	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Policy Numbe r	Name of policy	recommendation	May SG	update		
2	BL1	Location of development	Consider that biodiversity should also be protected on brownfield sites. There was some concern raised about us not allocating sites.	Support for walkable neighbourhood. Support for brownfield sites. Agreement on setting assessment criteria. Range of views on location – anti chicken-farm, some support for Bohunt (though SDNP), some preference for near to A3. • In response to conversations around chicken farm – be clearer about strategic link over infrastructure in plan, to enable more direct connections for travel. Through policy you should be able to put requirements on development. • RR: BL10 also talks about linking to the neighbourhood – link these policies together, and identify the links on the map (to ask Alison). • AT: Walkable neighbourhood concept also goes some way to suggesting it, but be clearer. • PCF: latest consultation from SDNP – what if they were to develop in SDNP, what would be the criteria? Parish Council has already responded. The temperature within the SDNP is different this year to last year. Support development where it could make sense, so what is the criteria? • To do: Identify strategic links over infrastructure in plan→this takes the walkable neighbourhood concept but pushes it further. Link together with BL10/11, and identify the strategic links on a map if possible.	Biodiversity topic would fall under policy BL5 (Biodiversity) - there is no need to repeat this in BL1 as all policies are read and applied collectively. Additional text added to the justification to make this point. Additional text added into justification to refer to strategic policies e.g. JCS Policy CP20 on landscape. In terms of site allocations, the group agreed that it was premature to allocate sites, in the context of the emerging Local Plans. All sites are of a strategic size. Those smaller sites that might be suitable are already located within the settlement policy boundaries, therefore the principle of development is already achieved here. Response to SG comments: The policy (clause iv) links to policy BL10 - all maps will ultimately be linked via the Policies map to be inserted at the end of the document. On the point about strategic links, I've added this as an additional bullet to the supporting text to recognise that new development needs to contribute to improving these particular pinchpoints/linkages (which is covered more fully in BL11). I'll add in an extra diagram in BL1 to show this. I've also added an additional clause to the policy to express thi and make the link to BL11.		
3	BL2	Meeting local housing need	Many of the comments are anecdotal, e.g. a call for semi-detached rather than terraced homes. Lots not wanting any development.	AT: How to put local needs first/help those in the community to remain? • JK: Petersfield tried to make new housing focus on local people first but very hard to enforce. • PCF: can local authorities/HA's do it? • AT: yes, but that's only a portion of the product. Need to ask Alison how enforceable and how to word. • To do: If possible, add criteria to put local needs first so that the current community remains in Parish. If this is too difficult to enforce, policy still to highlight importance of people who are already connected to the community.	The policy is underpinned by the Local Houing Needs Assessment prepared at the parish level in 2021. This is a report that has used the government-endorsed methodology to identify the type (mix, size, affordability, tenure) of new homes, based on existing datasets. Additional text has been added to the supporting information to enable a read across to strategic policy. A short section on Gypsy and Traveller (GT) accommodation has been added, although the expectation is that this is being addressed through the EHDC Local Plan, informed by the GT Accommodation Assessment 2020 - this is because such accommodation is a strategic issue and needs to be considered at the broader geographical scale. Response to SG comments: The only route for prioritising affordable housing to those with a specific link to the parish is as part of the the First Homes element of the affordable housing - the link to the parish is already included in the policy, which seeks to prioritise these people. Otherwise housing allocations are not planning policy - they are dealt with via the Housing Allocations Team. Incidentally that FH element of the policy also prioritises key workers. I've added an additional para to the supporting text to explain this.		
4	BL3	Character and Design of development	Comments relating to the Guidance document itself were collated. Concerns about over development and also impact of proposed developments (coming from developers) not respecting e.g. local character / sunken lanes.	AT: the policy combined with the Design Code covers the points raised.	The policy remains largely unchanges from the draft. It is underpinned by the Design Guidance and Codes for B&L, which themselves are being updated to take account of final comments received. On the point about sunken lanes, there is a specific policy relating to this.		
5	BL4	Climate change and design	Majority of comments supported this policy.	AT: Can the wording in policy be strengthened to achieve higher standards? To ask Alison about viability assessments and how they can be used.	The policy remains largely unchanged. Clause C has been reworded to add clarity (this relates to retrofitting of buildings). Some comments related to the provision of EV points at resiential properties - this is now a requirement under Building Regs for new build, so no need to include in the policy itself. Response to SG comments: At the moment, we cannot require higher standards than those set out in Building Regulations.		
6	BL5	Green and blue infrastructure and delivering biodiversity net gain	All agreed with this policy. Comments on: 1: whether a 10% net gain is appropriate for all sizes of development 2: that net gain is often done poorly. 3: Need to link biodiversity opportunity areas to wildlife corridors	. Some confusion on what net gain means and we can't do much different to what Natural England do. • Residents impressed that so many green spaces were identified – this links to the green corridors that people want. • To do: link policy with BL16 (allotments & community growing spaces & green corridors) as consultation showed enthusiasm for active community participation in this area.	Policy remains largely unchanged, just added the point about connecting BOAs to the existing network. Awaiting maps from the Biodiversity Record Centre to add to our maps - this will map the BOAs. On net gain, the requirements are set nationally and small developments (e.g. less than 10 dwellings) are likely to be required to deliver a net gain but this detil is being worked out. In terms of quality of net gain, Policy BL6 provides additional detail on the types of features specific to the area that should be prioritised. Response to SG comments: I've added to the green box to describe what net gain is. I've also added a clause to the policy to try to push developers who are unable to deliver their net gain on site to try to do this t least within the parish, focussing on your biodiversity opportunity areas. This may not fly, but I think it's important to try and push for this rather than seeing units be spent elsewhere in the country. Added into the text the link to BL16.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
7	BL6	Managing the environmental impact of development	All in agreement with the policy. Support for reduced mowing and for wildlife friendly features.	No disagreements	Few changes to the draft. Note that reduced mowing sits outside planning policy.		
8	BL7	Local Green Spaces	Support for all. Query about how spaces are maintained.	No disagreements	Maintenance would be the responsibility of the owner of the space - the designation does not change that. Final list of spaces being finalised.		
9	BL8	Protection of locally significant views	Much support for the five views identified (and those already identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal). Concern about development impacting views, but also might new views be opened up?	Following developer response (commissioned their own work to suggest SG view wasn't significant) need to double check this policy is robust.	We can only identify existing important views in the policy - if new views came forward we could include those in a future review of the plan, if they are felt to be significant. Policy therefore largely unchanged. **Response to SG comment:** Views are rather subjective. A developer will always argue against a view that crosses their potential site. What is required is a robust description of how you have identified the selected views and a description as to why they are considered particularly important. Perhaps the group could strengthen their reasoning, picking up any of the points raised by that developer. Ultimately the examiner will visit the views and come to a conclusion - we've found that some examiners are more lenient on this than others - noting too that this policy is rarely going to be able to completely stop a view being interrupted if, for instance, a stategic site is allocated there - it's more about recognising the value of the view and encouraing developers to try to design their developments to complement that view - which might be incoporating view corridors or considering layout of the site or height of buildings at certain points, or plcement of green space within the development.		
10	BL9	Dark skies	All in support. Comments largely non-policy related e.g. ensuring community safety in darker areas and educating parishioners about good practice when to comes to lighting their homes and gardens.	No disagreements	No changes. The policy in any case stem from best practice provided by the AONB Units. Added in the point about lighting to the non-policy actions table.		
11	BL10	Improving walking, cycling and equestrian opportunities	Largely supportive comments. Some concern about whether cars should be banned from the square (this Is not in the policy). Specific comments received about how people consider the potental strategic developments might deliver the policy.	. Total focus on Square. Everyone has their own solution, but this plan can't do most of it e.g. redevelopment of Square. • Agreement on signage and lighting which is more within our remit. • Implications: clear not just about the Square but all opportunities Parish-wide. Not just about moving vehicles from A to B, but improving active transport. • AT: part of one CIL application is seeking new modelling including pedestrians. • RR: this is what developers should be looking at too. It's an issue for everyone, not just cars. Example is Peak Day Centre – those not in cars have to cross the car park to get to it. • To do: Be clearer policy is not just about the Square but all opportunities Parish-wide. Not just about moving vehicles from A to B, but improving all active transport.	Amended to a '10 minute' radius. On strategic sites, these would need to demonstrate how they meet the critieria. **Response to the SG comments:** The policy is parish-wide. The only actual mention of the square is in relation to walkability - using the square (as a key focal central point in the village) as a demonstrator of where that 10 minute radius is - and it uses the railway too. I will add in the other pedestrian pinchpoints and infrastructure improvements required to the map, as per BL1.		

