate if that failure to meet an intermediate target were to trigger the building on AONB or AGLV sites. Once that has been done, it cannot be undone! I propose that the target for 2023 be deleted, and a more mature assessment of the situation made in 2028.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	The policy should define what the "Housing Numbers Threshold Achieved" means. I think it should refer to housing permissions granted rather than houses delivered (ie: built). Suggest that this policy starts off by saying "As Waverley Borough Council's Local Plan Part 2 has not yet been adopted, it is possible that sites outside the settlement boundary, defined in this Neighbourhood Plan, could be allocated for development in the future." Change the first sentence to say "normally permitted outside the settlement boundary" and remove "that include land designated as AONB or AGLV" This will protect green belt, AONB and AGLV by treating any allocated sites thereon as reserve sites and will remove all references to AONB/AGLV	The policy was removed because it was not supported by the majority of the community in their consultation responses.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	All land outside the Settlement Boundary should be sacrosanct and must not be developed unless it is classed as a brownfield site or is of low quality for wildlife or ecological balance and only when all other opportunities are exhausted. Higher density developments should be enforced to meet the need where these are within the zone from the station ensuring a vibrant town centre.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Because Waverley Council has systematically failed to produce good housing outcomes: architecturally, in numbers and quality of dwellings, in the use of brownfield sites for new homes, in mandating energy performance standards in keeping with government commitments on climate change, and has failed to protect the biodiversity of its region - without systemic change within the Council - it is hard to imagine that the systems they have in place will deliver better outcomes - or that they will direct the resources required to explore all avenues before considering building on AONB / AGLV land. It should be stated that there be a strict presumption on the use of brownfield sites or other viable non-protected land over any AGLV/AONB to give developers clearer guidance.	The NPPF protects the AONB and allows development only in exceptional circumstances.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	I do not support this policy with the wording as it is currently framed by the question about question H 1.3 However, with tighter wording I would accept it with some reservations. Whilst it is important to be thoughtful and pragmatic in taking a position on the potential for building outside the settlement boundary, I would wish to see a statement that committed to the principle, should this eventuality arise, that brownfield and areas of lesser ecological value were targeted for development first, prior to any consideration being given to AGLV and AONB, in that order. If the Plan intends to hold itself up as community-led, given that the community has expressed its wish to protect its green spaces, then it is important for the Plan to ensure that the town's precious green spaces are not offered up this way like 'aces' to developers without adequate protections in place.	The policy was removed because it was not supported by the majority of the community in their consultation responses.	Policy H1.3 removed

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	This question suggests that this policy be in place because development may be inevitable on AONB/AGLV. I would support this policy allowing for a case to be made for building outside the boundary under such circumstances if it explicitly stated that brownfield and other developable land be built on as a priority inside or outside the boundary as a priority. The policy should state its commitment to achieve the housing target by constructing on brownfield, in-fill and land of lesser ecological value as a priority, inside or outside the boundary, considering all reasonable alternative developable sites outside of the AONB/AGLV. This question suggests that the policy doesn't make a distinction between all these other types of land, and protected land. However this policy should.		
H1.3	H1.3 - States that AONB land may be required to be built on. I strongly disagree with this policy as we must protect AONB land for future generations. Allegedly, this statement has been included to facilitate the proposed Red Court development which is very disappointing and suggests collusion with the Red Court developers	The policy was developed independently without consideration for any developer interests and based on policies applied by other local authorities.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	There are a number of undeveloped sites available which have not been developed-it would be inappropriate to develop on AONB or AGLV sites whilst this situation persists-Constraint on other sites should make these more attractive to develop.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	It may be better to reclassify AONB and/or AGLV before allowing sites to be developed in these areas. That is, default is never to permit sites to be developed in AONB & AGLV. A consultation process should precede reclassification of these areas		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Fully accept that more houses needed including affordable, but would like to see development opportunities in the town centre optimised (eg large area occupied by the fire station which logically should be nearer the A3, the vast BT building and the Kia garage which looks completely out of place.)		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	This H1.3 narrative needs strengthening. As written it will all too easily allow potential developers to claim an 'exception/ exemption'. The para should start : ' Development should not be permitted on AONB/AGLV sites and will not be necessary to achieve the stipulated housing targets given the extent of existing brownfield sites within Haslemere. However, if there was an unavoidable shortfall, recognised as such by Haslemere Council and the relevant planning authorities, it may be necessary as a last resort to consider an area outside the settlement boundary, with priority to using a brownfield site.' The other factor which needs to be spelled out is the strong case for higher density builds on existing sites in Haslemere town. Such dwellings would be invaluable in enabling younger less financially strong working families to stay in or move to Haslemere.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	I would investigate other options such as expanding the higher density limit of 1km from the station. Perhaps there could be flexibility within the defined settlement boundary to increase density where appropriate outside the 1km limit but still within the defined settlement boundary and leaving our AONB land protected in line with its exceptional status.	To encourage higher densities the following wording has been added to H1.5 (new H2) "Development proposals that optimise the use of land shall be supported."	Policy H1.3 removed Density policy (new H2) wording added

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.3	Do not build on AONB. we as a town are known for these areas and it would be very disappointing to have a major development in these areas		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	AONB and AGLV sites should never be developed. We should protect them for following reasons: Development should only be on areas which are NOT beautiful. Why destroy beauty? visual and spiritual wellbeing vital especially in current climate. Climate change dictates that our land should be preserved where possible and most of our surrounding countryside has mixed or ancient woodland: vital for reducing excess of CO2. Most developments in Haslemere do not provide realistic affordable housing. They do not enrich the town in any way. Too many cars already and unnecessary development creates more concrete, more congestion, more parking problems and is destructive to our environment.	The NPPF protects the AONB and allows development only in exceptional circumstances. Policy H3 relates to building sustainably on such land should the exceptional circumstances be met.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	I fully support the policy but worry how it can best be delivered and by whom given the long timescales. With piecemeal development ongoing, how do we identify the criteria to decide at any specific point in time that the development rate is (or is not) being met?	The policy was removed because it was not supported by the majority of the community in their consultation responses.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Sympathetic development should be allowed if justified by the circumstances whether or not the proposed targets are being met.	The policy was removed because it was not supported by the majority of the community in their consultation responses.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	AONB AGLV only permitted if submitted to those in the locality and a majority approve.	The NPPF protects the AONB and allows development only in exceptional circumstances.	Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	AONB and AGLV is protected for a reason. Developers will always find ways of bending the rules or proposing 'gifts in kind' to justify development		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	I would prefer AONB and AGLV to be left intact at all cost. Our green natural areas define Haslemere and I would love future generations to have the benefit of these too.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	Failure to develop windfall sites is driven by economics; developers will always take cheap green space over brownfield sites - especially when the green space is adjacent to existing infra structure. Policy should expressly prohibit practice of profit over environment. Sorry but extremely skeptical about policy that gives developers an out - it really needs to make using green space the very last resort - no choice, no excuses. If its left open the space will go.		Policy H1.3 removed
H1.3	It seems Haslemere will meet its housing numbers through windfall sites. I would say only have housing in AONB or AGLV in exceptional circumstances and as a last resort. These areas are so special and we need to commit to protecting them.		Policy H1.3 removed

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.4	I would not want planners to forget that the proportion of over 75s is soon going to comprise 14% of the town's population. Thus consideration needs to be given to the increasing numbers of people who will be using walking aids, wheelchairs and possibly personal motorised buggies. The implications of these in each new development are : - there needs to be covered storage for buggies with electrical charging points; - flats need lifts / elevators or otherwise stairlifts for such people; - some town footpaths need to be wider, to accommodate people who have mobility problems and mobility aids of one sort or another, alongside the rest of the general public, who are often in a hurry and some of whom become impatient when around slow elderly people; - outside seating needs to be provided here and there, and not just at bus stops, so that the elderly can have a sit down and rest if needed, whilst shopping, 'running' errands or taking their daily exercise/ constitutional!	Only some of this can be achieved by the Neighbourhood Plan. Refer to H9 Access and Transport policy and H8 Consultation Requirements.	
H1.4	Haslemere town shouldn't be altered too much; certainly not into a large town.	Noted	
H1.4	I feel very strongly that my comments should not be misrepresented. I only support the development on brown field sites, nowhere else. I also feel that we need to make sure that we have sufficient amenities to support the additional households (such as water, road infrastructure, doctored, school). Not for the first time, Thames Water is struggling to provide sufficient water for the community currently living in Haslemere so adding to it would put unsustainable pressure on our community.	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot stop development on greenfield sites if they meet the exceptions within the NPPF. Policy H7 requires consideration to be given to ensuring new development is "not compromising the ability of the local infrastructure to support it". Based on a consultation response from Thames Water a new policy H10 has been added relating to water and wastewater infrastructure.	
H1.4	I support the policy subject to the community being consulted where the development is for more than 10 units	Policy H8 <i>Consultation requirements</i> now has 10 homes as the threshold	
H1.4	The settlement boundaries should never include AONB or AGLV land	There is no such land within the settlement boundaries set in policy H1.1 except for the Sturt Farm site which is within AONB but has <u>planning permission granted</u> .	
H1.4	Regarding Sturt Farm: If the present project does not proceed, the site should not be regarded as an approved site within the settlement boundary	As the site currently has planning permission it has been included within the settlement boundary.	
H1.4	Each site should be consider individually with an explicit number of dwellings the plan is looking for to achieve the housing allocation for the area. Also each site should have conditions in the plan to keep buildings of interest or replace community facilities elsewhere if they are being removed to make way for housing.	Development sites are not being allocated in the Neighbourhood plan. It is Waverley's responsibility to allocate sites in Local Plan part 2.	
H1.4	Plans should be supported but subject to procedural sign off to ensure that things are not shoehorned through automatically. A blanket support would allow totally unacceptable developments, purely to get the figures right. Subject to full consideration and appreciation of the impact on surrounding residents in all matters including traffic, aesthetic and residential amenity impact The elephant in the room of course is "Which are the Approved Sites? Who is approving them? How will I know which site is approved.? Shouldn't the approved sites be shown here?	Site will be allocated in LPP2 but developers will still need to apply for planning permission. Policy H8 requires consultation with the local community for all major development (10 or more homes). Waverley will consult on the sites proposed for allocation in LPP2 in November 2020.	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.4	I would only support development within the EXISTING Formal Settlement Boundaries. I would NOT support any development nor any movement of the EXISTING Formal Settlement Boundaries.	Noted	
H1.4	There needs to be protection of community buildings/amenity space. Why is there no provision for developers to be required to replace equivalent/equal size land/buildings to replace any lost amenity buildings or public open space.	Policy H7.2 requires developers to add green space where the National Green Space Standards are not met. Policy H8 requires consultation with the local community for all major development (10 or more homes).	
