

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT – SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS WITH OFFICERS RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mike Cooke – Chairman, Hook Heath Neighbourhood Forum

Summary of representations

- 1 There is nothing in the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) to point out that policies in made Neighbourhood Plans has the same legal standing as the 25 Core strategy policies. This should be emphasised in the introduction section of the DPD. The following is suggested:
Neighbourhood Planning Regulations were passed into law in 2012. The Regulations enable communities to establish Neighbourhood Forums, define Neighbourhood Areas and develop Neighbourhood Plans for the defined Neighbourhood Areas. Once a Neighbourhood Plan is made, the policies it contains become part of the legal planning framework, and have the same material weight and standing as policies in the Core Strategy. Where they exist, Neighbourhood Plans will therefore be used together with the Core Strategy, to determine development in areas to which the respective Plans relate.

Officer response

- 1 Adopted Neighbourhood Plans form part of the Development Plan for the area, and consequently, their provisions are a material consideration when determining planning applications in Neighbourhood Areas. It is therefore reasonable to emphasise the role of Neighbourhood Plans in the DPD. However, Neighbourhood Plans are one of a number of Development Plan Documents for this area and it is proposed that a new paragraph 1.22 on Development Plans be added to clarify the role of Development Plans as follows:

The Development Plan for the area comprise of:

- The Saved policy of the South East Plan;
- The Surrey Waste Plan;
- The Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents;
- Woking Core Strategy;
- The saved policies of the Woking Borough Local Plan (1999); and
- Adopted Neighbourhood Plans

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 emphasises that if regard is to be had to the Development Plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the Planning Act the determination must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material consideration indicate otherwise. If to any extent a policy contained in a Development Plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the Development Plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the latest document to be adopted, approved or published (as the case may be).

For the avoidance of doubt, the Development Plan is the Development Plan Document (taken as a whole) which has been adopted or approved in relation to that area. The Council is in the process of preparing the Development Management Policies DPD (this DPD) and the Site Allocations DPD. When they are adopted they will also form part of the Development Plan for the area.

Proposed modification

A new paragraph 1.22 should be inserted as follows:

The Development Plan for the area comprise of:

- The Saved policy of the South East Plan;
- The Surrey Waste Plan;
- The Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates Development Plan Documents;
- Woking Core Strategy;
- The saved policies of the Woking Borough Local Plan (1999); and
- Adopted Neighbourhood Plans

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 emphasises that if regard is to be had to the Development Plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the Planning Act the determination must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material consideration indicate otherwise. If to any extent a policy contained in a Development Plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the Development Plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the latest document to be adopted, approved or published (as the case may be).

For the avoidance of doubt, the Development Plan is the Development Plan Document (taken as a whole) which has been adopted or approved in relation to that area. The Council is in the process of preparing the Development Management Policies DPD (this DPD) and the Site Allocations DPD. When they are adopted they will also form part of the Development Plan for the area.

Mrs Sandra Simkin

Summary of representations

- 1 The DPD Regulation 19 consultation is in effect endorsing the Regulation 18 consultation that allocated Green Belt sites for housing. Policy DM13 supports new buildings allocated in the Site Allocations DPD and yet no discussion has taken place in this regard.
- 2 Paragraph 1.14 says that the Regulation 19 consultation is informed by the Regulation 18 consultation. However, no public expression of the consultation or the core allocation proposals in the Site Allocations DPD that was published for Regulation 18 consultation has been discussed by the Council.
- 3 Section 1.14 does not take account of the 28,000 representations received on the Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation.
- 4 Whilst paragraph 5.48 protects the visual amenity of the Green Belt, the Council is taking all Green Belt land in Mayford for dense housing and 50% affordable housing.
- 5 The voice of the people who will be affected by the DPD has not been given credence. Any recommendation should be in the open and not hidden in blanket coverage as Regulation 19 consultation.

Officer response

- 1 The Development Management Policies DPD is a separate Development Plan Document from the Site Allocations DPD, and it does not allocate sites for development. It sets out detailed policies to help determine day to day planning applications. It was published for Regulation 18 consultation between 19 February 2015 and 3 April 2015. The representations received were used to inform the Publication version that was published for consultation between 26 October and 7 December 2015. The Council published a schedule on how the representations had informed changes in the Publication version. This is on the Council's website (www.woking.gov.uk).

The reference in Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies DPD to the Site Allocations DPD is to establish the principle that if any site is allocated in the Site Allocations DPD, the development of that site as a matter of principle will not be inappropriate development. This is a statement of fact, which the policy is reiterating.

The Council is also committed to preparing the Site Allocations DPD, which will allocate specific sites for development. This process is presently running in parallel with the Development Management Policies DPD but is of different nature and content. The Regulation 18 consultation on the Site Allocations DPD was between 18 June 2015 and 31 July 2015. The Council is in the process of analysing the representations that were received and will be taking that into account before publishing the Publication version of the DPD. The relevant committees of the Council will be considering a report in due course about how the representations should inform the Publication version of the DPD. The

Publication version of the DPD will be published for a Regulation 19 consultation to give the public the opportunity to make their representations before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination.

The Council is considering a revised timetable for the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD and this will be published in the revised Local Development Scheme. The relevant committee papers relating to the Site Allocations DPD will be in the public domain when they are published. The above response also addresses points 2 to 5 above.

Proposed modification

No modification is being proposed as a result of the representation.

Savills (on behalf of Thames Water)

Summary of representations

- 1 In order for the Local Plan to be effective and compliant with the NPPF, there should be a policy dealing with water and sewerage infrastructure. The following draft policy is suggested: ‘

Planning permission will only be granted for development which increases the demand for off-site service infrastructure where:

- a. Sufficient capacity already exists or
- b. Extra capacity can be provided in time to serve the development which will ensure that the environment and the amenities of local residents are not adversely affected.

When there is a capacity problem and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed by the water company, planning permission will only be granted where the developer sets out how the appropriate infrastructure improvements will be delivered and completed prior to occupation of the development.

The development or expansion of water supply or waste water facilities will be permitted, either where needed to serve existing or proposed development in accordance with the provisions of the Development, or in the interest of long term water and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impacts is minimised.

A separate text has been suggested for the reasoned justification.

Officer response

- 1 Policy CS16: *Infrastructure delivery* of the Core Strategy provides a definition of infrastructure to include transport, Affordable Housing, education, health, social and community infrastructure, public services, utilities (such as gas supply, electricity supply, water supply, waste water treatment, telecommunications infrastructure), flood alleviation measures and green infrastructure. It will be misleading to single out water and sewerage infrastructure for a separate standalone policy. Whilst Policy CS16 covers all types of infrastructure, it is sufficiently comprehensive to cover the objectives that the representation seeks to achieve for water supply and water treatment. The proposed modification will be unnecessary repetition of what is already covered in the Core Strategy.

Proposed modification

No modification is being proposed as a result of the representation.

Ian Motuel (on behalf of Waverley Borough Council)

- 1 The policies are local to Woking and therefore do not wish to submit any formal representations. However, Waverley Borough Council would repeat its comment on the Site Allocations DPD Regulation 18 consultation that Woking Borough Council should commence a review of its Core Strategy, giving that much has changed since it was adopted in 2012.

Officer response

- 1 The Core Strategy has an in-built mechanism for monitoring and review. This matter is therefore not for the Development Management Policies DPD to address. It is acknowledged that Waverley Borough Council has made representations to the Site Allocations DPD. This will be dealt with separately through the Site Allocations DPD process.

Proposed modification

No modification is being proposed as a result of the representation.

