



MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY 08 SEPTEMBER 2026, 7.30pm, Village Hall meeting room

Parish Councillors – Simon Richards (Chairman), Ian Bowman, Rick Scholes; Clerk Susan Turner;
Guest Alex Tate as candidate for Parish Council advisory committee / future Parish Councillor.

2026.

43 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Apologies from James Ashmore, Brenda Hunt, Dianne Kirk; also from Ward Cllr Anne Crampton (as attending an impromptu briefing on LGR), County Cllr Richard Quarterman, and from Marie Crespo as prospective candidate for Parish Council advisory committee / future Parish Councillor.

44 PUBLIC SESSION No additional members of public present.

45 MINUTE OF PREVIOUS MEETING of 19 August agreed and signed.

46 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST in items on the Agenda, none.

47 REPORTS TO MEETING

.1 County Cllr written report **APPENDIX I**.

.2 Local Government Reorganisation – per update from Hart Chief Executive: Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government announced Mon 07 Sept that Government's LGR decision for the Hampshire area has been withdrawn. Government has also withdrawn the decision in three other county areas and has paused LGR in all other areas, with the exception of Surrey which is underway. Local elections will happen in May 2027, not shadow elections for the new unitary councils. This doesn't mean LGR is cancelled, but on hold subject to Government review.

48 FINANCE

.1 Accounts to date **APPENDIX II**; Bank reconciliation at 07 September = £18,570.54 Payments since last meeting of 19 August.

20 Clerk – Salary £340.00
21 Metro – Bank fees £3.00

.2 Budget update – **APPENDIX III** – recap / update

- i CCTV: a top-up grant of £1,730 requested from PCC (Police & Crime Commissioner) grant to cover additional cost of upgraded camera system; awaiting outcome, otherwise to be met from Parish Council reserves (ref minutes August meeting).
- ii Village Hall – Current level of Parish Council funding is £8K per year agreed until such time as the second cottage is generating income.
- iii Noted the main hall in need of internal decorating; requires professional job and scaffold tower. Likely a £10K project, to begin seeking quotes.
- iv Budgeted forecast for year end balance = c£6K

49 PARISH COUNCIL RECRUITMENT AND PRIORITIES

.1 Prospective new Parish Council members and advisors

As minuted August meeting.

'Heckfield Parish Council has an allocation of six Parish Councillors. To increase this number requires a submission to Hart via a Community Governance review which will include public consultation.

'The Parish Council may appoint advisory committees (s102(4)) of any number of appointees – which can include some or all or non-councillors [other than finance committee]. Noting that advisory committees can make recommendations.'

All Parish Councillors, employees and volunteers are covered by Parish Council insurance.

AGREED – The benefits of encouraging more people to engage, and bringing new interest / experience / enthusiasm to the Parish Council.

For signature (p1 of 4)

.2 Parish Council priorities

- i Speeding and road safety – of note to date:
 - Warning bollards and hard standing areas installed where public footpaths cross the B3349 (Highways identified a sufficient unused pot of S106 funding).
 - Operated AutoSpeedWatch camera for a year on B3349. Records speed and also vehicle information such as tax and MOT status. Solar powered and good camera (daytime working only): builds a picture of driver behaviour. But the radar not calibrated to accuracy that police can take as evidence to prosecute; as per Community SpeedWatch, warning letters can be sent; but Police can't commit the time to act on data provided.
 - Efforts instead moved to Wellington roundabout CCTV system installation in conjunction with the Estate. (See also 'item 49 CCTV Cameras' below.)
 - Ongoing liaison with County, Police and MP.
- ii Parish connectivity – of note to date:
 - Initially re-opened a pathway following route of old main road through the now woodland opposite Old School Road to New Inn.
 - This superseded by creating a passable footway to the New Inn roadside over the verge; upgraded this year.
 - Established permissive path through Coldpiece Wood with landowner agreement.
 - Seasonal public footpath maintenance via Parish Lengthsman scheme.
- iii Environmental protection – of note to date:
 - Liaised with Hart tree officer to achieve a group TPO on Chamberlains Meadow; trees include veteran Oaks, and potentially under threat from development.

.3 Projects to take forward – roles for new members

- i Continue to actively pursue road safety improvements.
- ii Reclaiming old public rights of way shown on maps from 1950s – **APPENDIX IV**; Looking to achieve circular routes from the village.
- iii Village Green.