H1.4	This is a leading question and relies too heavily on people understanding of a long and complex policy AGLV and AONB land should not be built on.	If sites are allocated in LPP2 the Neighbourhood Plan cannot prevent their development.	
H1.4	The NP must be in conformity with the Local Plans and emerging LPP2. Many of the brownfield sites being promoted within the NP area do not meet Government 'deliverable' tests and are largely aspirational (Fairground site, Youth Campus site). I do not want Haslemere to lose valuable car parking or retail/commercial sites. Or the fire station - with climate change increasing temperatures and our surrounding area made up of woodland it would be folly to close this facility.	Noted	
H1.4	The nature of all developments must be carefully considered. They must fit in with the nature of the existing town.	Policy H7 requires development to comply with the Haslemere Design Statement.	
H1.4	Developers must be strictly regulated and create green areas , wildlife habitat etc . Not simply for profit.	Policy H7.2 requires developers to add green space where the National Green Space Standards are not met. Policy H14 requires developers to protect and enhance Haslemere's Ecological Network.	
H1.4	Developments on brownfield sites should not reduce quality of life for existing surrounding homes, and should be built to enhance the area, adding green space and further tree cover	Policy H7.2 requires developers to add green space where the National Green Space Standards are not met. H11 requires developers to protect and enhance the trees and hedgerows on development sites.	
H1.5	Summary of survey results - There were 164 survey comments on this policy.	Policy H1.5 now policy H2 The context and reasoned justification has been enhanced and additional wording added to the policy.	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.5	<p>To put this policy in context, it would, for example, require a minimum of 42 dwellings to be built on the Heights site rather than the 25 that the developer is currently seeking permission to build. I would consider that this policy should be amended so that it takes into account the topography of the land, the character of the area, as well as considering the interaction with existing policies such as the Haslemere Hillside policy.</p> <p>This is very a blunt statement, not all 1 hectare sites are square and flat and suitable for 75 dwellings. Each site should be assessed individually, some will be on steep hillsides, have poor access etc. I strongly disagree with this aim, again lack of flexibility is wrong. You cannot have a blanket rule like this.</p> <p>There needs to be a more nuanced approach- while I fully support the principle of a far higher density within close proximity of the station and town centre, I believe there should be some flexibility to take account of topography, character of the surrounding buildings etc.</p>	<p>Additional wording has been added to the density policy to state that it should be applied subject to achieving high quality design and being fit for the site's setting and topography. The policy has more flexibility allowing developers to demonstrate how development at lower than the required densities is the optimum use of the land.</p> <p>The policy has been separated out (previously H1.5 now H2) and more detail added to the context and reasoned justification. The NP policies do not replace local plan policies and so the Haslemere Hillside policy and Conservation area policy apply in the relevant areas.</p>	<p>Policy wording amended. More detailed Context and Reasoned Justification.</p>
H1.5	<p>Can't have a blanket policy like this, each site should be looked at and assessed individually. That's what the planning office's role is. This statement should be altered considerably</p> <p>The 1km is too strict and there are lots of hills and small roads near the station and in the centre of town which may not make development of this density suitable.</p> <p>It is OK but I have some reservations - I agree that there should be different levels of housing densities, however, the distance of 1km would present challenges given the nature of Haslemere's hills, which would mean housing densities of 75 dph could not always be achieved. Instead, I suggest amending this policy to define the area for 75 dph based on roads.</p>	<p>See comment above</p>	
H1.5	<p>If, in order to achieve this buildings need to become higher, with more floors, this will not always fit in with the local vernacular. Another potential problem with increasing density is that flats, maisonettes and terrace houses etc will have increasingly small rooms, including tiny kitchens and 'bathrooms', with less and less storage space, making life very difficult sometimes, especially when two or more people are attempting to live together.</p>	<p>A Regulation 14 neighbourhood plan had a policy to require application of the Nationally Described Space standards, however, such a policy can only be included in the Local Plan. Waverley's LPP2 should include such a policy.</p>	
H1.5	<p>Hardly anyone commutes on the train any more. This is not a temporary blip. The assumption that people will be getting trains to work is now fundamentally flawed. Much better to expand into some more salubrious parts of Haslemere & preserve central Haslemere's character than to build 75 dwellings per ha, how can that meet the architectural requirements?</p>	<p>The 1km of the station criteria has been used as the station is a clearly defined point that is between the two centres of the town – High St/West Street and Wey Hill. Consideration was given to using a "walking time" criteria but it is harder to define and reproduce.</p>	<p>Information added to context and reasoned justification.</p>

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	Clarification needed on walking distance from the station, bearing in mind the topography of the town. If the station is the main target there needs some emphasis on the quantity of trains to transport these extra residents.		
H1.5	The proposed radius measured from the station is arbitrary, implying as it does, that the most likely inhabitants of the new developments will be commuters. It makes no sense to risk spoiling the character of already built areas of the town which have lower building densities for the sake of attracting commuters to the town. The 1km radius encompasses most of the town including districts outside the settlement area but excludes Critchmere, High Lane and Woolmer Hill where high densities already prevail. These should be added to the 75 dph area by name. A way to resolve this would be to add a condition that new site building densities should respect the current levels for the district in question. Proposed Restatement of Policy H 1.5 H1.5 Provided that the housing density of the proposed development is appropriate to the character of the surrounding area, all new developments of more than 10 dwellings should achieve a minimum of: > 75 dph within 1 kilometre of the station and at Critchmere, High Lane and Woolmer Hill. > 45 dph within the remaining areas	See above. The policy has been reworded. Developers are urged to make the optimum use of the land wherever it is located.	
H1.5	There should also be a maximum density consideration, especially further out to the edges of the settlement boundary, taking into consideration road use, utilities, availability of pavements etc.	Neighbourhood plan policies should encourage development rather than limit it. Policy H7 requires developers to consider the infrastructure impact of development.	
H1.5	I recognise that 75 dwellings per hectare within 1 kilometre of the station will be very demanding for both architects and planners but it can be achieved elsewhere, so there's no reason why it cannot be achieved here. The community needs more 'affordable' housing and social housing and this will be one way of achieving it.	Noted	
H1.5	It is preposterous to propose a blanket one size fits all policy with regard to number of dwellings per hectare. Every application, no matter the size of development, should take into account many factors before development could be considered. Character of the area, topography, appropriate access particularly in winter, volumes of traffic, on street parking and significant disturbance to existing properties should all be carefully considered before any development takes place. Other considerations are necessary too, such as sufficient school places and medical facilities.	Changes have been made to this policy. Parking issues are covered by policy H 9 Access and Transport and H7 requires consideration to be given to infrastructure requirements.	
H1.5	I think the density should also apply to smaller developments (e.g. smaller than 10 dwellings).	The 10 dwelling criteria has been used consistently throughout the Plan as this is the amount that is considered major development by WBC.	
H1.5	I do not want Haslemere's central area to be dominated by four story blocks of flats which would be totally over-bearing and out of character with its market-town heritage. Similarly, too low a density of housing on peripheral areas may not maximise use of scarce land opportunities. Every site should be considered individually and these limits are too restrictive.	The policy has been redrafted to provide some flexibility whilst encouraging the optimum use of land to be made.	Policy amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H1.5	The approved sites proposed within the settlement boundaries should have individual densities set that will go towards achieving the housing need and with a density that is in keeping with the surrounding dwellings. This policy is lazy and just a broad brush. The main sites for potential development in Haslemere are already known.	Waverley are allocating sites in LPP2 and will outline proposed densities at that time. This policy sets expected minimum densities that developers should aim to achieve.	