12	BL11	Mitigating vehicular impacts at junctions and poinch points	Much support for the policy. Some querying whether it would achieve much in practice. Comments about the need for more crossing points in the village, and the need for speed limits to be reduced and enforced (both sit outside land-use planning policy).	Disagreements came where people believed policy wouldn't do anything.
				• Suggestion to put something in policy about car parking? People upset e.g. no space in Midhurst Rd for Peak Centre or Green Dragon as everyone using cinema
				• LB: do you put another car park in to encourage more cars? Is it a bad thing to be discouraged from driving and to encourage others e.g. bike racks
				• RR: good point. For policy – make other concrete suggestions like bike racks.
				• LB: whilst doing this we need to be gathering ideas for CIL projects too.
				• RR: people pointing out that we are picking from EHDC/national, hard not to when we do have to be in line. But maybe we could have more pinch points on maps to make it more specific, clearly recognising Square being nightmare at peak times, and Midhurst railway bridge.
				• LB: could go with strategic links on map.
				• PCF: add Headley Rd avenue and schools, and Longmoor. Second map – heatmap along with the pinch points would be helpful.
				• To do: Specific suggestions like back racks. Plus locate the pinch points on a map. This clearly shows we are paying attention to local area. Same map as strategic links from BL1? Heatmap to be added?
					The wording has changed very slightly so as not to refer specifically to transport assessments - this follows on from a recent examation of another NDP on this point. Speed limits are a Highways Issue and is included in the non-policy section. Crossing points too are part of the wider need to encourage walking and cycling - include in para 6.22 and non-policy action table.
					