Alex Tate, on introducing himself and expressing his interest in joining the Parish Council, listed improving road safety and the public footpath network as tasks he is keen to engage with; also able to provide a valuable connection to residents east Laundry Lane area of Parish.

AGREED to devise a residents survey – seeking feedback on priorities and concerns the Parish Council can look to further and address. (Action all.)

- .4 Wider Parish communication** – Discussion on importance of reaching all Parish residents, and seeking contacts in areas at the moment missing regular channels of communication. To ensure working for the whole Parish, specifically a need to:
 - Maintain links with Malthouse Lane / Bar Lane, particularly farming community and the issues of rural crime
 - improve links with Bramshill side of Parish; issues here with the Bramshill Road, the triangle junction, and the B3011 with particular reference to BCA vehicles.

50 CCTV – Recap (IB).

- i Background.
 - The trial CCTV camera solar powered and requires SIM card connecting to a server via 4G or 5G (also needing power). Thus needs reliable signal and ideally south facing without shading; struggling in trying to deploy at the roundabout
 - Potentially worth re-siting at suitable location; SIM card cost £15 or £20 per month.

NOTED – The B3349 layby by graveyard a problem area for litter.

Further noted that the bin is located for the footpath in response to issue of dog poo bags being left. County specifically advised against bins in the layby as attract more flytipping.

Problem of litter thrown from car windows is ongoing... in past held village

litterpicks. District councils – Hart / Basingstoke joint services arrange a contractor for annual litter clearing the verges – B339, Causeway and A33 – usually late February time.

- ii Latest on CCTV – a more comprehensive solution for combatting drifting at the Wellington roundabout – in agreement with the Estate – a two camera system connected to the Wellington mains electricity and DVR (digital video recorder) system.

51 **VILLAGE HALL PROJECTS** (*recap / update*)

- i Various planning and LBC approvals achieved for Hall and Cottage.
- ii Update re Cottage – as per planning / LBC approvals in place – works to be underway asap though majority of external work will need to wait until after the winter. Confirmed roof generally watertight but windows not so and will need to be secured until they can be restored.

52 **HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC**

.1 **Village gateway signage** – *Minuted from last meeting that*

'41.3 'Proposal for... – for the Parish Council to install new and eye-catching 'gateway' signage but to use existing posts rather than the costly gate features. Suggested six signs needed with 'Heckfield please drive carefully' or wording to that effect... An agenda item for next meeting.'

AGREED – To allocate £1K from budgeted reserves to signage.

.2 **Traffic speeds on Odiham Road – past Dukes Meadow into Riseley**

Noted that

- Swallowfield Parish Council minutes of 14 April 2026 at item 3206.1
Agreed response to Wokingham Borough Council's Consultation on Speed Limits in the Parish – requesting speed limit reductions.
- The speed limit was reduced from 40 to 30 through Riseley a few years ago but the speeding problem remains.

AGREED – To seek meeting with Swallowfield Parish Council.

53 **PLANNING**

.1 **Parish Planning and LBC applications** Planning update **APPENDIX V.**

No new applications since last meeting.

.2 **NPPF August 2026** enacted immediately and so relevant to all current and ongoing planning applications. To consider first the National Decision-making Policies and 'Chapter 4 Achieving sustainable development' ref NDMPs S3-S5 **APPENDIX VI.**

.3 **National Delegation Scheme for planning decisions** comes into force 31 October as per the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 **APPENDIX VII.**

- Ward Councillors will no longer be able to call an application to committee, and there will be no referral to committee on the basis of public objections.
- Where applications fall under Schedule 1, decisions must be delegated to officers under reg 4.
- Where applications fall under Schedule 2, there is a presumption under regulation 5 that decisions are delegated to officers - *unless*
 - The application meets at least one of the criteria in regulation 5(3) which includes (among others) applications for planning permission which are not householder, minor commercial or minor residential applications, **and**
 - the nominated officer (chief planning officer or similar) and nominated member (chair of planning committee or similar) agree the application should be referred to committee, **and**
 - the application raises
 - A. an Economic, Social or Environmental issue of significance to the local area, **or**
 - B. a significant Planning matter having regard to the Development Plan and any other material considerations.

.4 **Local Plan update** Spatial Strategy Consultation scheduled for publication 19 October. [Subsequently rescheduled to Monday 26 October.]