Raakhee Patel (on behalf of Sports England)

Summary of representations

- 1 Sports England generally supports the recognition of development for outdoor recreation and sports activities and ancillary development. However, Policy DM3 remains unduly prescriptive and could result in essential new facilities being refused planning permission. The policy should be redrafted to more positively encourage outdoor sports and recreational facilities. The policy should include reference to paragraph 74 of the NPPF to ensure that there are no adverse effects on existing sports and facilities. The policy should also include reference to paragraph 81 of the NPPF to ensure greater flexibility and a more positive approach to outdoor sport and recreation development in the Green Belt.
- 2 Policy DM13 does not take account of the need to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt. The policy should be amended to allow for buildings that support outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt to be granted planning permission.
- 3 Policy DM21 acknowledges provision of indoor and outdoor recreational and amenity space. However, there should also be explicit reference to sports in recognition to its benefits.

Officer response

- 1 Policy DM3 clearly emphasises the Council's support for outdoor recreation and sports activities in appropriate circumstances. The policy provides a useful framework for managing development in both the urban area and within the Green Belt. However, that needs to be balanced with the protection of the Green Belt, heritage assets, versatile agricultural land and the amenity of nearby residents. In this regard, the Council do not consider the policy to be unduly prescriptive. The policy is positively drafted to permit planning permission for proposals that meets the prescribed criteria. The suggestion to include reference to paragraphs 74 and 81 of the NPPF is noted. However, particular attention should rather be drawn to paragraph 89 of the NPPF, which provides guidance on acceptable development in the Green Belt where most proposals that will be relevant to the policy are likely to occur. It emphasises that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this include the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purpose of including land within it. The NPPF therefore does not give a blanket support for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation if it will undermine the openness of the Green Belt. The exception also refers to the provision of *appropriate* facilities for outdoor sports and outdoor recreation (this implies that not all facilities will be appropriate). Policy DM3 reflects these requirements. The Council should be able to refuse planning applications that does not meet the requirements of the policy and or the NPPF. Policy CS17: *Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation* of the Core Strategy is robust enough to protect the loss of sport and recreational facilities. It also makes provision to enable the delivery of new facilities. In accordance with

paragraph 1.3 of Development Management Policies DPD, no purpose will be served by repeating this policy.

- 2 The first paragraph of Policy DM13 makes reference to the exceptions under Section 9 of the NPPF and Policy CS6: *Green Belt* of the Core Strategy. The exceptions include outdoor sport and outdoor recreation that preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purpose of including land within it. The objective of the representation has already been covered by the policy and no purpose will be served by repeating it.
- 3 The suggestion for an explicit reference to sports in the policy is reasonable. The last but one bullet point should be amended by inserting 'outdoor sport' after outdoor recreation.

Proposed modification

The last but one bullet point of Policy DM21 should be modified by inserting outdoor sports after outdoor recreation.

Philip Riley (on behalf of Basingstoke Canal Society)

Summary of representations

- 1 The word 'permitted' in paragraph 3.37 that states recreational, navigational and ancillary facilities will be 'permitted' should be replaced by 'encouraged'.
- 2 Policy DM4 mingles two issues – the concept of permanent residential moorings and the idea of creating off-line moorings, boat basins. The Basingstoke Canal Society have always argued against the provision of more permanent residential moorings but very much in favour of establishing new boat basins and other forms of off-line mooring in view of the clear need to provide additional mooring facilities on the canal.
- 3 There should be a restriction on the heights of new buildings within, say 50m of the canal. Within that area, buildings should not exceed 2 storeys and an adequate margin of undeveloped land between the canal and the nearest structure should be stipulated in any planning consent.
- 4 There is a word missing at the end of paragraph 3.47.
- 5 The canal requires regular dredging. The disposal of the dredged silt presents a problem in the urban area. There should be a policy to ensure that the Council cooperates with Basingstoke Canal Association and Surrey County Council to identify silt disposal sites either adjacent to the canal or elsewhere in the Borough.

Officer response

- 1 As a point of correction, the word 'permitted' in the context suggested by the representation appears in paragraph two of Policy DM4 instead of paragraph 3.37. The word permitted is appropriate in this context because it provides a clear and a positive intention of the Council to permit planning permission for the recreational, navigational and ancillary facilities along the canal if the criteria set out in the policy are met. It is a stronger positive intention than encouraged. The Council will continue to work with interested parties to encourage the recreational and navigational use of the canal through the implementation of the policy. This point can be highlighted by adding the following to paragraph 3.40: 'The Council will work in partnership with the Basingstoke Canal Authority, Surrey County Council and other interested parties to encourage the delivery of the aims of the policy. This will include partnership working in identifying suitable silt disposal sites after dredging. The appropriateness of any site for silt deposit will be considered on a case by case basis when a need is justified'.
- 2 The last paragraph of the Policy intentionally deals with both permanent residential moorings and the creation of off-line, moorings, boat basins. Whilst the Council is aware that the Basingstoke Canal Authority has always argued against the provision of more permanent residential moorings, it is important that the policy allows some flexibility in exceptional circumstances for the consideration of such proposals on a case by case basis depending on the merits of the proposal. In any case, Policy DM4 is clear that the Council will take into account any relevant advice from the Basingstoke Canal Authority in assessing proposals likely to have an impact on the canal and its setting.

- 3 Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy requires undeveloped buffer zones alongside watercourses including the Basingstoke Canal. The policy recommends 8 metres for main rivers and 5 metres for ordinary water courses. No purpose will be served by repeating this in the DPD. It will be unnecessarily prescriptive to specify the number of storeys for development along the canal. It is important that each application is determined on its own merits taken into account the particular locational circumstance of the development.
- 4 It is noted that something is missing from the last sentence of paragraph 3.47. The sentence should have read: Where embankment toe drains exist they are to be preserved and incorporated into the drainage scheme of any development. The paragraph should be modified accordingly.
- 5 This has been addressed in point one above.

Proposed modification

Paragraph 3.40 should be modified by adding the following: 'The Council will work in partnership with the Basingstoke Canal Authority, Surrey County Council and other interested parties to encourage the delivery of the aims of the policy. This will include partnership working in identifying suitable silt disposal sites after dredging. The appropriateness of any site for silt deposit will be considered on a case by case basis when a need is justified'.

The last sentence of Paragraph 3.47 should be modified by adding: 'preserved and incorporated into the drainage scheme of any development'.

Mike Waite – (on behalf of Surrey Wildlife Trust

Summary of representations

- 1 DM1 – Surrey Wildlife Trust should be replaced with Surrey Nature Partnership.

Officer response

- 1 The suggested change is a statement of fact, which is acceptable.

Proposed modification

Reference to Surrey Wildlife Trust in Policy DM1 should be replaced with Surrey Nature Partnership.