H2		This policy has been removed and wording added to H1.2 recognising acceptance of development on previously built land outside the settlement boundary.	H2 deleted, Policy H1.2 amended
H2	<p>The blanket 40% rule makes it very difficult for houses that were built over 100 years ago to be made into family homes. One person's 40% increase is another's 100% increase in actual size based on the original house and this is unjust. Decisions should be made on a case by case basis for private residential developments, to avoid developers knocking down older houses to rebuild bigger ones than they are allowed under this regulation, so defeating the object.</p> <p>Waverley fail to implement the existing 40% policy (too many exemption) what hope is there of sticking to this policy in the future.</p> <p>Important to ensure that a combination of subdivision and extensions does not result in overdevelopment of sites</p> <p>Agree on this clause as all brownfield site outside the Settlement Boundary should be used before green fields Remove the limit of 40% if the development creates more dwellings, rather than increase single dwelling.</p>	This policy has been changed to remove the percentage limit as the NPPF includes provisions limiting the size of extensions to buildings in the Green Belt.	H2 deleted, Policy H1.2 amended
H2	<p>I feel very strongly that brown field sites should be developed before green field sites, this policy should be prefaced by the statement that existing built up land will be prioritised over protected land- AONB/AGLV. I am not sure what 'minimises' visual impact on the neighbouring countryside means? This needs to be strengthened.</p> <p>Question H 2 is framed by the statement which addresses development outside the settlement boundary on "existing built land". Subdivision or a modest redevelopment is permitted under this Plan principle. It does not specify whether this land might be AONB/AGLV. It should be more specific as it is too open to interpretation and could be construed as including AONB/AGLV. Brownfield or existing built land outside the Settlement Boundary must be prioritised for development. AONB/AGLV on principle should be protected, especially green spaces which contain wildlife corridors and are habitats for wildlife and biodiversity.</p>	This policy has been removed and wording added to H1.2 recognising acceptance of development on previously built land outside the settlement boundary.	H2 deleted, Policy H1.2 amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H2	<p>There should not be development outside settlement boundary otherwise a precedent will be set to thereafter build on this protected land.</p> <p>If there is a lot of land, as there tends to be with properties outside the boundary, this seems to not permit any building on it at all. Is that really fair? Nice for those members of the Haslemere community who don't actually want to be impacted by the plan, hard for the rest of us though.</p> <p>I don't believe development in green belt is acceptable.</p> <p>Support this policy particularly for brownfield sites or if genuinely affordable housing is a consideration.</p>	<p>There are exceptions within the NPPF that permit development on Green Belt and AONB.</p>	
H2	<p>I have concerns about the sub-division of existing buildings without specific restrictions due to the increased number of cars etc. If a building is split in 2 dwellings that might be fine, but to split it into 4 dwellings might not. I suggest a maximum number of dwellings for both a subdivision or a redevelopment is specified.</p>	<p>Policy H9 Access and Transport addresses parking issues.</p>	
H2	<p>This is a challenge as an owner may wish to redevelop a small bungalow on a large plot to accommodate for a growing family but the resultant house under this policy would not be large enough to accommodate for the family. This could prevent new families moving into the area or young families (such as my own) unable to scale their homes to a suitable size as children get older. For example, we are a family of 5 in a 1,500sqft house on a plot of in excess of 1.5acres but to be able to increase to only 2,100 sqft would not give us the size that we need.</p>	<p>Restrictions on the scale of the development have been removed but the NPPF does limit the size of redevelopment in Green Belt and AONB.</p>	
H2	<p>Good policy</p>		
H2	<p>As I mentioned earlier, there is a great variety in areas outside the settlement boundary. I think these rules are broadly sensible but I'm not sure they should apply as a blanket, for example, on a brownfield site.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended and only applies to development on previously built land. Any other development would need to meet the exceptions within the NPPF para 145 or 172</p>	
H2	<p>Any such development should not have a negative impact on wildlife habitats, corridors and stepping stones (H.11and 14) and dark skies (H.12).</p>	<p>All of the Neighbourhood Plan policies must be considered when a planning application is made.</p>	
H3	<p>Fundamentally ALL new buildings should be built incorporating solar power with battery storage, some sort of heat pump system, rain water collection etc... all possible eco friendly systems involved</p>		
H3	<p>NPPF states that AONB/AGLV land is afforded protection from development. This policy effectively gives the green light to any developer who can claim to construct high quality buildings or provide net biodiversity gain. Developers are extremely skilled in claiming to enhance biodiversity with spurious hedge planting/copse creations/nesting boxes etc in order to present themselves as 'green'. I am extremely concerned that given the strength of community desire to preserve the protected landscapes outside the settlement boundary and on designated sites, that this will be seen as a loophole just waiting to be exploited. Protected land outside the settlement boundary should not be traded off in this way.</p>	<p>There are exceptions within the NPPF and Local Plan policy that permit development on AONB, AGLV and Green Belt. The NP cannot prohibit development on this type of land so requirements for more sustainable development in these areas should development occur were deemed appropriate.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	<p>I don't think there should be building outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>I think that all housing developments in Haslemere should meet sustainable living standards, no-matter whether they are to be built inside or outside of the settlement boundary. Additionally, there should not be an assumption that building will be carried out outside the settlement boundary and on the natural environment aimed to be protected in this plan.</p> <p>There should be no circumstance whatsoever where the development of AONB or AGLV land is deemed acceptable. I fundamentally disagree with this approach (as do the government with their policy on development) so this element of the local plan must be reconsidered and an alternative solution found</p> <p>I agree with all the subsections of H.3 but I do not agree that there should be any new development outside the Settlement Boundary.</p>	<p>LPP2 will set additional sustainability standards.</p>	
H3	<p>Genuinely affordable housing should be required to meet the above requirements and not excepted from any of them.</p>	<p>The policy no longer addresses the relaxation of the policy rules for community led affordable housing developments since the planning balance for considering community-led housing already allows flexibility in considering the effect of Policy H3.</p>	
H3	<p>I would suggest referencing the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan which is a formally adopted Plan and a material consideration and includes policies relevant to the intentions behind the Haslemere NP.</p>	<p>Information added to the Context and Reasoned Justification.</p>	
H3	<p>If this land is used, a higher density than 45 dph should be achieved to maximise the benefit of the use of the land. Social housing and affordable homes should a priority for this type of land above high priced large dwellings. Council housing and rented dwellings should also be priorities.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
H3	<p>I think some of this could be a bit stronger in terms of environmental protection/embedding of best practises around ecologically sensitive developments.</p>	<p>Policy H11 Trees, woodland and hedgerows and H14 Protecting and enhancing Haslemere Ecological Network have been amended to provide more clarity.</p>	
H3	<p>I agree that all building on AONB/AGLV should adhere to these high standards but feel it should be made clear that this should only happen in exceptional circumstances. Building on the ANOB/AVLG should be only be considered in extreme circumstances and if it has to be considered it need to be treated very carefully and not have similar rules applied as with brownfield sites within the settlement boundary.</p>	<p>Information added to the Context and Reasoned Justification</p>	
H3	<p>These guiding principles should be applied to ALL development not just those in AONB or AGLV as it will help ensure only high quality design and materials are used, and that environmental considerations are of paramount concern.</p>	<p>It would be preferable but there are concerns about the viability of applying these standards to brownfield sites. The residual land value in the WBC Viability Study (June 2017) was £1.86 m per ha for greenfield land versus £3.38m for brownfield.</p>	
H3	<p>This question rolls together the concept of best practise in development inside and outside the boundary with the assumption, inherent in its statement, that building on</p>	<p>Policy wording changed to "Proposals for development on previously developed land outside the settlement boundaries or on land</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	<p>AONB/AGLV is an acceptable premise. It nudges the respondent into accepting this premise. This means that a respondent keen to see good sustainable building standards is nudged towards answering 'Yes', or 'OK'. To nudge respondents into accepting this as a basis to develop protected AONB/AGLV without any conditions attached, namely that all available brownfield, in-fill and other developable sites must be built on as a priority, goes against the principle stated at the outset, that the Neighbourhood Plan has been established to reflect the wishes of the Haslemere community as to what kind of development they favour, when the majority clearly expressed the view that they do not want large-scale developments on AONB/AGLV outside the settlement boundary. This question is designed to obtain a tacit approval for building on AONB/AGLV with the lure of offering 'sustainable' building practises. These principles for sustainable building are fairly standard and should be applied where appropriate to all development in Haslemere, not singled out in this question to elicit support for building on AONB/AGLV.</p>	<p>designated as within AONB, AGLV, Green Belt or Countryside beyond the Green Belt which satisfy a recognized exception to planning policy..”</p>	
H4		<p>Policy H4 now policy H8 Title changed to “Consultation requirements for planning applications”</p>	
H4	<p>Setting the number of houses at 50 is too high, for Haslemere this is a large development. This policy leaves itself open to any developer applying for 49 homes. The consultation requirements should apply to any development of 15 homes or more.</p> <p>Public consultation is a vital part of development, especially in a small town like Haslemere. I would like to see public consultation on projects of 10 or more dwellings considering that your proposed policy without amendments would mean that even 49 dwellings could be built without a public consultation process.</p> <p>While I agree with the sentiment I cannot support this Policy unless the wording is changed. Given that the context to this Policy states "The WBC Local Requirements list states that for applications of 10 or more dwellings", this figure of 10 dwellings should be applied to this Policy wording rather than 50.</p>	<p>Many consultation responses stated that requiring a development brief for developments of 50 or more homes was too high. The policy was therefore amended to set the criteria as major development which is 10 or more homes.</p>	<p>Policy amended (now policy H8)</p>
H4	<p>All a bit tick box and apple pie. If developers conform to this is should be much more legally binding and very hard to vary. Too many examples recently of get the sign off then come back with with a totally changed plan/ design.</p>	<p>Additional policy provisions included for outline planning permissions</p>	<p>Policy amended</p>
H4	<p>What about schooling, health and community provisions? If there are going to be extra housing and hence families how is the town going to cope? Plan needs to include details on how are these changes to the town are going to be dealt with.</p> <p>What about consultation on pressure on local schools, medical services and train ?</p>	<p>Policy wording added to require the development brief to include details of the consideration and mitigation of any infrastructure issues raised by the proposed development</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H4	<p>Re: point iii. Properties further than 500 metres should also be given copies of the development brief because they too will be affected and residents need to be made aware of what is proposed.</p> <p>PROTECT the countryside! Whilst there appears to be lots of broad brush considerations for various aspects of the community, there remains no consideration for the wider community for those that live beyond 500m of any proposed development though would still be affected. The Town of Haslemere would be impacted, the Town of Haslemere should be consulted. That said, however, whilst contacting the whole of the Town may not be practically achievable, it would be acceptable to me that those people within 1Km of any proposed development should be consulted.</p>	<p>The policy says the development brief should be advertised and made available to the wider community.</p>	
H4	<p>It seems outside the remit of the NP to set additional requirements as to how the planning process works rather than to set requirements on the nature of development.</p> <p>This imposes far too onerous a burden on developers. (Complex planning regulations are a major factor in keeping housing prices so high). Some of the detail in here is in any case already part of standard planning requirements, and so just unnecessary</p>	<p>Ascot, Sunninghill and Sunningdale have a similar policy on their Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The requirements do not exceed those of the Validation list but merely makes them more accessible to the community.</p>	
H4	<p>I'm in agreement with most of these points, except perhaps it should include on-line/social media methods of communications too</p>	<p>Information added to Context and Reasoned Justification.</p>	
H4	<p>Consider adding Tree Survey identifying any protected trees.</p> <p>Developers should be required to submit a tree and vegetation plan that was in place at the time of contract of purchase. This stops them buying the place and hacking all the trees and vegetation before submitting their development plans.</p> <p>I should like to see more about landscaping and retention of mature trees and shrubs. Too many modern developments are concrete deserts with hard standings and paviers everywhere. This is also very bad for drainage and water run-off.</p> <p>Require a minimum tree cover percentage and plan as to how this will be achieved</p>	<p>Policy wording added at viii</p>	
H4	<p>All this states is a process. There is no obligation for the developer to actually respond to consultation responses</p>	<p>Policy wording added details of " how any issues or concerns raised have been addressed in the proposals submitted."</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H5		Policy H5 is now policy H4	
H5	<p>provision for parking particularly in the town centre needs to be ensured and sufficient parking provision is maintained</p> <p>This policy relates to managing the volume of windfall developments ie. infilling, conversion of a dwelling into multiple units and conversion of retail or commercial space into flats. The windfall development that has occurred in the town centre recently has not required parking provision for those developments eg. flats above the former Barclays Bank and flats above Caracoli.</p> <p>Developments such as these either reduce space in the main Haslemere Car park for shoppers as some town centre residents have season tickets to park there or alternatively these developments lead to additional parking in nearby roads such as Hill Road and others in the HEMERA area. Since sole use parking provision is very rarely available in the town centre for this type of windfall development, the policy should require that additional parking availability must be introduced in the town centre BEFORE additional town centre windfall developments without sole parking provision are allowed.</p>	Policy H9 relates to parking for new developments.	