					Response to the SG comments:
					
					In terms of parking, this is a seaprate issue to traffic pinchpoints and I think this would be better placed in an expansion of policy BL12. We can include a clause to seek to safeguard existing space and support proposals that would alleviate parking issues on areas under pressure. see to the right an example, that would also pick up on EV charging points and e.g. bike racks.
					
					Back to the pinchpoints policy, I'll add the additional pinchpoints to the map
					
					Does the group have access to a heat map that can be added?
						POLICY BL12: PUBLICLY AVAILABLE PARKING
						
						A. Development proposals that would result in an unacceptable loss of existing publicly available off-street car parking spaces will not be supported.
						
						B. Proposals that enable the provision of additional, publicly accessible off-road car parking spaces will be supported subject to the policies of this Neighbourhood Plan. In particular proposals which:
						
						   i. alleviate parking congestion within Liphook Village Centre and near to the schools will be supported; and where
						
						   ii. parking spaces are landscaped, ideally with native species, to minimise the visual impact of parked vehicles. They must also not exacerbate or cause additional surface-water runoff.
						
						C. At existing locations and alongside any new public car parking provision, the following facilities will be strongly supported to be provided as part of that provision:
						
						   i. dedicated covered and secure bicycle parking facilities, preferably with e-bike charging points; and
						