- .5 **Water infrastructure** Re publicised issues with South East Water supply – Hart Planning Committee to receive briefing from Officers at Development Management (Planning) Committee meeting of 16 September. [Subsequently postponed.]

54 **FURTHER UPDATES / REPORTS**

.1 **Village Hall events**

Saturday 14 November – Heckfield Christmas Fair.

Saturday 12 Dec – a gig with the local band; a community event and aid of the hall

.2 **Defibrillator** – confirmed in working order.

.3 **Hampshire Bus Action Group** – Email forwarded by County Cllr Richard Quarterman re campaign group **APPENDIX VIII** which seeks to improve bus services around Hampshire. Provided for info as several Hampshire town and parish councils, including Yateley and Eversley, have endorsed their vision.

ACTION (SB) to forward to local resident who earlier this year instigated a residents survey on, and approached Stagecoach to support, a bus service connecting Heckfield with Hook and Riseley services. (See March and May 2026 Parish Council minutes.) Despite some feedback from Stagecoach that at least wasn't negative, no further action taken at the time.

55 **NEXT PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**

Monday 19 October 7.30pm, Village Hall meeting room.

Meeting close 8.30pm with thanks to all.

For signature (p4 of 4)

APPENDIX I COUNTY COUNCILLOR GENERAL REPORT JULY / AUGUST 2026

Richard Quarterman, Hartley Wintney & Yately West Division

1. This is the second of the bi-monthly reports I undertook to write to various Parish Councils in my division, covering the period of July and August. Traditionally, this is a relatively quiet period, covering as it does the main holiday period, but there are a number of items to update you on.
2. At the July meeting of the County Council, Liberal Democrat Councillors proposed three motions to the Council. The first was about the effect of on-street parking charges on town centre businesses from our Councillor representing Lymington, and will have little impact on this Division as we don't have any on-street parking charges.
3. The second was from our Councillor representing Tadley in Basingstoke & Deane, and was borne out of the frustration I think we all feel with the lack of pace and efficiency experienced in highway maintenance and dealing with potholes. The motion was carried with support from Reform Councillors, with only the Conservatives voting against:

'Council resolves to request Cabinet to report back to the next Council with proposals for a major step change in approach to how Highway maintenance is delivered to include a five-year plan that can be inherited by the new Unitary Authorities when they are established to resolve the backlog.'
4. The third motion, brought by one of our Councillors from Winchester, was to simplify the process by which local Councils can request the reduction of speed limits on Highways, particularly with respect to 20mph speed limits in residential areas.

This motion was supported by a deputation from an action group in Winchester, but I know from conversations with several of the Parishes in this division that this is a widely-held concern, along with experience that suggests the current process is cumbersome and ineffective. The Leader of the Council proposed that the motion be referred to the Universal Services Select Committee, stating that a detailed review of current policy would enable the Council to assess the effectiveness of existing arrangements and consider whether changes were required. There was broad agreement that the matter would benefit from further scrutiny before any policy recommendations were developed. There was some concern on our side of the chamber that this was a device to 'kick it into the long grass', but we will follow this up through the relevant Select Committee as proposed.
5. The Conservative Cabinet at Hampshire are continuing to pursue a Judicial Review of Local Government Reorganisation, although there has been no further update over the summer. Meanwhile, the process of setting up the Unitary authorities continues, and I have been nominated to sit on the North Hampshire Joint Committee to review this process – the committee meets for the first time on the 29th September. In the meantime, I am due to attend a County Council briefing on LGR on the 15th September, so there may be more to report next time.
6. The next meeting of the Full Council will be on the 1st October, to which I will need to send my apologies, but I am in the process, along with several of my colleagues, of drafting a motion to reinstate the telephone booking process for Household Waste and Recycling Centres which was stopped last October, as we feel strongly that having it online only excludes those without access to the internet and is therefore insufficiently inclusive.
7. However, I have a very busy month of meetings in September with Regulatory Committee, Children's and Young People Select Committee and Corporate Services Select Committee all meeting this month in addition to the LGR meetings mentioned above. Nothing on the Agendas so far appears to have any impact in this division, but I'll let you know if anything does come up.