H5	<p>I understand the wish to protect the town from unbridled windfall developments on the one hand but note that on the other hand this type of development has been a substantial source of permitted housing at a rate of 41 dwellings pa recently and is popular with residents. In other words Windfalls alone have provided 80% of the overall average 50 dwellings pa required to fulfil the overall housing provision over the plan period. This, of course, is not surprising in a town heavily constrained by the nature of the topography and almost surrounded by designated land. I also note the intention to obtain Article 4 directions to protect the town centre (Policy H 17) so that full planning applications will be required for this class of development as it already is currently required for infilling and existing large dwelling conversion. So, in view of this protection, why is it considered necessary to manage the “volume” (Policy H5 title) or “the overall scale” of these developments? When: - There is clearly considerable scope for their provision from the town as built; - By their nature the “volume” available will tend to be self-limiting; - There is obviously a demand for housing of this type/price-point so provided; The dangers of “overdoing it”, which I share, can be guarded against by the planning permission process in which I have every faith. Finally, the provisor in the policy statement, namely, “demonstrate how they meet the housing needs of the local communityand those who work in the town” hopefully applies to all housing developments, it is therefore redundant. No one that I have spoken to wishes the town to grow by 990 dwellings in order to provide housing for commuters when we already have land constraints and problematic infrastructure concerns. Proposed Restatement of the Policy H 5 Because sufficient protection is already provided by the two requirements in the “arrowheads”. Truncate the proposed policy statement after the words “...will be supported.” by deleting the final sentence. For clarity, the policy should now state:- H 5 Planning applications for the development of windfall sites within the settlement boundaries (as defined by Figure 1 a c), -> which are consistent</p>	<p>Title of policy changed to remove the words “Managing the volume of..”</p> <p>Policy wording amended</p>	Policy wording amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	with development plan policies to deliver the mix, type and design of housing, and -> which are appropriate to the character of the area will be supported.		
H5	Very important to encourage more smaller properties	Noted	
H5	We need to be more flexible in permitting this type of development	Noted	
H5	There are no details for the provision of education, health and youth/community facilities for the extra people living in the town.	Additional information added to the Infrastructure part of the Haslemere Today section in Section 1 of the Plan.	
H5	<p>Must ensure not overly dense or crammed in. Nor too tall and overbearing, or out of keeping with surrounding properties.</p> <p>The must be appropriate for the area - some recent examples are totally out of keeping with the existing street scene.</p> <p>We should also say 'developments that protect the significance of heritage assets in the local area</p> <p>Buildings of architectural interest should also be considered, rather than being 'appropriate to the character of the area'</p>	<p>Policy H7 High quality external design states "recognising the scarcity of land within the area's settlement boundaries and fulfilling the intentions, regarding density, of Policy H 2 while avoiding overdevelopment of the plot in relation to the characteristics of neighbouring plots in respect of built form, massing and the building line."</p> <p>It also requires development to comply with the Haslemere Design Statement.</p>	
H5	Development of windfall sites should not become a one size fits all where minimum number of dwellings are developed without any regard for character of the area, topography of land, access, traffic volumes, lack of parking and disruption to existing dwellings.	These matters are considered in Policies H2 Housing Density, H7 High quality external design and H9 Access and Transport.	
H5	<p>The policy should require that additional parking availability must be introduced in the town centre before additional town centre windfall developments without sole parking provision are allowed.</p> <p>Windfall conversion to residential above retail/office premises in the town centre have been allowed without any sole use parking provision. Residents of these windfall developments either purchase season tickets for the town centre car park thereby reducing parking for shoppers or alternatively park 'on street' in residential roads causing significant congestion. The policy should be amended so that sole parking provision is required before any additional similar windfall development is allowed unless additional town centre parking provision is introduced.</p>	Policy H9.1 relates to sufficient parking for new housing.	
H5	I agree with these principles, particularly that new developments should be appropriate to the character of the area. However, I cannot see how this is achievable alongside policy H1.5 which sets the densities of new developments at 45 or 75 dph. In many areas of central Haslemere, these densities will be very harmful to the character of the area.	This policy has been amended to apply to 1-9 homes. The density policy applies to 10 or more homes.	Policy amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H5	<p>Windfall sites are determined by WBC and hence this policy should be amended accordingly. I agree that guiding principles should be consulted upon, so that any developments do follow strict criteria. It is misleading to give the impression that windfall sites will make up the majority of Haslemere's housing needs as they can only supply a limited and unknown quantity. They are also more likely to be provided in small numbers and are often self build and hence may not contribute to the Affordable homes quota or produce CIL contributions. There is a risk that they could also change the character of the town, increasing density and with garden infilling spoiling the frontage/garden of existing homes.</p>	<p>This policy provides guidance to WBC when determining planning applications for windfall sites. Historical rates should that windfall has provided a high proportion of the housing for the plan area. WBC will allocate sites in LPP2 which will also contribute significantly to meeting the housing target and ensuring affordable housing is supplied. CIL is now also due on all development even windfall.</p>	
H5	<p>This is a massive loophole that developers will exploit. Each development should be assessed on its own unique merits, not on the basis of "it's fine if there is a token nod to requirements listed above". It is alarming that "downsizing" here is seen as a key priority. This means the construction of vast blocks of flats in every available space right up to the boundaries of people's properties. There have been numerous examples of developers attempting this, using all manner of underhand tactics to achieve their desired outcome. This is a disastrous policy.</p>	<p>Planning applications are assessed against this policy along with all of the other policies in the plan. Policy H7 High quality external design states "recognising the scarcity of land within the area's settlement boundaries and fulfilling the intentions, regarding density, of Policy H 2 while avoiding overdevelopment of the plot in relation to the characteristics of neighbouring plots in respect of built form, massing and the building line."</p>	
H5	<p>This is unrealistic because windfall sites typically only deliver a small number of dwellings and by having this policy less windfall will be built. This policy will cause the economics of the build to be challenging and will mean the windfall sites will not deliver dwellings for the housing need. This in turn will put pressure on to build out side of the settlement boundary. There are no examples of windfall sites that have delivered affordable housing in the borough.</p>	<p>This policy does not discourage windfall and has been amended to apply to developments of 1-9 homes. The NPPF permits, in exceptional circumstances, development of green belt land for "limited affordable housing for local community needs".</p>	
H5	<p>There is a general assumption in some of the Plan that commuters are not of high priority in the town and that the bias should at all times be towards local workers. Whilst I agree that I would want those who work in the town to be able to live here, it should be borne in mind that Haslemere has grown up as a commuter town and a good deal of its prosperity, that feeds back into the retail and amenities of the town, is founded on commuter income.</p> <p>The plan should focus on attracting high-income residents as this is what allows Haslemere to thrive when compared to other towns.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6		H6.1 now policy H9	
H6.1	There is a need for more creative thinking around transport and active travel going forward post Covid there may be a significant shift in working patterns. The provision of off road parking provision can prohibit the creation of smaller, cheaper housing units in the town centre- there should not be a presumption of each dwelling requiring the provision of parking- occupants may choose not to own a private car, to use active travel, electric bikes or public transport, hire cars or use car share clubs. I am not sure how realistic stating that developments within 1km of the station can contribute to the improving the flow of all forms of transport in the vicinity of the station.	Comment noted.	