						   A. future-proofed four hour or faster electric vehicle charging points (or wireless charging facilities).
						
						Conformity Reference: NP objectives: 3; Saved Local Plan policies: ; EHDC Local Plan Part 1: CP31; EHDC Local Plan Part 2: LP1 ; SDNPA Local Plan: SD19; NPPF: 104, 106, 107, 112	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
13	BL12	Publicly available electric vehicle charging points	Largely support for this policy. Some concern raised about the environmental friendliness of EVs themselves and the need to promote public transport. Some concern that policy is redundant as repeating national standards.	EV charging surprisingly confrontational, not everyone agrees with it. Can we make it clearer that this is PART of active travel, not solution? • PCF: agree to adapt this policy, we don't know where the EV situation is going. • RR: not enough on public transport. This is because we can't do much about it, but can we do anything? LB: could we have map for desired public transport routes, linking hospitals, station etc.? Link to heat map etc., all related. • All agreed on map with key routes and services, linking to BL18. • DS: can we link up with other councils? • PCF: yes possibly. Link to Haslemere hospital for example. • NH: Is this a significant change to the policy and its wording? • RR: change name to greener vehicle options? This moves EV down the priority list but still there. • PCF: Or targeted local transport? Do we have any experts we could talk to? E.g. find cost for a bus – driver, vehicle etc., find out if that is sustainable? • RR: can talk to Bohunt which is exactly that and always loss making. Some private schools do too. • JK: Age Concern have their bus too. • To do: rename and slightly re-direct policy. Talk about public transport/targeted local transport here too. Add to map key routes and services inc. hospitals, station.	National policy has been amended in relation to residential dwellings and EV points. This policy supports EV points in publicly accessible settings. Noted the point about EV cars, The NDP overall seeks to support active travel - and where possible public transport (although provision of the latter is dependent on private companies - developer contributions could assist though). REsponse to SG comments: As noted above, I'd suggest expanding this to cover parking generally - see example policy above right. Public transport - little we can do about this. Remember that transport issues largely sit outside the scope of land-use planning - it's the responsibility of HCC.		
14	BL13	Conserving the heritage of the parish	Mostly supportive. Some comments about whether new conservation areas could be identified e.g. Gunns Farm, Berg Estate. Concern about the impact of traffic on e.g. village centre heritage.	Tricky to highlight newer areas – if we start doing some of them maybe all will want it. • RR: Roger hasn't done his list of heritage assets. He probably hasn't got the time to do it. • LB: to pursue	Points raised sit outside the scope of the NDP. On CAs, it it the DC who could designate new ones - added some text to note this. On traffic impacts, clearly our other policies are trying to reduce such impacts and support more active (non-car travel), but there is no legislative hook we can use to address this from a heritage angle.		
15	BL14	Sunken Lanes	All in agreement. Note that some mention made of one of the strategic sites and the potential impact it might have on sunken lanes. This policy would help to guard against that.	No disagreements. Still need to update map with some more – maps finishing session needed. • JK: East Hants will have it already. Ask them.	No changes aside from map to be added		
16	BL15	Enhancing Liphook's shop frontages and and design	Call for Station Road to be recognised in this policy.	Agreement to put Station Road in this policy.	Station Road added.		
17	BL16	Allotments and community growing spaces	All in agreement. Request for Liphook in Bloom to be recognised. Recognise the need for any new space to have certain features, e.g. good drainage, light exposure, water/electric etc.	No disagreements, to link up with BL5 Green Spaces if possible.	Liphook in Bloom added to the supporting text. Policy amended to include the desire for new space to provide/have access to particular features. Response to SG comments: I've made link (in supporting text - not required in the policy) to BL5.		
18	BL17	Enhancing community, cultural, sporting, and recreational facilities	Comments about the need to make the policy more specific.	List of projects for CIL would help with the disagreement that policy isn't constructive enough.	I think we should see what comes out of Reg 14 and then try to tighten up the wording on this in terms of specific facilities needed. Basically, the more specific you can be on what's needed, the better.		
19	BL18	Providing adequate health and education services.	Most supportive but some concerned that new development has to make adequate provision of health/education so as not to be detrimental to existing residents.	Also comes back to list of projects to be more specific about tapping into grants etc. • LB: make it clear at beginning of NDP what we can and can't do? • RR: we already do, people will still say it. • PCF: is there anything pro-active we can put in? new health centre – should not just support one GP but should be linked to community, to PC, to funding sources, to range of services. • RR: tricky – developers can suggest sites but NHS might not want them. Centre around social prescribing and easy access? • PCF: Or an onboard pharmacy. Ways around it. • RR: our policy can be more specific on health. Worth talking to Alison about how to be pro-active within our limits.	Response to all: The policy is on the edge of what we have responsbility for (health is PCTs/ NHS, schools is HCC), so realistically it will not be easy to go further than what is stated.		