Hook Heath Neighbourhood Forum

Summary of representations

- 1 The introduction section of the DPD should make reference to Neighbourhood Plans and their place in the hierarchy of planning documents. A new paragraph 1.2 should be inserted as follows: Neighbourhood planning Regulations were passed into law in 2012. The Regulations enable communities to establish Neighbourhood Forums, define Neighbourhood Areas and develop Neighbourhood Plans for the defined Neighbourhood Area. Once a Neighbourhood Plan is made, the policies it contains become part of the legal planning framework, and have the same material weight and standing as policies in the Core Strategy. Where they exist, Neighbourhood Plans will therefore be used with the Core Strategy, to determine development in the areas to which the respective Plans relate.
- 2 Reference to Green Belt boundary review report should be deleted and specific reference made to the fact that the evidence is under review. Evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the Green Belt boundary review is not robust and should not be referred to.
- 3 There are two paragraphs numbered 1.18. A suggestion is made to insert a new heading and a paragraph after the second paragraph 1.18 as follows: Neighbourhood Plans set out a clear vision for the neighbourhood to which it applies. They include specific policies for their areas which have been examined to ensure they are consistent with the NPPF and the Core Strategy. They must therefore be taken together with the Core strategy and this DPD when determining planning applications.
- 4 Paragraph 3.1 – second sentence ‘consists’ should be replaced by contains as consists implies that there is nothing else.
- 5 Policy DM1 – additional bullet point should be added to read: development proposals which would result in significant harm to the broader green infrastructure network will only be considered if ‘the benefit arising from the development is of sufficient value to outweigh any harm caused.
- 6 There are two paragraphs numbered 5.43.
- 7 The first sentence of Policy DM13 that reads ‘the Site Allocations DPD does not allocate buildings’ does not make sense. It should be reworded as ‘unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated, the Council will regard the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate.
- 8 The following should be added to the first bullet point of policy DM15 ‘or it can be demonstrated that competition from nearby development has reduced the viability of the shop’.
- 9 Policy DM18: insert a new paragraph 3 as follows: advertisement proposals on other heritage assets will only be permitted in they do not spoil the character of the building or the street scene.
- 10 The last paragraph of Policy DM20 should be prefix by ‘in general’.
- 11 Implementation and monitoring – paragraph 8.2 should begin ‘when it is’ and not ‘is it’
- 12 Appendix 1 – evidence base documents – add as second bullet point ‘Neighbourhood Plans when made, and their supporting documents.

Officer response

- 1 This representation has been comprehensively covered in the Officer response to representations made by Mike Cooke (Chairman of the Hook Heath Neighbourhood Forum). No purpose will be served by repeating that.
- 2 Reference to the Green Belt boundary review report is appropriate in this context. The report continues to be a published and a robust evidence base of the Council.
- 3 The numbering of 1.18 twice is an editorial error that has been noted and will be corrected. The first paragraph 1.18 should be replaced by 1.17 and the subsequent paragraph numbers modified as a consequence. The suggested new paragraph has already been covered in a previous response.
- 4 The proposed change of 'consists' to 'contain' is reasonable and the DPD will be modified accordingly.
- 5 The proposed additional bullet point is a reasonable addition. The DPD should therefore be modified by adding: 'the benefit arising from the development is of sufficient value to objectives of the Development Plan to outweigh any harm caused'.
- 6 The numbering of 5.43 twice is an editorial error that has been noted and will be corrected. The first paragraph 5.43 should be replaced by paragraph number 5.39 and the subsequent paragraph numbers modified as a consequence.
- 7 The wording of the first sentence of Policy DM13 is mainly appropriate in the context of the objective that the policy seeks to achieve. To provide further clarification it is proposed that the first sentence of the policy be redrafted as follows: 'Unless very special circumstances can be clearly demonstrated, the Council will regard the construction of new buildings and forms of development other than those specifically identified on allocated sites in the Site Allocations DPD as inappropriate in the Green Belt'.
- 8 It is not intended to use the policies of the DPD to influence or intervene in the competition amongst businesses. The proposed wording is therefore unacceptable.
- 9 The Glossary of the Core Strategy defines the heritage assets of the Borough. To be all encompassing in ensuring that the overall heritage assets of the area is not compromised by development, it will be reasonable to include a paragraph that covers all the other heritage assets. A new paragraph 4 should be inserted in Policy DM18 as follows: 'Advertisement proposals on other heritage assets or areas will only be permitted if they will preserve or enhance particular features of architectural or historic interest'.
- 10 The last paragraph of Policy DM20 is appropriately worded in the context of the objectives that it seeks to achieve. However, the first sentence of the paragraph can be reworded to provide further clarification as follows: 'The Council will not permit the demolition of heritage assets except in exceptional circumstances. Where partial or total demolition of a heritage asset is permitted in exceptional circumstances, a high standard of design will be required in any replacement building'.

- 11 The words 'is it' in the first line of paragraph 8.2 should be 'it is'. This is an editorial error that should be corrected.
- 12 It is reasonable to add 'adopted Neighbourhood Plans' to the list of evidence base in Appendix 1.

Proposed modifications

The first paragraph 1.18 on page 9 should be replaced by 1.17 and the subsequent paragraph numbers modified accordingly.

The word 'consists' in the second sentence of paragraph 3.1 should be replaced with 'contain'.

The fifth paragraph of Policy DM1 should be modified by adding the following bullet point: 'the benefit arising from the development is of sufficient value to the overall objectives of the Development Plan to outweigh any harm caused'.

The paragraph number 5.43 on page 55 should be replaced with paragraph number 5.39 and the subsequent paragraph numbers modified accordingly.

The first sentence of Policy DM13 should be replaced by: 'Unless very special circumstances can be clearly demonstrated, the Council will regard the construction of new buildings and forms of development other than those specifically identified on allocated sites in the Site Allocations DPD as inappropriate in the Green Belt'.

A new paragraph 4 should be inserted in Policy DM18 as follows: 'Advertisement proposals on other heritage assets or areas will only be permitted if they will preserve or enhance particular features of architectural or historic interest'.

The first sentence of the last paragraph of Policy DM20 should be replaced with: The Council will not permit the demolition of heritage assets except in exceptional circumstances. Where partial or total demolition of a heritage asset is permitted in exceptional circumstances, a high standard of design will be required in any replacement building'.

The words 'is it' in the first line of paragraph 8.2 should be replaced with 'it is'.

'Adopted Neighbourhood Plans' should be added to the list of evidence base in Appendix 1.

British sign and graphics association

Summary of representations

- 1 The following legal corrections are suggested to policy DM18: replace conserve with preserve, planning permission in the penultimate paragraph should be replaced with express consent or advertisement consent.
- 2 The final paragraph of Policy DM18 should make it clear that any condition requiring removal or discontinuance may only be imposed where there are specific reasons for the condition, and that these must be stated and explained on the grant of express consent.
- 3 Reference to need in paragraph 6.14 should be deleted because an application cannot be refused on grounds of being unnecessary.
- 4 Paragraph 6.12 makes reference to road traffic safety and highway safety. For simplicity one should be deleted.
- 5 The law does not allow considerations to be restricted to whether they would 'add to visual interest' as set out in paragraph 6.13 of the DPD. Provided the advertisement does not detract from amenity or public safety, it must be allowed. There is no reason small internally illuminated 'plastic boxes' should unlikely be suitable. Each must be considered on its individual merits. The whole paragraph should be deleted.
- 6 The first two sentences of paragraph 6.15 should be positively prepared as follows: Bulky, fully illuminated box signs, crudely attached to an existing fascia, are unlikely to be acceptable. Slimline box signs with individual illuminated letters and logos, or halo illuminated signs are often more appropriate. External illumination from discreetly located spotlights, or through trough lighting, is also often more appropriate.
- 7 The phrase 'in limited circumstances' in paragraph 6.16 should be replaced with 'sign posting in rural areas'.
- 8 Reference to NPPG Advertisements and to the free DCLG advisory booklet – Outdoor Advertisement and Signs – A Guide for Advertisers should be added to the Policy Links.