H6.1	Support all but all developments not just those over 50 dwellings should provide a travel plan.	Policy H4 (now H8) has been amended based on consultation feedback to require all developments of 10 or more homes to provide a Travel Plan.	Policy H4 (now H8) amended
H6.1	Additional people will need to transport themselves around so it is difficult to see how this can reduce traffic congestion.	Development concentrated in central areas (new policy numbers - H1.1 & H2) New policy number H9 (previously H6) focuses on facilitating active travel	
H6.1	This is all good but I would suggest that cycling routes and electric bikes get a little bit more consideration here: Line 4 • safe, directto existing pedestrian and cycle routes. Line 6 • safe accessiblefor cycles, with charging facilities for electric bikes. Isn't line 7 covered by the three lines above? And then widen the radius at line 8 to 1 mile.	H9.1 Requirements separated into storage, access and infrastructure provision. Requirements now apply to all new development, not just within 1km (or suggested 1 mile) of central point.	Policy wording amended
H6.1	The policy wording is too vague. I suggest "Proposals for new housing MUST ensure that they are well and safely connected....."	Noted and policy H9.1 wording amended.	Policy wording amended
H6.1	This set of transport policies should be radically expanded to cover the likely effect of traffic generated by new development, whether from housing, business or recreational development. Traffic generation is a topic covered by the NPPF. Highways Authorities are an integral and influential part of the planning system and their aim is to ensure that development does not cause either severe transport problems, including those relating to road safety, or environmental or amenity problems for residents. An in-depth consideration of traffic (generation) issues should support the main direction of the Neighbourhood Plan and improve the outcome of its policies.	Noted and response as per similar comment above.	Policy wording amended
H6.1	The aims are broadly sensible. I think some flexibility is required in terms of, for example, housing developed above business premises, which could make a useful contribution to more affordable housing but might not have cycle storage. I don't see the logic of requiring electric car provision within 1km of the station but not elsewhere. Especially as much of the housing we would hope to develop in this area would be smaller, possibly consist of flats, and hopeful be used by resident who can walk to the shops etc. I'd think the need for electric car provision further away from the centre, from where residents are more likely to drive into the centre to shop, would make a bigger impact on the environment. I think the NP should limit itself to the types of development we want to see or not to see in Haslemere. I question whether it can change the planning process as the last bullet seems to suggest. This seems outside of our remit.	H9.1. Comment noted and flexibility for cycle storage built into policy. In addition, electric car charging points now required for all development.	Policy wording amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
	<p>The 1km boundary from the station for the requirement of developments contributing to reducing traffic congestion and safe provision for electric car technologies is too small. I think this should apply to all developments in the settlement area. The further away from the station the development is, the greater the likelihood that people will drive either too the station or to either ends of the town. These developments will also increase congestion. I think the threshold of 50 or more dwellings is too high for the provision of a travel plan. Much smaller developments can create traffic chaos in Haslemere's small narrow lanes. For example, based on TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System), Surrey County Council Highways estimate that a development of ten residential units (two bedroom flats) would be expected to generate an additional 54 – 72 two-way trips throughout the day. This threshold should be reduced to developments of 10 or 20 dwellings.</p>	<p>H9.2 now applies to all major residential (10+ dwellings) or commercial development.</p> <p>- A useful source – thank you!</p>	<p>Policy wording amended</p>
H6.1	<p>Potential impact on local infrastructure (roads) as well as local schools and GP surgeries need to be considered.</p>	<p>See Infrastructure section of the Introduction.</p>	<p>Introduction - wording added</p>
H6.1	<p>One of the main blights caused by new developments of any material size is the extra traffic and the problems it causes to the existing infrastructure, and to street parking if there is no provision. We do not think that this should be confined to close proximity to the station and should be for all developments within the settlement boundary, including provision for electric car technologies. All developments should show how it will not affect local traffic materially and preferably improve it.</p>	<p>H9.2 Threshold for Travel Plan requirements lowered from 50+ homes to 10+ homes.</p>	<p>Policy wording amended</p>
H6.1	<p>Policy H 6 Comment Residential neighbours to all housing developments should be afforded the same protection against the loss of amenity, including the adverse effects of traffic generation (parking, noise and air pollution) as granted to those residents neighbouring commercial developments by Policy H 15.3. Proposed Additional Policy H 6 Add new Policy H 6.6. "All applications for housing developments will ensure that they are appropriate in terms of protecting the amenity and the well-being of residential neighbours, including but not limited to, the effects of traffic generation, parking, noise and air pollution)."</p>	<p>Comment noted. Effects of traffic generation and parking addressed in Policies H9.2 and H9.5.</p>	<p>Policy wording amended</p>
H6.1	<p>The key guiding principle for transport policies should be sustainability, i.e., is the proposed site within walking distance to key amenities and facilities so that residents are able to walk to the train station and shops and are not reliant on private car. It should also prioritise sites that will be integrated/well connected sites within the community and hence prevent any sterile edge of town housing estates. All developments should include detail on how the site will impact on traffic in the immediate surrounding area, and offer solutions and improvements. Developments that provide CIL payment should be prioritised in order to help fund improvements to infrastructure and mitigate any extra traffic issues that may arise.</p>	<p>Comments noted and seem in line with the direction and content of the Plan.</p>	
H6.1	<p>Electric cars are the future of inter-town travel, but for intra-town travel bicycles should be the default and easiest option. Given the topography of the Surrey Hills, the should be provision for easy ebike storage and charging. Make it easy for people to make the change.</p>	<p>Included with policy H9.1</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6.1	Most worryingly, the plan has not assessed two obvious options for relieving some of the railway commuter parking and congestion issues. Namely: - a second level could be built on the station car park which would alleviate some of the current and future situation - Waverley Borough Council could have been encouraged to investigate the maximisation of parking provision in the Wey Down Road car park. This is a major omission from the Plan. As such, it leads to questioning the veracity of the Plan regarding parking and related congestion. On the one hand, an assessment of these two major options could have been omitted by accident. On the other hand, they could have been omitted for local 'political' reasons. Whatever the reason, their absence leads to challenging the integrity of the Plan. By ignoring these two obvious options and by the Plan not proposing any immediate solutions to parking and congestion issues, the Plan implicitly accepts the unacceptable. That is: the parking situation in Haslemere will get considerably worse and consideration of it has been omitted from the Plan.	Comment noted. As both of these solutions concern existing land allocated to parking, it does not form part of the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy H9.5 added to support additional off-street parking for shoppers and residents.	New policy added
H6.1	It would be wonderful to make Haslemere a truly cycling-friendly town. Parking and parking spaces required by new builds are important considerations not referenced in any detail here. The need to create additional parking spaces for Haslemere is of pressing concern, and comprehensive, cohesive future-proofing planning is required. I would favour building an additional level on the station carpark, possibly two, and rather than this being an egregious eyesore, consider how it could be turned into a thing of beauty by creating a green living wall that could make this a very attractive feature of the town, aside from a merely utilitarian necessity. Cars are not going away; electric cars will become the norm	Comments noted. Response as per above. It should be noted that there is also significant opposition to providing additional car parking decks on these sites – not highlighted in these comments as it did not form part of the Regulation 14 consultation.	
H6.1	developments which are needed near the station are not necessarily capable of reducing traffic congestion- it should suffice that they do not make it materially worse	Comment noted.	
H6.1	The local traffic infrastructure is fine if you live in the middle of Haslemere, all outlying areas have poor and irregular singular one route only services that do not run into the evening. This means you need to rely on private hire or driving yourself, hardly progressing a green agenda. What scope for change are HTC encouraging to address this demand.	Refer to Opportunity 16 in Section 5.	
H6.1	The exact number of car parking spaces per dwelling has not been identified, what does 'sufficient' mean? There should be a minimum of two parking spaces for a one bed and one extra space per bedroom after; i.e. a three bed home should have 4 spaces, this then allows for families with children who still live at home but own a car	WBC have set out the parking standards per dwelling in LPP1, so they are not repeated in the Neighbourhood Plan. Reference to WBC standards included in H9.1 for clarity.	Policy wording amended
H6.1	Provision should be made for charging electric bikes too.	Comment noted and requirement specified in H9.1	Policy wording amended
H6.1	It would strengthen the policy if it could point to a firm plan for developing routes not open to motor vehicles that connect Haslemere Town, Weyhill, Hindhead and Grayswood. The local topography is challenging enough for pedestrians and cyclists without having to contend with fast moving vehicles on narrow roads with pinch-points.	Routes included within Figs 2 & 3. Requirement for Grayswood route noted.	
H6.1	New pedestrian / cycle routes should be provided wherever possible. Developments should be permeable for sustainable transport with lots of short footpaths rather than blocked cul de sacs. Routes to facilities such as shops, leisure and schools should be considered essential along with the station.	Requirements for better connectivity specified better within Policy H9.4.	Policy wording amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6.2	The roads and lanes involved are so narrow it is difficult to see how footpaths and cycle lanes could be created. Numerous similar comments	Comment noted.	
H6.2	Again, really sound principles, but there needs to be a clearer and more positive approach to cycling and cycle paths. The distances in Haslemere lead people to drive rather than walk, the hills discourage both walking and cycling. And traffic on Weyhill deters all but determined road cyclists. We won't reduce car travel much with pedestrian solutions (time pressures) but cycling stands a much better chance if we can do two things — create safer routes that reduce gradients and embrace electric bikes. Suggestion: Line 2 Opportunities to facilitate safer pedestrian and cycle paths linking ... (delete the 'or').	Comments noted and suggestion to delete 'or' incorporated in H9.2 bullet 1.	Policy wording amended
H6.2	The wording "should" is vague - again I would recommend using "must".	Comment noted.	
H6.2	6.2 ... and development should also improve pedestrian & cycle access to the town centre & Weyhill. This should not be 'welcomed' but is essential for the economic welfare of the town. You need to encourage people to come into town without a car. Also, not everyone uses the station. This is too limited and lacking in foresight. Where access to the station is already established, then require developers to pay into a central fund to be allocated to fund development projects for access around the area.	Comment noted. Station selected as a central point rather than because everyone uses it to access the town. It also supports economic diversification via National green tourism and the public transport gateway to the South Downs National Park.	
H6.2	I think that it is an excellent idea to facilitate walking and cycling. I'd entirely support activities by the TC or others to do so. However, I don't think we should make it a condition of development that developers have to give the public the right to cycle through new developments - this could reduce the amenity of the new residents. This is the only way I can see that H6.2 can be implemented	Comments noted and Policy H9.4 now refers to developments of 5+ dwellings. Wording clarified to avoid the impression footpaths would be routed through private space, just that space should be left so that in the future there are options available.	Policy wording amended
H6.2	New pedestrian and cycle access to/from the development site to the station are to be welcomed but are of very limited use if you live in Beacon Hill.	Comments noted.	
H6.2	Create pavements where there are currently none, maintain the existing pavements, upgrade the street lighting to remove the dangerous white spotlight type that are in Haslemere.	Comments noted.	
H6.2	Should the first sentence just apply to larger developments. If someone was building 5 new homes in Hindhead what are they expected to contribute to "improving pedestrian and cycle access to and from the site and the station" ?	Comments noted and H9.2 policy wording amended to refer to developments of 10+ dwellings.	Policy wording amended
H6.2	Pedestrian requirements, particularly parents with children and buggies, is very poor at the moment	Comments noted.	
H6.2	Pavements and cycleways need to be much improved by widening in many places, maintaining them better, stopping private hedging encroaching on them. It would be great to join up and make fully accessible a route from Critchmere Lane/Liphook Rd along the railway, past the Herons, through the industrial estate and along King's Rd. That would make possible a safe and attractive pedestrian/cycle route from the Critchmere Lane area to the station and the High St. The stretch of King's Rd that is always blocked by parked cars, between the industrial estate and the pinch point, could be improved by removing the pavement on the south side and letting pedestrians use the residential branch of the road running alongside it.	Comments noted.	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6.2	The opportunities to facilitate safer pedestrian and/or cycle paths should be more general. Links to the station, High street and Wey Hill are important, but so are many other routes and destinations, such as to the hospital, sports facilities, pubs, etc.	Comments noted.	
H6.2	There should be no widening or modification to roads next to ANOB land as not to disturb local habitats	Comments noted – Policies H11 and H14 concern protection and improvement for hedgerows and wildlife corridors	
H6.2	Site restrictions will limit how much access to the town centre for pedestrians and cyclists can be improved. I recommend adding the words "seek to" before 'improve'. Otherwise good plans will be rejected by an over absolute interpretation of this policy.	Comments noted. (H9.2 bullet 2)	Policy wording amended
H6.3	Figure 3 cycle route via the stream at the back of Bunch Lane appears completely unnecessary. It by passes a public footpath from the car park to Bunch Lane & then joins Bunch Lane further up, what's the point of that? Wasting money & damaging nature.	Comments noted.	
H6.3	These routes are not nearly enough - pedestrian and cycle traffic needs to be prioritised on all routes within the town centre if the wellbeing of residents is to be prioritised seriously	Comments noted.	