Continued next page

APPENDIX I CONTINUED – COUNTY COUNCILLOR GENERAL REPORT JULY / AUGUST 2026

8. There are a number of ongoing issues within the Division that I am continuing to monitor and chase up, which can sometimes be frustrating as Hampshire officers are not always good at responding promptly. One that effects several parishes is an ongoing issue regarding the routing of the historic Welsh Drive Public Right of Way over the common land sites currently occupied by British Car Auctions and Blackbushe Airport on Yateley Common. I won't try to describe the problem here, but suffice it to say that, although this is taking a frustrating long time, there are signs of some progress from the relevant officers at Hampshire and that with continued pressure and patience, I am hopeful that some kind of decision will be reached with the various agencies involved in the not too distant future.

9. By far and away the majority of the outstanding County Council queries from Parishes relate to Highways issues, ranging from road or pathway maintenance, request for speed management measures, or dealing with illegal parking. The Executive Member for Highways, Cllr Steve Forster from Fleet, has made it very clear, in his responses to questions and the above-mentioned motions to Council, that Highways have no budget for anything other than the current agreed programme of works, and they will continue with their 'casualty-led' approach to assessing road safety risk. This means that notwithstanding the response we should see from the motion on Highways maintenance, there is likely to be little opportunity to progress more discretionary pieces of work in the current climate.

10. There are also a number of major planning applications currently working their way through the system. Hart is the local planning authority and so these should normally be discussed with the relevant District Councillors, but I did arrange to meet representatives of Winchfield Parish Council in August with Alex Brewer MP to discuss the wider planning context.

11. I have also arranged to spend a day out with my predecessor Tim Davies in September, so that he can brief me on the various issues that he was working on over the previous four years.

Richard Quarterman
County Councillor

APPENDIX II – ACCOUNTS TO DATE

HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL INCOME 2026/27 07 SEPTEMBER								
Balance brought forward 1st April 2026						£12,672.52		
Date received	Payee	Description		Precept	Grant	VAT reclaim	Bank Interest	Total
10/04/2026	Hart DC	Parish Precept		£16,500.00				£16,500.00
14/05/2026	PCC-Hants Police	CCVT grant			£2,270.00			£2,270.00
2026/2027	Metro	Bank interest					£85.97	£85.97
TOTAL								£18,855.97

RECEIPTS & PAYMENTS SUMMARY	
<i>Bal brought forward 1st April 2026</i>	£12,672.52
Plus income	£18,855.97
Minus expenditure	£12,957.95
Balance	£18,570.54
BANK RECONCILIATION	
Metro Current	£71.09
METRO Business instant access	£18,499.45
TOTAL ACCOUNTS	£18,570.54

VAT to be reclaimed 2025/26

£325.55



on approvals

LD PARISH COUNCIL

ig Management

My accounts

From here you can access all your accounts:

HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
Business Community Current
23-05-80

£71.09

HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
Business Instant Access Acc
05-80

£18,499.45

HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL - EXPENDITURE 2026/2027 - 07 SEPTEMBER													
	Date invoice	Date Paid	Supplier	Description	Salary	Admin / Governance	Community	Traffic monitoring	Upkeep /	VH - energy efficiency	Village Hall Maintenance	VAT	Total
1	APRIL	15/04/2026	Hugo Fox(DD)	Email hosting		£9.99						£2.00	£11.99
2	APRIL	28/04/2026	Meto	Bank fees		£3.00							£3.00
3	08/04/2026	12/05/2026	HALC/NALC	Subscription 2026/27		£283.00							£283.00
4	APRIL	12/05/2026	Clerk	Salary	£340.00								£340.00
5	14/05/2026	14/05/2026	PGGM	New Inn Footway					£3,400.00			£680.00	£4,080.00
6	MAY	15/05/2026	Hugo Fox(DD)	Email hosting		£9.99						£2.00	£11.99
7	MAY	28/06/2026	Meto	Bank fees		£3.00							£3.00
8	29/05/2025	30/05/2025	Zurich On-line	PC Insurance 2025-26		£300.00							£300.00
9	MAY	26/05/2026	Clerk	Salary	£340.00								£340.00
10	JUNE	15/06/2026	Hugo Fox(DD)	Email hosting		£9.99						£2.00	£11.99
11	JUNE	28/06/2026	Meto	Bank fees		£3.00							£3.00
12	JUNE	05/07/2026	Clerk	Salary	£136.00								
13	JUNE	05/07/2026	HMRC	PAYE-Tax-Ap-May-Jun	£204.00								£340.00
14	14/07/2026	14/07/2026	Peter Brown	Internal audit		£100.00							£100.00
15	15/07/2026	15/07/2026	Hugo Fox(DD)	Email hosting		£9.99						£2.00	£11.99
16	22/07/2026	22/07/2026	Haywood roofing	Village hall roof							£5,350.00	£1,070.00	£6,420.00
17	JULY	28/07/2026	Clerk	Salary	£340.00								£340.00
18	JULY	28/07/2026	Meto	Bank fees		£3.00							£3.00
19	17/08/2026	17/08/2026	Hugo Fox(DD)	Email hosting		£9.99						£2.00	£11.99
20	AUGUST	28/08/2026	Clerk	Salary	£340.00								£340.00
21	AUGUST	28/08/2026	Meto	Bank fees		£3.00							£3.00
Totals:					£1,700.00	£747.95	£0.00	£0.00	£3,400.00	£0.00	£5,350.00	£1,760.00	£12,957.95