Officer response

- 1 The proposed change of 'conserve' to 'preserve' in Policy DM18 is reasonable. Consequently, 'conserve' in paragraph 2 and 3 of Policy DM18 should be replaced with 'preserve'. The suggested use of express consent instead of planning permission is legally preferable. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) clarifies the various types of advertisement consents and the use of express consent will be appropriate in this context. The words 'planning permission' in the penultimate paragraph of Policy DM18 should be replaced with 'express consent'.
- 2 The PPG sets out the standard conditions that would apply to any advertisement consent. If the Council wishes to impose additional conditions they must be supported by specific and relevant planning reasons. This point can be clarified in the Policy. It is also stressed that a condition has to be attached to any consent to require the removal of an advertisement at the end of the express consent period. Policy DM18 should be modified by an additional paragraph at the end of the policy as follows: 'The Planning Practice Guidance sets out the standard

- conditions for all types of advertisement consent. If the Council wishes to impose additional conditions it will specify the relevant planning reasons on the express consent why the conditions are imposed’.
- 3 References to the word ‘need’ in paragraph 6.14 are appropriate in their context and should be retained. They do not imply that decisions by the Council about the appropriateness of the advertisement will be judged on need.
 - 4 For consistency and simplicity ‘highway safety’ should be used instead of ‘road traffic safety’ in paragraph 6.12.
 - 5 To reflect the objectives of the PPG on advertisements, the first sentences of paragraph 6.13 should be modified as follows: ‘Projecting signs will only be permitted if it is considered that it is not harmful to public safety and amenity and are of appropriate materials and dimensions. The second sentence beginning with ‘Small plastic box signs ...’ should be deleted to allow each application to be determined on its merits.
 - 6 The wording of paragraph 6.15 is appropriate in this context. It communicates a clear message of what is appropriate to minimise any adverse effects caused by displays and shop signs, and to help preserve and/or enhance the character of Conservation Areas. The wording does not absolutely rule out consideration of other forms of shop signs or displays on a case by case basis other than individually illuminated letters or indirect light from spotlights. The suggested wording by the representation implies that illuminated box signs should be bulky or crudely attached to be inappropriate. This is not always the case.
 - 7 The PPG provides some guidance on sign posting in rural areas. In this context, the suggested wording by the representation is reasonable. The words ‘in limited circumstance’ in paragraph 6.16 should be deleted and replaced with ‘if it is in relation to sign posting in rural areas’.
 - 8 The following contains useful information to merit adding to the list under the supporting guidance: Planning Practice Guidance – advertisements and DCLG advisory booklet – Outdoor Advertisement and Signs – A guide for Advertisers.

Proposed modification

The word ‘conserve’ in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Policy DM18 should be replaced with ‘preserve’.

The words ‘planning permission’ in the penultimate paragraph of Policy DM18 should be replaced with ‘express consent’.

Policy DM18 should be modified by an additional paragraph at the end of the policy as follows: ‘The Planning Practice Guidance sets out the standard conditions for all types of advertisement consent. If the Council wishes to impose additional conditions it will specify the relevant planning reasons on the express consent why the conditions are imposed’.

The words ‘highway safety’ should replace ‘road traffic safety’ in paragraph 6.12.

The first sentences of paragraph 6.13 should be modified as follows: ‘Projecting signs will only be permitted if it is considered that it is not harmful to public safety and amenity and are of appropriate materials and dimensions’.

The second sentence of paragraph 6.13 beginning with 'Small plastic box signs ...' should be deleted.

The words 'in limited circumstance' in paragraph 6.16 should be deleted and replaced with 'if it is in relation to sign posting in rural areas'.

The following should be added to the supporting guidance under Policy links: Planning Practice Guidance – advertisements and DCLG advisory booklet – Outdoor Advertisement and Signs – A guide for Advertisers.

Tony Howe – County Archaeologist and Manager, Surrey County Council

Summary of representations

- 1 The following wording in Policy DM20: ‘The Council will not permit the demolition of heritage assets, but where partial or total demolition of a heritage asset is permitted in exceptional circumstances, a high standard of design will be required in any replacement building’ should be replaced with ‘The Council will resist the demolition of heritage assets except in exceptional circumstances, but where partial or total demolition of a heritage asset is permitted, a high standard of design will be required in any replacement building’ This is necessary because the demolition of heritage assets is not prohibited in national legislation, just discouraged.
- 2 The Council should consider if the provisions of Policy DM20 are fully deliverable and what new and further measures might be necessary to ensure this. The Council will have to scrutinise proposals to ensure that new designs are in keeping with existing heritage landscape, ensure that features such as street fittings are sympathetically designed, enforce the submission of acceptable professional heritage statements from applicants etc.

Officer response

- 1 The representation has already been comprehensively addressed by the Officer response to representations by Hook Heath Neighbourhood Forum.
- 2 The Council is committed to preserve the heritage assets of the area and work in partnership with all interest parties to ensure the delivery and enforcement of the requirements of the policy. The Council is also investing in urban design expertise to scrutinise proposals when they come forward. Organisations such as the County Council will be consulted on relevant applications when it is necessary to do so.

Proposed modification

No modifications are being proposed as result of this representation.

Stephen Saviker

Summary of representations

- 1 DM1 - It seems quite vague and not clear about where and when new Green Infrastructure assets will be required. The wording is not strong enough to ensure the required results.
- 2 DM2 – Where retaining trees or hedgerows it would be useful to say that developers must comply with RHS.
- 3 DM7 – is an appropriate level of mitigation calculable? would it be easy to argue against. A firm wording will be needed.

Officer response

- 1 Policies CS16: *Infrastructure delivery* and CS17: *Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation* and Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy sets out clear standards to achieve regarding green infrastructure. Policy DM1 is not intending to repeat that but to be read in conjunction with them. Taking as whole, the policy is not vague as suggested.
- 2 The British Standards (BS5837) is the most relevant set of standards, which are taking into account when considering development with implications for trees. This is already referred to in the other supporting guidance.
- 3 There are acceptable standards for noise and light pollution. In this regard, acceptable levels of mitigation can be agreed and enforced by condition. The policy sets out the factors that will have to be taken into account is assessing any scheme of mitigation.

Proposed modification

No modifications are being proposed as a result of this representation.

Alice May (on behalf of Martin Grant Homes)

Summary of representations

- 1 The overall approach to meeting housing need is unsound. The DPD is not positively prepared. To meet objectively assessed need for housing and be consistent with achieving sustainable development, the Site Allocations DPD should be brought forward in advance of the DM Policies DPD or at the very least at the same time. The Site Allocations DPD should be prioritised over the DM Policies DPD.
- 2 The DPD is not effective as it will not deliver housing to meet housing need, and will add an additional layer of policy, particularly in relation to Policy DM13.
- 3 The DPD is not consistent with national policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Policy DM13 is not consistent to recent changes to Green Belt policy and should be deleted. It does not add anything that is not covered by local or national policy. The policy is not filling any policy gap as there are no saved local plan policies relating to buildings in the Green Belt which require replacing.

Officer response

- 1 Paragraph 1.10 of the Core Strategy commits the Council to prepare both the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management Policies DPD. Both are necessary to ensure the delivery of the Core Strategy and are being prepared in parallel. They both perform different purposes in setting the necessary policy framework for managing development in the area and delivering the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Council has a Local Development Scheme and a work programme for the preparation of the two DPDs, and have allocated resources accordingly to ensure their preparation. It is not envisaged that the preparation of the Development Management Policies DPD will undermine the timetable for the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.
- 2 The DPD has a clear purpose to set out detailed policies to help determine day to day planning applications. The Core Strategy sets out the strategic context for the Borough's housing requirement, its broad distribution and the standards that development should achieve. The Site Allocations DPD allocates specific sites for various types of development. All three DPDs have different purposes, and it is not intended that the Development Management Policies DPD will be allocating sites to deliver housing to meet the objectively assessed housing need. It is emphasised that the Council has identified about 6.4 years housing land supply over and above the required 5 year housing land supply. The suggestion that housing completions are lagging because of lack of supply of housing land is incorrect.
- 3 This representation has been addressed above. The Council considers Policy DM13 to be relevant in managing development in and adjacent to the Green Belt.