H6.3	The route in Figure 2 is great and it can be usefully be extended and must surely be made a cycle route too: a. The section behind the station is a long boring stretch for pedestrians but looks perfect for bikes. It may be necessary to ask cyclists to dismount here and there but for the people we need to encourage it does two important things. It improves safety and it makes the long forbidding gradients much easier. b. The connection between the lane by Jewsons behind the station and the Church Road bridge unlocks a route from High/West St all the way to Lion Green (easy access to M&S, Haslewey Community Centre/Post Office and Tesco). The extension to the route shown being via the newly refurbished Bunch Lane alleyway and Bunch Lane onto Weysprings (a short steep stretch but quiet) and thus to Lion Green. This makes a pleasant, safe cycle/pedestrian connection between Shottermill and the old centre of Haslemere. It also usefully passes near the hospital/health centre, connects two green spaces and integrates the 'shed' stores behind the station into the retail environment. Terrific!	Comments noted, with thanks.	
H6.3	Should we be backing one route only? Where this works best is where the pathway is attractive in its own right which I fear the proposed is not. A route through Redwood and over the railway would be more direct but would necessitate a new bridge and may not be accessible. Is there scope to consider changing the traffic flows to have a circulatory including Lower Street and so encourage other modes that way?	Flexibility built into Policy H9.6 to ensure that routes can be adjusted with due regard to suitability and to the pedestrian/ cyclist experience and desire lines.	Policy wording amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6.3	<p>re Figure 3 - Proposed route to Devil's Punchbowl: As a resident with a garden (Stoatley Cottage) directly overlooking Bunch Lane, I am very aware of the importance of the Lane as an amenity for Haslemere residents. Especially during this period of the pandemic, the Lane is in constant use by walkers, joggers, cyclists, and families with children - on bikes, tricycles, pushchairs, and on foot. Because the Lane has blind bends and for the most part, no footpath or accessible verges, is prone to flooding and speeding traffic, I welcome this excellent proposal for an alternative, safer route through woodland. The Bunch Lane Residents Association, with the assistance of Cllr. Nikki Barton, has already restored and protected a footpath at the southern end of the Lane. There will be problems, however: *The route through woodland is very boggy and the path would require boardwalks, whose construction and maintenance would be expensive *There have in the past been restrictions on any kind of development in the woodland, which is also home to several species of bat. *The proposed route appears to emerge from the woods up a steep bank on to Bunch Lane near a blind bend: measures would need to be taken to ensure that this is safe.</p>	<p>Comments noted, with thanks. The danger of the existing on-road route is well known. Policies H11 and H14 would apply when assessing routes for habit conservation and protection – with particular reference to Fig 9, wildlife corridors.</p>	
H6.3	<p>This objective may be a nice thing for the wish list but price property rights must be respected. I do not believe that the green/orange dotted lines are indeed a PUBLIC Right of Way (PRW). Or at least only partly so. If I am right then this policy should read: "We seek to create a continuous public right of way for pedestrians and cyclists only to connect High street and Wey Hill/ Station and PunchBowl as shown approximately on the Figure 2. Developments should not impede this general objective but for the sake of clarity it shall not be mandatory to provide a PRW across any private land.</p>	<p>Comments noted with thanks and clarification provided within the H9 Context and reasoned justification that no new paths or PRW will be mandatorily routed across private land.</p>	<p>Wording added to Context and Reasoned justification</p>
H6.3	<p>Shouldn't 4th bullet have a "not" in it??</p>	<p>Comment noted but N/A.</p>	
H6.3	<p>I agree with the base statements, but NOT with the footpath to join Haslemere High Street and Wey Hill areas not being a combined footpath and cycleway. My belief is that the way it was previously presented for approval or not has resulted in the plan developers having an skewed view that the support is for just a footpath, whereas if they were to ask if should be a footpath or a combined footpath and cycleway, I suggest the majority would be in favour of the combination. It does not make sense to link the two ends of the town for foot traffic and not for cyclists, especially when the Lower Street via the station to Wey Hill is so busy and cyclists on that road would make congestion worse. Please, please join the two ends of town for foot AND cycle traffic (and then perhaps also ban cycle traffic from sections of the main road). I say this as someone who lived in Haslemere without a car and cycled or walked or took buses and trains everywhere for some time.</p>	<p>Path at Fig 2 is for all forms of non-motorised transport, not just a footpath. H9.6 wording clarified.</p>	<p>Policy wording amended</p>
H6.3	<p>Fig's 2 & 3 and the text explanations are unclear whether these new routes are foot, cycle or mixed.</p>	<p>Wording clarified at Fig2&3 and within H9.6.</p>	<p>Policy wording amended</p>

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6.4	<p>This policy needs to be consistent with policy H11 and ensure there is protection of the environment and trees etc besides the actual transport outcome.</p> <p>There should be a larger focus on protecting the environment when proposing new road layouts and alterations, not just on motorised and non-motorised traffic.</p>	Any development should comply with all of the Neighbourhood Plan policies.	
H6.4	Somewhat vague - Haslemere and local area are hilly, often with roads in cuttings. Can we be specific - we need pavements (wide enough for a buggy or wheelchair, with ramps) and cycle lanes, safe crossings and speeds down to 20mph in residential areas to provide a safe environment for non-motorists and motorists alike.	Comments noted. Engagement with Surrey Highways continues outside the Neighbourhood Planning process.	
H6.4	Given the hilly nature of the area, motorised transport is the only practical form of transport and should not be disadvantaged by prioritising non-existent alternatives. It is not realistic to expect to get the weekly supermarket shop home on a bus or bicycle.	Comments noted.	
H6.4	The economic sustainability of Haslemere is dependent on easy access by motor vehicle from surrounding districts. Whilst it is important to improve access for non-motorised modes of transport, this needs to be balanced with the need to attract shoppers and workers from further afield	Comments noted.	
H6.4	There is little point in improving access to public transport if such transport doesn't exist. Improvements to public transport (service level and fares) must be higher on the priority list to reduce our reliance on cars especially for journeys to the station and schools	Comments noted. Ref opportunities in section 5.	
H6.4	Maintain existing pavements, create pavements where there are none, install decent street lighting rather than the dangerous white lights currently in place, ensure clear distinction between pedestrian areas and road users - with clear solid boundaries between them.	Comments noted. Ref opportunities in section 5.	
H6.4	What does 'improving access for commercial transport' mean? There is likely to be a conflict between the interests of large haulage vehicles and other users, and if commercial traffic is prioritised then it will inevitably dominate	H6.4 (now H9.3) Reference to commercial transport removed.	Policy wording amended
H6.4	The policy should be strengthened to mandate positive changes - "should seek to improve" is too weak. Developers should be required to build in line with a broader strategic redesign, which prioritises pedestrians and cyclists and reduces traffic.	Comments noted.	
H6.4	commercial transport needs further definition! Haslemere has become a rat run for large articulated lorries. Reference to improving access should be for 'commercial transport appropriate to the specific area in question' (i.e. a small delivery van may be fine but making things easier for large lorries will not be!)	H6.4 (now H9.3) Reference to commercial transport removed.	Policy wording amended
H6.4	There will always be cars using the roads in the Plan Area. Giving pedestrians priority can have the negative effect of causing queues of traffic causing local pollution, for example the pedestrian crossing on Weyhill which is not synchronised with the Tesco traffic lights. The window of opportunity for cars to move in the Hindhead direction is sometimes cut to virtually nil by this pedestrian crossing and the bus stopping. Both having a bus and a pedestrian crossing, on the face of it, would seem to be a good idea.	Comments noted.	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6.4	This policy wording will be used to reject reasonable or even good design because it fails to be perfectly in line with the wording. The Building for Life concepts are fine but this goes much further. it assumes private cars are a negative and all other means of transport or movement are better. It's simply not the case. Ask almost any family who lives in Haslemere if a member of their household drives a car. They have to do so to exist! I recommend change the policy wording : 1. provide proper means of access from the public realm for non motorised modes 2.where practical provide for convenient access to public transport 3. provide proper means for commercial deliveries	Comments noted.	
H6.4	In terms of improving access for commercial transport, what is being referred to? If it means improving access for home deliveries then I could support that as I know in some areas if a van pulls up to deliver to a house or business it can potentially be blocking up a whole road where the road is narrow or cars are already parked bumper to bumper.	H6.4 (now H9.3) Reference to commercial transport removed.	Policy wording amended
H6.4	Given the peak traffic problems we should not be increasing priority to non-motorised modes, but increasing access and safety for non-motorised modes whilst maintaining or increasing motorised throughput capacity.		
H6.5	This should not be a firm rule. It should again be dependent on the site	(now Policy H9.4) flexibility built into policy.	Policy wording amended
H6.5	Not just 'designed into the development' but given full priority over petrol/diesel traffic!	Comments noted.	
H6.5	I am very nervous about effectively saying that, if someone adds a windfall building in a garden, they have to give the public the right to walk through their land, This idea seems to presume all development will be to large greenfield or brown flied sites and not to individual properties or small sites.	Policy H9.4 amended to apply to developments of 5+ dwellings.	Policy wording amended
H6.5	It is so important that new developments are permeable - that public access is maintained across the site - even if the exterior is private land. Otherwise you end up in a situation where future footpaths are already blocked.	Comments noted, with thanks.	
H6.5	This final paragraph H 6.5 is somewhat obscurely worded. "within 200 metres" of what ? The town or the construction/land allocation ?	150m-200m considered an 'easily walkable' distance conducive to repeated active travel.	
H6.5	All new developments should adopt a Pedestrian First policy with extra wide pavements and traffic slowing systems.	Reference the Building for a Healthy Life standards – Policy H7.3	
H6.5	I would word the policy even more strongly so that a pedestrian route is created that is the shortest route - e.g building in a footpath entrance to an estate if this cuts off the corner to a route to the town or green space. I would also include that it should enable pedestrians and cycles to be segregated from cars where possible. The target is not just to include a pavement alongside the car entrances and exits but really to study the needs of pedestrians and include them -i.e more like housing estates built in the 70s that had cut-throughs and short cuts in between the houses for pedestrians. These are much more user -friendly than newer estates tend to be where the only access is alongside the car access.	Comments noted, Policy H9.4 aims to facilitate multiple active travel routes across the town and village settlements.	