APPENDIX III – BUDGET UPDATE 2026/27

HECKFIELD 2026/27 @ 07 SEPT				
2026/27 TO DATE	LATEST ESTIMATE		2026/27 BUDGET	Item
INCOME				
£16,500.00	£16,500.00		£16,500.00	Precept
£2,270.00	£2,270.00		£2,270.00	PCC Camera grant
£85.97	£150.00		£150.00	Bank interest
	£1,760.00			VAT reclaim current yr
	£325.55		£325.55	VAT reclaim previous yr
£18,855.97	£21,005.55		£19,245.55	Total Income
EXPENDITURE				
£1,700.00	£4,080.00		£4,202.40	Salary
£747.95	£1,050.00		£1,050.00	Finance/Governance
	£1,000.00		£500.00	Community
	£300.00		£300.00	Training
	£2,270.00		£2,270.00	Traffic-CCTV
	£1,730.00			Traffic-CCTV
	£500.00		£500.00	Village-access/upkeep
£3,400.00	£3,400.00		£3,500.00	Footway New Inn
	£6,300.67		£8,880.67	Village Hall / Cottages
£5,350.00	£5,350.00			VH roof
			£4,500.00	Village Hall / Cottages
£1,760.00	£1,760.00			VAT
£12,957.95	£27,740.67		£25,703.07	Total Expenditure
£5,898.02	£6,735.12		£6,457.52	SURPLUS/DEFICIT
£18,570.54	£5,937.40		£6,215.00	BALANCE

APPENDIX V PLANNING UPDATE 07 SEPTEMBER

APPLICATIONS NEW SINCE LAST MEETING OF 19 AUGUST

No new planning applications

APPLICATIONS PENDING OR RECENTLY DECIDED

26/01232/CA (**Pending**, Validated 23 July) The Memorial Hall, Church Lane. T1 - Species unknown - Remove; T2 - Laurel - Remove; T3 - Cypress - Remove; T4 - Yew - Crown reduce by 3m back to suitable growth points, lift crown to 3m above ground level, reduce radius to shape the crown by up to 4m back to suitable growth points; T5 - Leylandi - Remove

26/01195/LBC (**Pending**, Validated 29 July) The Memorial Hall, Church Lane.

Works to well house - repair or replacement of clay tiles - renovation, re-painting and re-instatement of weather vane - replacement of lead flashing - replacement of battens; and - re-pointing of brickwork with lime based mortar

Works to front wall to the left of the entrance - Partial demolition and re-erection and partial repair accommodating the roots of the Yew tree - Re-alignment and re-pointing of gate pillar.

26/01071/**PREAPP** (**Pending**, Validated 25 June) Land At Mill Lane, Riseley. Option of utilising the entire field, creating an additional 22 acre SANG extension.

26/00243/LBC (**Pending**, Validated 17 February) The Memorial Hall, Church Lane. Remove existing wire fence and gate at the rear of the hall and replace with a close board wooden fence.

CROSS BOUNDARY / RISELEY APPLICATION Application from the Wellington Estate.

26/00541/OUT (**Pending**, Validated 13 April) Land At Sun Lane, Basingstoke Road, Heckfield. Outline application with all matters reserved except for access for the construction of up to 44 dwellings, including affordable housing together with access, landscaping and associated infrastructure (cross boundary application)

Described as 'cross boundary'. All the application site is in Riseley (Wokingham BC). But the application includes some S278 works to the Highway - Sun Lane where it meets the B3349 is just in Heckfield.