Proposed modification

No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.

Historic England

Summary of representations

- 1 Policy link on page 79 should also provide a link to the National Heritage List for England (<http://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/>) and the Heritage Gateway.
- 2 The word 'compliment' in paragraph 6.31 should be 'complement'.
- 3 On monitoring, it may be helpful to include an additional measure of the effectiveness of the policy in preserving and enhancing heritage assets related to heritage at risk. This will provide a good indication of the trends in the condition of the historic environment and the effectiveness of the implementation of the policy.

Officer response

- 1 The National Heritage List and the Heritage Gateway contains useful information to signpost to. The links should therefore be added to the Policy Link on page 79.
- 2 The word compliment in paragraph 6.31 should be replaced with complement. It is an editorial error that should be corrected.
- 3 Appendix 3, the indicator under Policy DM20 in Table 3 should be modified by adding 'the number of heritage assets at risk'. The measure under Policy DM20 should be modified by adding "the effectiveness of the policy in preserving and enhancing heritage assets at risk".

Proposed modification

The following should be added to the Policy Link under Policy DM20 on page 79: The National Heritage List for England at: <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/>.

The following should be added to the Policy Link under Policy DM20 on page 79: Heritage Gateway.

Appendix 3, the indicator under Policy DM20 in Table 3 should be modified by adding 'the number of heritage assets at risk'. The measure under Policy DM20 should be modified by adding "the effectiveness of the policy in preserving and enhancing heritage assets at risk".

Iain Warner – Tetlow King (on behalf of Retirement Villages Group Ltd)

Summary of representations

- 1 The Council is pursuing a suite of documents to form the Local Plan that is considered unsound in terms of providing a joined up thinking approach for the proper planning within the specialist field. For example, the draft Site Allocations DPD failed to allocate specific new sites to meet identified need for specialist housing. It is clear that the Core Strategy and the emerging Site Allocations DPD are currently failing to ensure that the demand for specialist housing is met. The Development Management Policies DPD does not allocate new sites either but only focus on the use of existing buildings through sub-divisions and conversions etc. Furthermore, the Site Allocations DPD was published before the latest version of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. In the light of the importance of ensuring the provision of sufficient levels of specialist housing for the elderly, the DPD's approach of only considering additional provision through conversion and sub-division of existing properties is not an appropriate solution to the problem.
- 2 The DPD should set clear criteria for determining planning applications for specialist housing for the elderly. The DPD should include reference to the need for sites to be able to accommodate at least 50 Extra Care Housing units, the need to provide those services and facilities set out in the North West Surrey Extra Care Housing Strategy, the need to identify sites that are in sustainable locations and the potential for co-locating a nursing/residential care home on part of the site where there is an identified need.
- 3 There should be a mechanism for monitoring the specific delivery of specialist housing across the plan period.

Officer response

- 1 The Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD are separate documents from the Development Management Policies DPD and by way of the process for their preparation should be treated as such. They will collectively help achieve the sustainable development of the area. It is a considered decision of the Council to prepare the documents separately. The Council has an up to date sound Core Strategy that is in general conformity with the NPPF. The Core Strategy sets out the overall spatial strategy for the Borough, the quantity of development and their broad distribution. Paragraph 1.10 of the Core Strategy commits the Council to prepare the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management Policies DPD. These DPDs are necessary to enable the comprehensive delivery of the Core Strategy. Policy CS13: *Older people and vulnerable groups* offer an in-principle support to elderly people's accommodation. The purpose of the Development Management Policies DPD is to prepare detailed policies for determining day to day planning applications. It is never intended for it to allocate specific sites for development. That is a matter for the Site Allocations DPD. The Council does not accept it is pursuing a local plan that is unsound and neither does it accept that its overall approach is not joined up. The Site Allocations DPD process is on-going and it will not be helpful to second guess its outcome at this stage. It is acknowledged that the Retirement Villages Group Ltd has made representation to the Site Allocations DPD Regulation 18 consultation, which will

appropriately be taken into account as part of that process. The housing need figures in the 2015 Strategic Housing Market Assessment are broadly similar to the 2009 SHMA. Whilst the Council had the opportunity to take into account the 2015 SHMA before the DPD was published for Regulation 19 consultation, there is no significant new evidence in the study that would change the policies of the DPD.

- 2 Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy and other policies of the Core Strategy are sufficiently comprehensive to enable consideration of any application that might come forward for the provision of elderly people accommodation. The rest of the representation has been addressed above.
- 3 Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy includes a clear monitoring framework for monitoring the delivery of specialist accommodation. No purpose will be served by repeating that in the Development Management Policies DPD.

Proposed modification

No modification is being proposed as result of this representation.

Katharine Harrison (on behalf of Surrey County Council)

Summary of representations

- 1 Reference should be made to the government's policy on SUDS and to the Council's own guidance contained in an advice note. A suggested new paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 2.3 has been provided as follows: Core Strategy Policy CS9 requires relevant development to incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) as part of any development proposals. This is in line with new Government Policy introduced in April 2015 which requires the provision of SUDS for all new major developments. The Borough Council has prepared an advice note on SUDS which is available to download from the Council's website. Similarly, there should be an additional reference to the advice note in paragraph 8.5 after the references to SUDS in paragraphs 3.4 and 4.14.
- 2 Support Policy DM4 but there is an omission from the last sentence of paragraph 3.47.

Officer response

- 1 This matter has been adequately and appropriate covered under paragraph 4.14 of the DPD, and no purpose will be served by repeating that as a separate paragraph in section 2. Paragraph 4.14 should be expanded by adding a sentence to acknowledge the existence of the Council's Advice Note on SUDS as follows: The Council has published an Advice Note on SUDS, which is available to download on the Council website. This is in line with the Governments policy on SUDS to require the provision of SUDS for all major developments. The Policy Link under Policy DM6 should be modified by adding the link to the Advice Note as follows: <http://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/service/suds/sudadvice>.
- 2 This matter has already been addressed.

Proposed modification

Paragraph 4.14 should be modified by adding the following sentence: The Council has published an Advice Note on SUDS, which is available to download on the Council website. This is in line with the Government policy on SUDS to require the provision of SUDS for all new major developments.

The Policy Link under Policy DM6 should be modified by adding the following link: <http://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/service/suds/sudadvice>.

Stephanie O'Callaghan (on behalf of Scotia Gas Network)

Summary of representations

- 1 The Core Strategy allows for the redevelopment of B Class uses for alternative uses that accord with other policies in the Core Strategy. However, the Council has not given due regard to the significant costs related to the decontamination of the former Gas Holder site on Boundary Road, which thus would require uses of sufficient value to ensure the redevelopment of the site is viable. It is essential that the site is allocated for uses of sufficient value to ensure that redevelopment is viable, taking into account the significant abnormal costs of the enabling works. The future uses of the site should be considered within the emerging plan.
- 2 The DPD should include the following policy to recognise the importance of viability of the site and the associated costs required to make the site suitable for alternative higher value uses such as residential: 'Hazardous installations will be identified in the adopted Proposals Map. The Council will take account of the need to incentivise and fund decommissioning as part of any redevelopment proposal through higher value land uses'.