H6.5	This provision will mean all sites are open to the public 24/7. Completely unacceptable. It seeks to create PRW by the back door. The revised policy H 6.4 will cover proper pedestrian access from the public realm to the private. DELETE this policy.	Comments noted. Policy H9.4 amended to 5+ dwellings and wording clarified to avoid impression of putting public routes through private space.	Policy wording amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H6.5	Such routes need to follow paths of desire. If these are convoluted then they will not be observed and/or will fail to encourage pedestrian rather than motorised access. Cycleways need to be clearly distinct from pedestrian routes.	Desire lines wording now included in policy H9.4.	Policy wording amended
H7.1	vi, this is a contradiction, 75 dwellings will be an overdevelopment of some plots. Each plot needs to be assessed individually	The density policy H2 provides flexibility to consider whether the development is fit for the site's setting and topography and consideration of the optimum use of land.	Policy H2 amended
H7.1	There should be designated garden space sizes. And direct reference to fitting in with existing architecture.	Garden sizes have not been specified due to the extensive tracts of green space around the town. Additionally green spaces within the settlements have been protected by policy H13 Local Green Spaces and Green Fingers. The policy directs compliance with the Haslemere Design Statement which identified eight areas of the town and describes their distinctive characteristics.	
H7.1	High quality design is clearly essential but the inclusion of the Haslemere Design Statement, now past its review date, together with the adjustments and other requirements proposed in the Plan, leave a lot to be interpreted by developers and the planning authority. As a result of the recent work by the Beauty Commission and the Government's move towards a National Design Code there is now a route to better design that can integrate the ideas, provide more certainty on delivery to the community, and on planning acceptance to the developer, and can be enforced. The Plan should specifically reference a commitment to develop a Design Code (possibly using the BIMBY Housing Toolkit) as soon as possible which will supercede the design requirements.	There are opportunities in the Neighbourhood Plan relating to development of site design briefs and updating the Haslemere Design statement. The guidance referred to will be considered if and when those opportunities are taken forward. Policy H7.3 requires developers to evidence how major developments contribute positively to the Building for a Healthy Life standards.	
H7.1	I agree with the design principles but struggle to see how (vi) can work alongside policy H1.5. the very prescriptive and high density numbers in H1.5 of 45 and 75 dph will make avoiding over development almost impossible. There are sites within Haslmere that are less than 1km from the station that could not have a density of 75 dph without causing over development and destroying the character of the area.	Policy H1.5 on density policy is now policy H2. It has been altered to provide more flexibility based on the optimum use of land.	Policy H2 amended
H7.1	I do feel that reducing hard landscaping features should be mentioned here - both from an environmental (allowing movement of different species) and a visual attractiveness perspective. Comparative costs are now at a point where allowing this is not prohibitively expensive – road and driveways do not have to be tarmacked, fencing with holes in the bottom is a usual request for tradesmen. Reducing 'dead-space' for cars should also be tackled (maybe belongs in the density policy) overtly - under-ground car parking may not happen unless specified.	Context and reasoned justification of policy H2 Density has been enhanced to include the suggested use of under- ground car parking. Policy H11 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows and H14 Haslemere's Ecological Network address the retention of green infrastructure to enable, promote and enhance biodiversity.	Context and Reasoned justification policy H2 amended

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H7.1	<p>Resident</p> <p>H7.1(i) according to the local residents, the Scotland Lane developer has endangered and trapped 7 deer in the last year. This clause invites developers to pre-empt planning permission and take detrimental steps against the environment to ensure the area is a lower value. Seven trapped deer is a travesty while a developer damages AONB. It needs a pre-planning application clause.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy H4 has been amended so that the development brief includes “the location of trees and any that may be affected by the development” and it is required for outline planning permission also. Unfortunately until permission is granted there are no planning policy mechanisms to prevent these actions.</p>	<p>Policy H4 amended</p>
H7.1	<p>Where new developments are close to existing properties a safety boundary should be established so not to devalue any existing properties amenity.</p>	<p>Policy H7.1 states that new development should protect the residential amenity of neighbours.</p>	
H7.1	<p>Privacy and light of existing dwellings should be respected when planning adjacent, new developments. Adequate drainage is vital. Our new build development did not succeed in this and led to waterlogged gardens in which nothing could grow. Can developers be required to fix drainage issues if they arise? Or can planning requirements be made more rigorous to prevent this happening in future?</p>	<p>The requirement in H7.1 iii relating to “surface drainage solutions that delay or prevent surface rainwater egress from the site” should prevent issues in the future. A new policy H8 based on comments from Thames Water requires developers to consider water and wastewater infrastructure.</p>	<p>New Policy H8</p>
H7.1	<p>This should apply to new development and also development of pre-existing buildings, especially conversion of commercial property to residential where developers are getting away with poorly designed conversions and no provisions for bins, cars, outside stores for bikes etc.</p>	<p>Changes to the law have meant that commercial buildings can be converted to residential without planning permission. It is not therefore possible to have policies that will affect this type of development.</p>	
H7.1	<p>The requirement to screen developments from the road using native species green hedging and/or trees for highway boundaries wherever possible requires more thought as it is potentially in conflict with policies to provide and encourage pedestrian routes. There are many examples of pavements becoming difficult to use because of overgrown trees and hedges or fallen rotting leaves. Trees provide shade which encourages slippery moss and weeds.</p>	<p>The policy includes the word “where these are in keeping with the existing streetscape”.</p>	
H7.2	<p>The 10 unit stipulation might be too restrictive in situations where the principle might be fulfilled through either proximity to existing green space or a group of such developments might ultimately support a new, larger green area.</p> <p>There is lots of wonderful natural space around this area, and it is this which we should be seeking to protect. I do not want to see lots of box-ticking municipal parks springing up to accompany developments.</p> <p>There is ample public green space in and around Haslemere. Additional public green space is not required - the policy should merely require access to these spaces to be maintained.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to state that accessible green space should be provided where the Accessible Green Space Standards are not met.</p>	<p>Policy H7.2 amended</p>
H7.2	<p>How will 75 dwellings in 1 hectare then allow for additional green space.</p> <p>This policy seems likely to conflict with being able to get a sufficient density of housing on sites within the settlement boundary</p>	<p>The density policy H2 has been amended to provide some flexibility. Developers should demonstrate that the development offers the optimum use of the land.</p>	<p>Policy H7.2 amended</p>

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H7.2	<p>This sounds sensible for large open developments. It sounds like it could preclude the development of high density housing, flats, affordable housing, and the like.</p> <p>We are fortunate in this area that we have a great deal of accessible open spaces near our communities. If land is available for development it seems to me that the priority should be to deliver the development required rather than impose limitations. Development should be attractive both to look at and live in, but that is somewhat different to setting a policy such as this.</p> <p>This is an ideal but given the proximity of all parts of Haslemere to open public green space and the case for increasing the density of accommodation in the centre of town I believe this is not a priority -and indeed could detract from the possibility of keeping new development within existing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>We have HUGE amounts of public green space already. This requirement is unnecessary and will create substandard site layouts. The Design Statement already covers this aspect adequately</p> <p>Several similar comments</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to state that accessible green space should be provided where the Accessible Green Space Standards are not met.</p>	
H7.2	<p>Should be for developments of over 5 dwellings</p>	<p>10 or more dwellings was selected as this meets Waverley's definition of major development. All of the policies in the plan that refer to a number of dwellings are for 10 or more dwellings.</p>	
H7.3	<p>I would prefer to see "MUST" rather than "should"</p>	<p>When a health check of the Neighbourhood Plan was performed by a Planning Consultant, he advised that policies should not include "must". The monitoring of the NP will ensure developers meet this requirement.</p>	
H7.3	<p>It is not clear why this plan picks out only Building for Life Standards 6 and 11. All 12 standards seem relevant. Again, it is difficult to see how Building for Life Standard 6 can be achieved alongside the densities prescribed in Policy H1.5. These densities will not allow new developments to be a considerate neighbor and have regard to the character of surrounding development, particularly with regard to height and building line. Nor will they allow the retention of older buildings. Careful consideration of the topography is also mentioned which is very relevant in Haslemere and will be impossible to manage at densities of 75 dph.</p>	<p>Policy H7.3 has been amended to include all Building for a Healthy Life standards (the successor to Building for Life).</p> <p>The density policy H2 has been amended to provide some flexibility. Developers should demonstrate that the development offers the optimum use of the land.</p>	
H7.3	<p>Developers may demonstrate anything at the design stage; but, so often, the finished design bears little resemblance to the original proposals and standards are gradually eroded in the quest for increasing densities and developer profits. So real monitoring is required.</p>	<p>Policy H4 has been amended to include the requirement of a development brief and community consultation for outline planning applications as well as full applications.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H8		H8 is now policy H10. H8.2 on Nationally described space standards has been removed and a new H10.1 relating to water infrastructure has been added	
H8	<p>Dwelling should need space standards but I think they are too low.</p> <p>The standards set are lower in some cases than those required for its own housing by Waverley which represent local best practice and is for affordable housing. To keep to the Context they should be improved.</p> <p>Space standards are a WBC standard in any case. But it should be noted that these have a serious impact on both overall viability and (especially) impact on the delivery of 2 bedroom apartments as the sizes required are well ahead of normal developer designs.</p>	<p>The Nationally Described Space Standards can only be introduced by a Local Plan as stated in the March 2015 Ministerial Statement so the policy has been removed.</p> <p>WBC intend to require these space standards through a policy in LPP2.</p>	H8.1 removed
H8	<p>There is a loophole here around broadband provision (i.e. getting from the local data communications infrastructure to the house). Why not be specific and mandate anything above 10 dwellings must have full fibre to the premises pulled to them. Yes this often costs in the thousands (may low tens of thousands if trenching is required) but it is easily affordable to developers give land value and resulting profits in the area. The added benefit is that other local houses nearby will also be able to benefit.</p> <p>Fibre to the home should be mandatory</p>	<p>As the Neighbourhood Plan applied through 2032 the term “up-to-date” has been used as there will be technological advances during that time.</p>	
H9		H9 is now policy H5	
H9.1	<p>However small and 'affordable' housing needs to fulfill family needs for storage ...so, ideally there will be storage space near the front door for push chairs/ children's buggies/ other large items e.g children's scooters, skateboards etc.</p>	<p>WBC has Housing Design Standards for New council Homes which include standards for storage space.</p>	
H9.1	<p>A property 'brought to market with at least 20% off versus the agreed market value for the area' is merely 'cheaper' than similar expensive properties. Such a property may still be way beyond the reach of local people on low wages and totally 'unaffordable'. The property only becomes 'affordable' when the people on low wages, for which it was intended, can afford to buy/rent it. PLEASE redefine 'affordable'.</p> <p>Many affordable homes are not really "affordable". More development is needed where the underlying land value can be discounted (e.g. Waverley BC owned) to provide genuinely affordable homes, possibly by way of Community Land Trusts.</p> <p>80% of market value is not affordable for a great many people. 'Affordable' housing definition needs a radical review. I would like to see a push for social and affordable housing in perpetuity.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework. Additional explanation has been added to the Context and Reasoned Justification explaining the need for genuinely affordable homes.</p>	H9 Context and Reasoned Justification enhanced

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H9.1	<p>I am not sure why there is a focus on affordable homes in Haslemere - other areas short distances away have this such as Liphook and Bordon - in areas of London that are expensive (SW London for example) you do not insist homes must be affordable but young people go and live somewhere nearby slightly cheaper until they can afford to buy in their preferred area.</p> <p>This locality is, by its very nature, an affluent area and affordable housing will be completely out of place.</p>	<p>The Vision for Haslemere is that by 2032 there are “more local workers living in the area”. 80.65% of respondents supported this policy fully.</p>	
H9.1	<p>Agreement to provide affordable housing should be legally binding on developers where plans are agreed. If they do not accept commercial risk and want to get out of obligations later, very large financial penalty should be applied</p> <p>Essential that we ensure that where practicable the obligations to provide property for rent is an obligation of the developer imposed at the time planning and development permission is granted and not simply an option to be disregarded as the build continues after planning has been granted.</p> <p>Developers must be held to account to ensure that proposals for truly affordable housing are not watered down.</p>	<p>Developers enter into a section 106 agreement with WBC which, among other things, specifies the details of any affordable housing.</p>	
H9.1	<p>There is a crying need for more affordable and social housing in this area. If that requires more intense development at, say 75 dwellings per hectare, then that should be achieved.</p> <p>Affordable homes should be for those who genuinely need them. Homes for rent should not become a means for landlords to purchase multiple homes as "buy to lets", thereby blocking out the young and first-time buyers.</p> <p>Allow for housing developments that will permit young people in their 20s earning local average salaries (£24,000) to have somewhere to live, not just retirees using their downsizing windfalls to outprice the buying power of those earning a pittance.</p> <p>I think the big need in Haslemere is for downsizers.</p> <p>I support more council owned housing, because people who can't afford to buy a house, however cheap, still need somewhere to live, and it is better for tax payers to pay for council houses than to pay long term housing benefit to private landlords.</p> <p>Importantly developers must not be allowed to wriggle out of their responsibilities with numerous follow up planning applications once they have been given approval.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
H9.1	<p>'... fully integrated ...' should go on to stipulating common access to facilities.</p>	<p>Policy amended to state “such that residents of affordable homes have the same access to all communal facilities as the residents of market housing”</p>	<p>Policy H9 amended</p>

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H9.1	I think it is self-defeating, as it makes the viable development of affordable housing less likely and so will allow developers to argue that they don't need to provide it as to do so would be economically unviable.	The policy is based on WBC's LPP1 policy AHN1. A Viability Study was carried out to support the Community Infrastructure Levy which demonstrates that the affordable housing and CIL levels will not cause developments to be unviable.	