Public comments Received: 35 Objections: 34 Supporting: 1

APPENDIX VI

NEW NPPF 2026 – NATIONAL DECISION-MAKING POLICIES AND NDMPS S3-S5 'SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT'

Government has restructured this latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published 17 August 2026. *The notes below as a starting point...*

1. The format is now of separate chapters and chapter numbering rather than the previous ongoing paragraph numbering system. Importantly Policies are restructured into those for Plan-making (PM) and National Decision-making Policies (NDMPs). The latter are the Policies that directly apply in deciding planning applications.
2. The new NDMPs took effect immediately upon publication, thus they apply to all current undetermined applications, regardless of when submitted.
3. The 2026 NPPF retains its central principle of 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' based on interrelated economic, social and environmental objectives. However the familiar concept of the 'tilted balance' as per the old Paragraph 11d no longer applies in the same way; it is replaced, as Government explains, by new 'location-based' policies, as set out in NDMP 'S3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development'.
4. Chapter 4 focuses on 'Achieving sustainable development' and is divided between Plan Making Policies (S1-S2) and NDMPs (S3-S5).
5. Policy S3 explains how the 'Presumption in favour of sustainable development' will now operate.

S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

'S3(1) Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means:

- (a) Policy S4 in this Framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements;
- (b) Outside settlements, policy S5 should be applied; and
- (c) In all locations, development proposals that accord with both an up-to-date development plan and the decision-making policies in this Framework should be approved without delay.

'S3(2) Where a development proposal falls partly within and partly outside a settlement, policies S4 and S5 should be applied to the relevant parts which are inside or outside of the settlement.'

Thus NDMP S3 directs decision-makers to separate Policies – S4 or S5 – depending on whether the development is inside or outside a settlement boundary.

6. NDMP 'S4 Principle of development within settlements' establishes a presumption in favour:

S4: Principle of development within settlements

'S4(1) Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.'

- Para S4(2) outlines circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects.
- Paras S4(3) and S4(4) do go on to detail specific circumstances in which the presumption is that development should not be approved or only in exceptional circumstances, and S4(5) clarifies that all development proposals not included in the 'positive' list should only be approved in exceptional circumstances.

continued

APPENDIX VI CONTINUED**NEW NPPF 2026 – NATIONAL DECISION-MAKING POLICIES
AND NDMPS S3-S5 'SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT'**

7. NDMP 'S5 Principle of development outside settlements' sets out a presumption in favour for specific types of development.

S5: Principle of development outside settlements

'S5(1) Only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, as set out in the following list. These should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework:

- Thus to compare with BDBC's adopted local Plan Policy SS6 New Housing in the Countryside, the list here of acceptable development is rather longer...

S5(1)(a) Development for agriculture, horticulture and forestry; outdoor sport and recreation; allotments; cemeteries and burial grounds; mineral extraction and processing; engineering operations and infrastructure (including for transport, energy, water and telecommunications); roadside facilities in accordance with policy TR5; national defence and security; or which is solely for nature conservation, restoration and/or enhancement;

S5(1)(b) Development for rural businesses and services, including tourism, where allocation outside settlements is shown to be necessary;

S5(1)(c) The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building.

In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not disproportionately larger than the one it replaces;

S5(1)(d) The development of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential);

S5(1)(e) limited infilling within groups of houses;

S5(1)(f) An exception site as provided for in policy HO10 Exception Sites, or development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order;

S5(1)(g) Development which would address an evidenced unmet need for gypsy, traveller or travelling showpeople accommodation, provided it meets the criteria in policy 'HO12 Traveler Sites';

S5(1)(h) Residential and mixed-use development which would:

- i. Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary at Annex B),
- ii. Be physically well-related to the station or the settlement in which the station is located,
- iii. Be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure, and
- iv. Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location;

S5(1)(i) The development of land allocated for that purpose in the development plan (where this lies outside settlements);

S5(1)(j) Development which would address an evidenced unmet need* (including, but not limited to, development proposals involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites or scores below 75% in the most recent Housing Delivery Test), and where the development would:

- i. Be physically well-related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; or
- ii. Comprise major development for freight and logistics purposes which accords with policy E3 Freight and logistics.

* To note then, re S5(1)(j), 'Addressing an unmet need' is now written into the Policy for 'development outside settlement boundaries', a lack of five-year land supply explicitly evidencing such an unmet need.