Officer response

- 1 The site is in an employment area and is identified in the Site Allocations DPD to contribute towards the employment needs of the area. The Council is of the view that the site continue to be a suitable employment land and the proposed uses should enable the site to come forward. Having said that, this matter is outside the scope of this DPD because it does not allocate sites for development. This is a matter for the Site Allocations DPD which is a separate process.
- 2 See response to one above. The suggested additional policy is unacceptable. The Council has no intention to fund the decommissioning cost of the site.

Proposed modifications

No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.

Kieran Gregson (on behalf of Burhill Group Limited)

Summary of representations

- 1 Paragraph 5.46 (should be paragraph 5.52) implies that all associated features such as fences and walls, driveways, domestic paraphernalia and ancillary buildings harm the open character of the area. This might not be the case as each proposal should be judged on its merits. The word 'may' should be inserted between buildings and harm in that sentence.

Officer response

- 1 It is accepted that not all associated features will be harmful to the open character of the area. It is proposed to insert 'could' between 'buildings' and 'harm' in the last but one line of paragraph 5.46 to highlight this point.

Proposed modification

Paragraph 5.46 should be modified by inserting 'could' between 'buildings' and 'harm' in the last but one line of the paragraph.

Brookwood and Bridley Neighbourhood Forum

Summary of representations

- 1 Welcome the Council's assurance to work with local communities through Neighbourhood Plans to make sure that Green Infrastructure achieves maximum benefit to the Neighbourhood Area. It is suggested that Brookwood Cemetery should be one place that the Council could provide safe footpaths and cycle access to reduce the need to travel by the car.
- 2 Whilst trees are generally a great asset and benefit to the community and the environment, due consideration should also be given to the adverse effects mature trees can have on those living nearby. For example, mature trees can endanger lives and buildings and can restrict sunlight reaching neighbouring properties.
- 3 Support the approach taken by the Council on self build and custom housebuilding in the DM Policies DPD, but very surprised that in preparing the Site Allocations DPD the Council has refused to consider for allocation sites that would not yield at least 10 dwellings at an average density of 30dpd. There are a number of sites in Bridley which are suitable for low density housing and which can be developed without in any way infringing the Green Belt principles and without damage to the surrounding area. These sites will be highly suitable for self build homes.

Officer response

- 1 The point made about Brookwood Cemetery is noted. Brookwood cemetery is being considered as part of the Site Allocations DPD process, and this matter will appropriately be considered as part of that process.
- 2 Whilst the benefits of trees are clearly highlighted by the policy, it is also accepted that it might not always be beneficial to biodiversity and amenity in a limited number of cases and locations. For example, trees should not be planted on priority habitats such as lowland meadows or along water courses that are already very shaded. It is proposed that an additional sentence be added to paragraph 3.15 to highlight this as follows: 'Whilst the benefits of trees are acknowledged, the Council is also aware that trees might not always be beneficial to some forms of biodiversity, and they need to be maintained to avoid potential danger to safety, property and amenity. This will be taken into account in planning decisions'.
- 3 The DPD appropriately offers an in-principle support to self build and custom housebuilding. The allocation of sites is a matter for the Site Allocations DPD process.

Proposed modifications

Additional sentence be added to paragraph 3.15 as follows: Whilst the benefits of trees are acknowledged, the Council is also aware that trees might not always be beneficial to some forms of biodiversity, and they need to be maintained to avoid potential danger to safety, property and amenity. This will be taken into account in planning decisions

Gladman Developments

Summary of representations

- 1 Since the Core Strategy was adopted, there have been significant changes to local plan making. The adopted Core Strategy recognises the need to undertake a Green Belt boundary review to meet housing need between 2022 and 2027. Now that the Green Belt boundary review has been completed it is considered that this is an appropriate juncture for the Council to consider whether the production of a single new local plan, taking account of the latest evidence on housing need would be more appropriate way of managing the Borough's development needs over the next 15 – 20 years.
- 2 The Council should take the opportunity to review its Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) in the light of more up-to-date information and population projections. The process for carrying out OAN and the key points to note has been highlighted.
- 3 To boost significantly the supply of housing, the Council should ensure that its housing requirement is sufficient to support demographic needs, economic growth and address market signals of affordability and demand.
- 4 The Council should ensure that it plans to deliver the full assessed need for affordable housing.
- 5 The requirements of Policy DM13 that deal with development adjoining the Green Belt or outside the Green Belt but conspicuous when viewed from it is onerous because it is already covered by Policy CS24 of the Core Strategy. It is also onerous because all proposals for development will be required to submit a landscape assessment to ensure landscape character is not harmed. The policy as draft appears to treat Green Belt as requiring special landscape protection. However, land is not designated as Green Belt because it has a landscape quality that needs to be protected.
- 6 The part of Policy DM20 requiring that where a development proposal affects the character or setting of a heritage asset, the applicant must show that the works are in 'harmony with' the heritage asset lacks precision and is too open to interpretation. It should be drafted to meet the requirements of paragraph 154 of the NPPF.

Officer response

- 1 Paragraph 1.10 of the Core Strategy sets out the Development Plan Documents that the Council wishes to prepare. This includes a separate Site Allocations DPD and a Development Management Policies DPD. The latest guidance on plan preparation allows flexibility for Local Planning Authorities to prepare separate Development Plan Documents if they wish to do so. The Council has an adopted Core Strategy that is post NPPF and has considered but taken the decision to prepare the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management Policies DPD as separate documents. Both documents are being prepared expeditiously. This approach is not at odds with Government guidance.
- 2 The Council already has an up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment with an up to date objectively assessed housing need. This was only published in September 2015. The SHMA had been prepared following good practice guidance, and is in line with the requirements of the NPPF. There is nothing in the SHMA that should require the immediate review of the Core strategy.

- 3 The Core Strategy sets out the housing requirement for the area of 292 dwellings per year (average). The Core Strategy (Policy CS12) also includes a policy on Affordable Housing with a clear target for Affordable Housing provision. The DPD and the Site Allocations DPD will facilitate the delivery of the housing requirement.
- 4 See 3 above.
- 5 The Council does not accept that the requirements of Policy DM13 are onerous. It provides a policy framework for determining applications for new building with Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt (there are two designated Major developed sites in the Borough), extensions and alterations, replacement and reuse of buildings. The Council continue to receive these types of application and the policy will be helpful in determining the applications. The policy does not require all proposals to submit a landscape assessment as suggested by the representation.
- 6 The part of the policy referred to is appropriately pitched to allow planning decisions to be made on the merits of individual proposals on a case by case basis.

Proposed modification

No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.