20	BL19	Enhancing opporunities for local employment To do: ask Alison about demonstrating 'circular' in policy, not just in the title.	Mostly supportive comments. Call for support for start up, shops, small businesses etc. also shared workspaces and pop-up/mobile businesses. Call for the policy to be stronger in terms of focussing employment in existing areas / extensions to existing areas, as this will enable greater relationships and cross-working.	To ask Alison about wording policy to support existing cluster areas of business	The policy does reference the expansion of existing sites. Text added to include shared space. Tempoary (Pop-up) shops is referred to in Policy BL20. Response to SG comments: I'm not sure what more can be added - we have mapped the existing clusters of businesses and the policy specifically seeks to safeguard these and support expansion of these.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
21	BL20	Enhancing the role and setting of Liphook village centre	Supportive comments. Mention of Newtown as well as The Square in Liphook. EHDC also noting that permitted development rights allow numerous changes without the need for planning permission – for example class E can go to residential (C3). Likewise temporary uses may not need planning permission.	Policy to mention Station Rd/Newtown	Justification added to so as to define Liphook village as The Square and surrounding commerical areas. **Response to SG comment:** I've added those to the policy wording.		
22	BL21	Promoting sustainable rural tourism	Largely supportive comments. Just some concern about the impact of traffic.	Give clarity that this policy isn't necessarily about building new things, it's signposting etc., which is more within the remit of NDP and won't increase traffic.	Traffic impact mentioned as a clause in the policy, with a note that new developments should be walkable and linked to the main movement routes as identified in Policy BL10. **Response to SG comment:** I've added additional clause: B.As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should contribute to improved wayfinding and signage for the parish, provided that they can be satisfactorily integrated within their surroundings.		
23							
24							
25	Developer responses:	General comments	Key points:	**LB: 3 developer responses received. All highlighting East Hants lack of plan and our new status as 'Tier 1' settlement in East Hants – large settlement. Casting doubt on housing numbers as reason for not allocating – all suggested reconsidering.** **• PCF: Suggestion from one developer to ask EHDC & SDNP for indicative housing requirement number could be good.** **• JK: They didn't want to give us a number last time.** **• DS: Development should be led by local people.** **• RR: Should be, but isn't, so we need to work with it.** **• PCF: At the district level – 2 offices. Might change in two weeks after changing office. 2024 for EHDC, 2025 for SDNP.** **• RR: Regarding developers' disagreement with one of our locally protected views: policy is not to stop development where there is a view, just to take it into account.** **• LB: We cannot commit to an early review as they have asked. We need to be clear the NDP is not an interim.** **• RR: Has everyone seen the developer's full comments as well as the summary?** **• NH: Not yet. Will share with the SG.**		
26			•Highlighting EHDC's lack of district plan, and Liphook's recent status as 'Tier 1' (large) settlement in EHDC's Issues & Priorities consultation → casting doubt on housing numbers being met.		Noted but the housing numbers is being considered strategically and B&L has been given no requirement to deliver through the NDP. All of the sites are strategic in size and should be considered against other potential strategic sites across the whole district as opposed to simply the parish. The SNDP have been clear that they would not support the site in the National Park at this time. Of the smaller sites that came forward in the call for sites, all are located in the settlement policy boundaries in any case, so the principle for them to come forward for develoment is already in place. The work that you have undertaken on sites can be used to influence the emerging Local Plans.		
27			•All suggest re-considering site allocation, or committing to an early review.		as above.		
28			•Policy-specific suggestions applied to BL1 particularly RE settlement boundaries: "The draft policy should be clear about the circumstances in which development outside of the settlement boundaries could be supported"		Clause B sets this out.		
29			•One developer commissioned independent landscape consult to 'assess and advise' on the NDP's protected views, suggesting they 'do not sincerely reflect experience'		Noted. Views and their identification is very subjective. Examiners will go and visit the view and ultimately will give their opinion. It should be noted though that identifying a view cannot completely protect it from development. The idea is to try and ensure that if there were ever development, it would be designed to try and be sympathetic to that view, for instance by incorporating the view into the overall design.		
30			•"We note the Steering Groups decision to progress an interim BLNP, pending the outcome of upper tier plan reviews; and that an early review of the BLNP may therefore be needed"		This is not an interim Neighbourhood Plan - there is no such thing. The NDP will progress and hopefully get through the referendum. It is within the gift of neighbourhood planning groups to choose not to allocate - that is not a requirement. Given the fact though that the two Local Plans are emerging, it would make sense to review the NDP - perhaps within six months of their adoption - to check if any additional updates are required to the NDP policies.		
31			*NB: NSP Steering Group clarity - this is not an interim NDP*				
32			•Asked for BLNDP to request an indicative housing requirement number from SNDPA and EHDC		We have not been provided this.		