H9.1	I would like to see explicit reference to rental accommodation to ensure young people who wish to live in Haslemere, but not with their parents, are able to and that young people coming to work here (eg at Haslemere hospital) are able to live here too. Social housing is needed.	The policy refers to "tenures that meet local needs". The Haslemere Community Land Trust's Housing Survey July 2018 is referenced in the Context and Reasoned Justification. This provides data about the number of respondents who wanted rental homes. The Survey will be updated during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan. WBC's housing register identifies social housing need as well as the strategic housing market assessments and local housing surveys. The policy directs developers to meet local need.	
H9.1	We've seen far too many times how qualified people can acquire property on advantageous terms and subsequently sell (perhaps after an interval) on open market terms thus making a substantial undeserved profit and taking the property out of the affordable sector. There absolutely MUST be measures to prevent this happening with new affordable development here.	H9.2 encourages developers to ensure homes remain affordable in perpetuity.	
H9.1	I am concerned as to who will own and manage those properties for rent not sale, but subject to that providing financial safety and integrity of the concept, fully support the policy.	An organisation such as a Community Land Trust, Housing Association or Co-operative would own and manage affordable homes for rent.	
H9.1	There is no need to require that affordable homes be fully integrated within the market housing. Far better that a well deigned overall development be achieved.	Where affordable homes are provided on a large development integration within the site is preferred. In some situations such as a small rural exception site of affordable homes there would be no market housing.	
H9.1	I would like to see more solar panels and renewable energy for the houses and the town in general.	Policy H3 requires development outside the settlement boundary to have minimal energy requirements. WBC's LPP2 will include policies about more sustainable development.	
H9.2	This needs to be compulsory. Haslemere Community Land Trust should be given priority over all other developers for this type of housing.	There are other organisations that can own affordable housing and secure the affordability in perpetuity. Based on advice from an external planning consultant the plan does not specifically identify one organisation in the policy although Haslemere Community Land Trust is referenced in the Context and Reasoned Justification.	
H9.2	I recommend removal of the word 'early' as it doesn't add much. I hope the Neighbourhood Plan also explains clearly what the Community Land Trust is. 'or an equivalent body' is also rather vague. The requirement to "enter into early discussions" is fairly weak wording. A certain percentage should be required, not negotiated	Policy wording amended	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H9.2	<p>Resale of "subsidised" homes after a few years and their placement on the open market should not be permitted. Presumably this can be ensured through covenants or similar arrangement.</p> <p>I would like to see all affordable homes safeguarded from future sale and safeguarded from being rented privately. This is because that would be an asset lost to the community and this indirectly places an additional burden on the community, driving the need to build more affordable housing.</p>	<p>Agreed. This is what is meant by affordable homes remaining so in perpetuity and it is frequently achieved by the use of covenants or other forms of legal agreement. Usually a Community Land Trust or similar organisation will own the freeholds of the homes.</p>	
H9.2	<p>Not a "proportion" of affordable homes - ALL affordable homes should be held in the affordable sector in perpetuity. It is wrong that the initial buyers should be able to make a super-profit by a change in classification, or that affordable property should be lost to those who need it.</p> <p>I feel it is critical that there is not a right to buy mechanism for new rental properties as this encourages profiteering and reduces the amount of affordable rental property.</p> <p>It is very important that affordable homes remain so. There should be blocks in place to stop homes being purchased cheaply, and then later sold on at the full market rate, at which point they are no longer affordable.</p>	<p>Currently the law permits affordable housing which can be sold on at market value. Policy H9.2 encourages developers to secure some homes as affordable in perpetuity.</p>	
H10		<p>Policy H10 is now policy H6</p>	
H10.1	<p>It would seem that the need is not for just one-bedroom or two bedroom dwellings as stated in the policy. It is also not clear how the needs of downsizers for 2-3 bedroomed dwellings with modest gardens closer to the centre of town can be met when policy H1.5 states that all development within 1km of the stations should have a density of 75 dph. Again, developments providing 'range of different types and sizes of housing to meet the needs of the community, reflecting the most up to date evidence of housing need for the area' will not be possible at such high densities as set out in H1.5.</p>	<p>The policy encourages developers to include one and two bedroomed properties as these are the property sizes that Haslemere has greater need for than Waverley as a whole. The Waverley Housing Need data has been added to the Context and Reasoned Justification to enable comparison.</p> <p>Regarding Policy H1.5 (now policy H2), it has been altered to provide more flexibility encouraging developers to demonstrate that the optimum use of land is achieved by their development.</p>	<p>Information added to Context and Reasoned Justification</p> <p>H2 amended</p>
H10.1	<p>The proposed house type and style must meet the surrounding housing type & style to blend in and be at the same density (DPH).</p>	<p>This is encouraged by Policy H7 High Quality External Design.</p>	
H10.1	<p>Small homes do serve a purpose for some, but one and two bedroom homes are quickly outgrown by many. People often don't choose a small home, it is a case of all they can afford. This policy should be more carefully described, so it doesn't only give developers an opportunity to squeeze more properties in at the expense of decent size homes.</p>	<p>Policy H8.1 required the application of the Nationally Described Space Standards. However, WBC informed us that the standards can only be introduced by a Local Plan as stated in the March 2015 Ministerial Statement so the policy has been removed.</p> <p>WBC intend to require these space standards through a policy in LPP2.</p>	

Appendix 11a - Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation Representations, Response and Suggested Action

Old number	Representations, comments and issues raised by residents via online survey	Response	Suggested actions
H10.1	I support the intent of the policy but I don't see how the Haslemere specific part has been formed from the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Waverley Summary Report and Addendum December 2015) is not very clear about the division. In addition, the report is over 5 years old, is it still relevant?	Referencing added and also data for Waverley. The policy refers to the “most up-to-date evidence of housing need for the area” as new reports are likely to be prepared during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Information added to Context and Reasoned Justification.
H10.1	The demand for a particular type is mostly determined by price not number of bedrooms. The developer should not have to comply with a survey that will inevitably be out of date. I recommend to delete the first two sentences leaving only the last.	The policy refers to the “most up-to-date evidence of housing need for the area” as new reports are likely to be prepared during the life of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
H10.1	Fully support the aspiration but wonder whether it isn't too ambitious for a development of say 10-12 homes. Maybe a little larger? 20 or more homes? Assume also this is thinking largely of developments of houses rather than blocks of flats? This area already is inundated with one bedroom flats, please start building proper homes with private gardens, even two beds would allow for a young family but a garden and somewhere to park is just as important as indoor space.	Ten or more homes is defined as major development by WBC. Developers may support their proposals with reference to local housing need data and evidence of the recent delivery of homes by size and type in the plan area. Policy H6 relates to parking requirements and should also be complied with in addition to this policy.	
H10.2	This does not address the need for affordable medium sized dwellings.	The policy refers to the “most up-to-date evidence of housing need for the area”. There is a need for affordable three and four bedroomed homes identified by the Haslemere Community Land Trust Housing Survey and also by the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment Waverley Addendum December 2015.	
H10.2	I think this plays down the importance of other factors. A would certainly not want to favour a development with a proportion of smaller dwellings that was a poor development in other ways.	Development proposals should comply with all of the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.	
H10.2	This policy refers to dwellings - H10.1 refers to homes - make consistent throughout plan.	Policy H10.2 amended	Policy H10.2 amended