Greg Dowden (on behalf of McKay Securities PLC)

Summary of representations

- 1 Policy DM3 is unclear as to whether it relates just to formal buildings and playing pitches or other facilities as well. The Policy will not prevent development coming forward as easily as it should. The policy should make it clear whether it relates to buildings or to formal playing pitches or recreational facilities so that there is no ambiguity as to how the policy applies.
- 2 The part of Policy DM4 that relates to important views is insufficient and is entirely subjective because the important local views are not identified and the setting of the canal has not been mapped. The policy should be amended as follows:
'Development proposals which would conserve and enhance the landscape, heritage, architectural or ecological character, setting or enjoyment of the Basingstoke Canal and would not result in the loss of important views as illustrated on the Proposals Map will be permitted if all other relevant Development plan policies are met'.
- 3 Policy DM5 is vague and should provide robust guidance as to what constitute unacceptable impacts in relation to the environmental factors listed. The most important parts of the evidence should be incorporated into the reasoned justification. The policy should deal with the upper pollutant limits for each factor. It is also not clear that health and safety is a legitimate land use planning concern. Reference to unacceptable impacts should be deleted and replaced with specific, measurable criteria against which proposals can be examined.
- 4 Policy DM7 is not effective because there is no appropriate definition accompanying the light pollution section of the policy. The use of the word unduly causes uncertainty.
- 5 DM16 treats servicing of development as onerous which ignores its vital contribution in enabling economic activity and allowing it to continue. The policy should be redrafted to positively promote the importance of good servicing facilities in new development and positive criteria should be set which encourages new schemes to come forward. Rewording has been suggested.
- 6 Policy DM17 ineffective and unsound because the policy objective is vague and seeks to identify and encourage appropriate levels of activity and social interaction, which is not a planning policy objective. It also repeats the Woking Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The policy requires only improvements to be made to the public realm and does not recognise that the preservation of the current standard can be satisfactory.
- 7 Policy DM18 is negatively phrased. It should be redrafted to use positive language. The policy is also excessively detailed and contradicts paragraph 67 of the NPPF which states that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety.
- 8 Policy DM19 repeats guidance in the Design SPD. The duplication adds to unnecessary complexity which will reduce the effectiveness of the policy. The following has been suggested as a rewording: Proposals for new and replacement shopfronts will be permitted where they pay regard to the guidance set out in Woking Design SPD on shopfronts in terms of character, proportion, materiality, lighting and security.

- 9 Policy DM20 is unsound because it does not accurately reflect the correct legal or policy test for heritage assets which are conservation areas. It presently excludes development which would not preserve the conservation area rather than just enhance it. The word 'preserve and' should be inserted before enhance in the first bullet point of the policy.

Officer response

- 1 Policy DM13 is clear that the policy relates to extension and alterations to buildings, replacement of buildings, re-use of buildings and new buildings and facilities relating Major Developed Sites. There are two designated Major Developed Sites in the Borough and any new buildings or facilities within them should relate to the designated uses on the sites.
- 2 It will be unreasonable to anticipate and define views to and from the canal or potential future development on the Proposals Map for every proposal that might come forward. The Proposals Map identifies areas of protection, identifies safeguarded sites and sets out the areas to which specific policies apply. The way in which views to and from any of the designations are assessed should be considered on a case by case basis taken into account the merits of each proposal and the appropriate vantage points from which the views are taken.
- 3 Policy DM5 is not vague. There are unacceptable levels of pollutions regarding air quality, surface and ground water quality, land quality and health and safety of the public. The policy is clear to emphasise that the relevant experts will be consulted on relevant applications and their advice will help determine what is acceptable or unacceptable. The other supporting information has a link to relevant pollution information. A condition to limit pollution of any kind and the potential effect that might have on health and safety as a result of development is a legitimate planning issue.
- 4 There are acceptable standards for noise and light pollutions. The relevant experts will be consulted when necessary. The other supporting guidance includes a lot of relevant information to enable informed decisions to be made. It is not accepted that the policy creates uncertainty.
- 5 Policy DM16 is in the DPD because of the recognition of the importance of servicing of development to the functioning of the local economy. Nevertheless, it is important that its impacts are fully addressed and as such a balance needs to be struck between the two objectives. The policy as drafted struck that balance.
- 6 Policy DM17 seeks to encourage the integration of public realm in development. Public realm has a clear social function that is a legitimate planning function. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF sets out the purpose of the planning system, which is to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development. The three dimensions of sustainable development are given as economic, social and environmental.
- 7 The policy provides a positive framework for determining applications. There are proposed modifications in response to representations by the British Sign and Graphics Association that might address some of the comments raised by this representation.
- 8 Policy DM19 as drafted is necessary to give it the appropriate weight to determine planning applications on shopfronts. Shopfronts are a source of a

significant number of applications, and the policy will contribute towards informing what needs to be taken into account when the applications are determined. The Design SPD is already referenced in the policy.

- 9 The suggestion to insert 'preserve' in the first bullet point of Policy DM20 is reasonable.

Proposed modification

The first bullet point of Policy DM20 should be modified by inserting 'preserve and' before enhance.

Anthony Heslehurst (on behalf of Thakeham Homes Ltd)

Summary of representations

- 1 Policy DM13 applies a presumption against development on land adjacent to the Green Belt and employs a wording that is anti-development, contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF. The policy is unacceptably vague and shifts the onus onto the applicant to demonstrate that development would not cause perceived harm. Green Belt issues are dealt with in detail within the NPPF and it is not considered necessary to revisit that in the DPD. The part of the policy that refers to 'development adjacent to the Green Belt' should be removed.
- 2 Although supportive of policy DM9, concern is expressed that applications will only be permitted 'provided the appropriate car parking standards for such development can be met'. Such proposals should not adhere to the full relevant car parking standards.
- 3 Policy DM10 is excessively restrictive and would make infill development difficult. This is in particular regarding to the following part of the policy 'provided that it does not involve the inappropriate sub-division of existing curtilage to a size below that prevailing in the area, taking account of the need to retain and enhance mature landscapes'.

Officer response

- 1 Policy DM13 sets out the circumstances under which certain types of development in and adjacent to the Green Belt will be considered. Strict controls are necessary to avoiding any harm to the purpose and integrity of the Green Belt. In this regard, the policy is not considered anti-development. It seeks to ensure that the types of development set out in the policy could come forward if the required criteria are met. It is always the case that the applicant has to justify the merits of the proposal they are promoting and the requirements of this policy are no different.
- 2 The Council has an adopted car parking standards that should apply to proposed developments. In applying the standards, Policy CS18 emphasises that the Council will seek to ensure that this will not undermine the overall sustainability objectives of the Core Strategy, including the effects on highway safety. Decisions about parking are taken on a case by case basis depending on the nature of the proposal and its locational characteristics.
- 3 Policy DM10 is positively drafted to support development on garden land that does not compromise the overall character of the area. This is necessary to preserve the character of the area, and there are sufficient number of policies in the Core Strategy, the DPD and the various Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes to ensure that this is the case.

Proposed modification

No modification is proposed as result of this representation.

Donatella Cillo (on behalf of the Environment Agency)

Summary of representations

- 1 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report does not include up to date statuses of the main rivers within the Borough as well as water pollution incidents. As such it does not provide the appropriate evidence to support the DPD. Objective 14: 'maintain and improve the water quality of the Borough's rivers and groundwater, and manage water resources sustainably' included in Appendix 2 need to be updated as part of the minor modifications. The up to date information in the Cycle 2 of the River Basin Management Plan 2014 data should be included at the current ecological status of the main rivers as follows:

Up to date Cycle 2 of the River Basin Management Plan 2014 data

Main River	Ecological Status	Chemical elements	Overall risk
Hoe Stream	Moderate	High: Ammonia and phosphate Moderate: Annex 8 chemicals Good: Annex 10 chemicals	Not assessed yet for cycle 2, at risk for cycle 1.
Basingstoke Canal	Moderate	Not assessed	Not assessed
The Wey	Moderate	High: Ammonia Poor: Phosphate Pollutants High and Good	Not assessed yet for cycle 2, at risk for cycle 1'.

- 2 In accordance with paragraph 103 of the NPPF, Policy DM9 should be amended by adding a further bullet point: 'there is safe access and egress route during flood events'. The supporting paragraph 'Application Information' should be amended to include the following: Change of use planning applications need to be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment (FRA), subject to the triggers set out in footnote 20, paragraph 103 of the NPPF. Within the FRA it should be demonstrated that a safe route access and egress can be provided and maintained during flood events up to and including 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100 years) plus an allowance for climate change flood events'.
- 3 In accordance with paragraph 103 of the NPPF, Policy DM11 should be amended by adding a further bullet point: 'a safe access and egress route during flood events can be provided'. The supporting paragraph 5.16 should also be amended by including the following: 'The criteria in this policy are also intended to ensure that sub-division and conversions are appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including demonstrating that a safe route of access and egress can be provided and maintained during flood events up to and including the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100 year) plus an allowance for climate change flood event'.
- 4 Policy DM1 should make reference to undeveloped buffer zones to make the policy more consistent with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 5 A further bullet point should be added to the part of Policy DM1 that begins with Development proposals which would result in significant harm ... as follows: 'the benefits of the development outweigh the harm to biodiversity'. In addition, reference

to SANGs in the policy will be helpful with emphasis on them being not established on Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI)

- 6 Policy DM2 should include a wording to highlight that tree planting is not always of benefit to biodiversity.
- 7 Policy DM5 should refer to the aims of the Water Framework Directive.
- 8 Policy DM6 should include reference to undeveloped buffer zones. The policy should also seek to minimise the potential impacts of fly tipping over back fences for all developments facing the Borough's watercourses.
- 9 Policy DM7 should include the following additional wording 'Proposals for the external lighting as part of a new or existing development which require planning permission will be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate that the lighting scheme is the minimum necessary for security, safety, working or recreational purposes and that it minimises that pollution of glare or slippage to prevent impacts on nocturnal animals such as bats and water base species such as fish'.
- 10 Policy DM10 should also mention that the protection of green spaces is important to help minimise flood risk.

Officer response

- 1 It is important that the Sustainability Appraisal is informed by up to date information. Consequently, objective 14 in Appendix 2 regarding water quality should be amended with the following information:

Up to date Cycle 2 of the River Basin Management Plan 2014 data

Main River	Ecological Status	Chemical elements	Overall risk
Hoe Stream	Moderate	High: Ammonia and phosphate Moderate: Annex 8 chemicals Good: Annex 10 chemicals	Not assessed yet for cycle 2, at risk for cycle 1.
Basingstoke Canal	Moderate	Not assessed	Not assessed
The Wey	Moderate	High: Ammonia Poor: Phosphate Pollutants High and Good	Not assessed yet for cycle 2, at risk for cycle 1'.

- 2 The suggested new bullet point is in line with paragraph 103 of the NPPF and therefore acceptable. Policy DM9 should be modified by adding a new bullet point as follows: 'there is a safe access and egress route during flood events'. The following should also be added to the application information in paragraph 5.4 as follows: 'Change of use planning applications need to be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment (FRA), subject to the triggers set out in footnote 20 of paragraph 103 of the NPPF. Within the FRA it should be demonstrated that a safe route access and egress can be provided and maintained during flood events up to and including 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100 years) plus an allowance for climate change flood events'.
- 3 Based on the same reason as point 2 above, Policy DM11 should be modified by adding an additional bullet as follows: 'there is a safe access and egress route during flood events'. Paragraph 5.16 should also be modified by adding the

- following to clarify the suggested new bullet point: 'The criteria in this policy are also intended to ensure that sub-division and conversions are appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including demonstrating that a safe route of access and egress can be provided and maintained during flood events up to and including the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100 year) plus an allowance for climate change flood event'
- 4 Paragraph 1.3 of the DPD emphasises that 'the Development Management policies do not cover all policy areas: where principles of development are fully addressed by national or Core Strategy policies, they are not repeated'. Policy CS17: *Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation* clearly states 'The Council will seek to protect river corridors by creating undeveloped buffer zones, which will serve as green infrastructure as well as habitats of biodiversity value'. In the context of Policy DM1, no purpose will be served by repeating this.
 - 5 This point has already been addressed in response to Hook Heath Neighbourhood Forum's representations. The second bullet point of the part of Policy DM1 beginning 'where proposals include...should be modified by adding an additional bullet as follows: 'that the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace will not compromise the biodiversity value of Sites of Nature Conservation Interests'.
 - 6 The representation about tree planning has already been addressed with a proposed modification to Policy DM2 that covers this point.
 - 7 The aims of the Water Framework Directive have been taken into account in the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal and the policies of the DPD. Reference to it in the policy is reasonable. Paragraph 2 of policy DM5 should be modified by adding: 'the aim of the Water Framework Directive should be taken into account in planning decisions affecting water quality and management'.
 - 8 Reference to undeveloped buffer zones has already been addressed. There are other functions of the Council that appropriately deals with fly tipping. Fly tipping is not a matter that can effectively be addressed through planning policy.
 - 9 The Core Strategy seeks to protect the biodiversity of the area. Therefore, the suggested modification to minimise the impacts of light pollution on nocturnal animals is reasonable and consistent with the requirements of the Core Strategy. Policy DM7 should be modified by adding the following as a last sentence under the part of the policy on lighting and illumination: 'Proposals for the external lighting as part of a new or existing development which require planning permission will be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate that the lighting scheme is the minimum necessary for security, safety, working or recreational purposes and that it minimises the pollution of glare or slippage to prevent adverse impacts on nocturnal animals such as bats and water species'.
 - 10 The policy is not about the protection of green spaces. It is about the factors to be taken into account when developing on garden land. The principle of back garden development that does not detract from the character of the area is acceptable. The suggested addition to the policy in this particular context will be counter productive to the objective that the policy seeks to achieve. There are other policies in the Core Strategy and in this DPD that promotes new green spaces and protect existing ones.

Proposed modification

Objective 14 in Appendix 2 regarding water quality should be amended with the following information:

Up to date Cycle 2 of the River Basin Management Plan 2014 data

Main River	Ecological Status	Chemical elements	Overall risk
Hoe Stream	Moderate	High: Ammonia and phosphate Moderate: Annex 8 chemicals Good: Annex 10 chemicals	Not assessed yet for cycle 2, at risk for cycle 1.
Basingstoke Canal	Moderate	Not assessed	Not assessed
The Wey	Moderate	High: Ammonia Poor: Phosphate Pollutants High and Good	Not assessed yet for cycle 2, at risk for cycle 1'.

Policy DM9 should be modified by adding a new bullet point as follows: 'there is a safe access and egress route during flood events'. The following should also be added to the application information in paragraph 5.4 as follows: 'Change of use planning applications need to be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment (FRA), subject to the triggers set out in footnote 20 of paragraph 103 of the NPPF. Within the FRA it should be demonstrated that a safe route access and egress can be provided and maintained during flood events up to and including 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100 years) plus an allowance for climate change flood events'.

Policy DM11 should be modified by adding a bullet point as follows: 'There is a safe access and egress route during flood events'. Paragraph 5.16 should be modified by adding the following to clarify the suggested bullet point: 'The criteria in this policy are also intended to ensure that sub-division and conversions are appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including demonstrating that a safe route of access and egress can be provided and maintained during flood events up to and including the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100 year) plus an allowance for climate change flood event'

The second bullet point of the part of Policy DM1 beginning 'where proposals include...should be modified by adding an additional bullet point as follows: 'that the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace will not compromise the biodiversity value of Sites of Nature Conservation Interests'.

Paragraph 2 of policy DM5 should be modified by adding: 'the aim of the Water Framework Directive should be taken into account in planning decisions affecting water quality and management'.

Policy DM7 should be modified by adding the following as a last sentence under the part of the policy on lighting and illumination: 'Proposals for the external lighting as part of a new or existing development which require planning permission will be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate that the lighting scheme is the minimum necessary for security, safety, working or recreational purposes and that it minimises the pollution of glare or slippage to prevent adverse impacts on nocturnal animals such as bats and water species'.