- In all cases, the requirement for 'sustainable' development remains and proposals must still comply with other NDMPs and relevant local Plan policies.

continued

APPENDIX VI CONTINUED**NEW NPPF 2026 – NATIONAL DECISION-MAKING POLICIES
AND NDMPs S3-S5 'SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT'**

NPPF 2026 Annex A, para 2 states.

'Local Plan policies should not be given reduced weight simply because they were adopted before the publication of the new Framework.'

However

'Existing development plan policies which are materially inconsistent with the new national decision-making policies should be given very limited weight.'

Which again is familiar... all the new NPPF National Decision-Making Policies need to be taken into account when considering whether adopted local Plan Policies (and parts of policies) continue to be compliant and carry weight.

FURTHER NOTES

The concept of 'reasonable walking distance' as per the NDMP 'S5 Principle of development outside settlements'

S5(1)(h) Residential and mixed-use development which would:

i. Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station...

is defined in the Annex B Glossary:

'Reasonable walking distance: For the purpose of policies S5, I3, GB7 (relating to land around well-connected stations), this should be considered to be around 800 metres, or around 10 minutes' walk time if topography, route availability and quality or physical barriers would prevent or discourage walking from up to 800 metres away... Where a reasonable walking distance is required to be calculated when applying policies S5(1)(h), I3(2)(c) and GB7(1)(h) – and only part of the site falls within the reasonable walking distance – those sub-paragraphs of policies S5, I3 and GB7 only apply to the area of the site within that reasonable walking distance.'

Re 'S5 Principle of development outside settlements', the circumstances in which benefits of approving development proposals are likely to be considered to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects are covered in paras S(5)2 to S(5)4.

S5(2) In applying this policy, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development proposals are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include, but are not restricted to, situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies (NDMPs) which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

S5(3) Development proposals comprising isolated homes, which are those lying outside settlements or groups of houses, should not be approved other than in accordance with policy [NDMP] 'HO11 Isolated Homes in the Countryside'.

S5(4) Development proposals which do not fall within one of the categories set out in this policy should only be approved in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the proposal would substantially outweigh the adverse effects, including to the character of the countryside and in relation to promoting sustainable patterns of movement.

This as a starting point in becoming familiar with NDMPs S3-S5 as key policies

APPENDIX VII NATIONAL DELEGATION SCHEME FOR PLANNING DECISIONS

From 31 October, officers will make decisions under delegated powers for all but very significant or complex applications. Ward Councillors will no longer be able to call an application to committee, and there will be no referral to committee on the basis of public objections. See

www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-committees-and-the-national-scheme-of-delegation-of-planning-functions-guidance-for-local-planning-authorities-in-england

7. The ... Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 (the Regulations) set out the following general approach to decision making:
- where applications fall under Schedule 1 decisions must be delegated to officers under Reg 4.
 - where applications fall under Schedule 2, there is a presumption under Reg 5 that decisions are delegated to officers unless...
 - the nominated officer and nominated member agree the application should be referred to a planning committee or sub-committee for determination and
 - that it meets at least one of the criteria in Regulation 5(3)
10. a. the nominated officer should be the Chief Planning Officer or equivalent
 b. the nominated member should be the chair of the planning committee or equivalent member.
12. It is for individual Local Planning Authorities to put in place their own arrangements for how the consideration of cases for referral to committee will operate in practice.
13. It is not a requirement of the National Scheme of Delegation that nominated officers and nominated members consider all Schedule 2 applications... for potential referral to committee.
20. The functions which fall within Schedule 2 of the Regulations (Reg 5(3)) are –
- applications for planning permission which are not householder, minor commercial or minor residential applications
 - applications for planning permission which would otherwise fall into Schedule 1 but are connected to a Schedule 2 application for listed building consent or for the variation or discharge of a condition on a listed building consent
 - applications to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached in respect of which the previous planning permission was a Schedule 2 planning permission (under section 73(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990)
 - applications for development which has already been carried out (under section 73A(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990)
 - where it is related to a large outline planning permission, applications for reserved matters approvals (under Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015)
 - where a local planning authority considers a planning obligation is connected to a Schedule 2 application, requests to agree to modify or discharge a planning obligation (under section 106A(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990)
 - where a local planning authority considers a planning obligation is connected to a Schedule 2 application, application for modification or discharge of a planning obligation (under section 106A(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990)
 - applications for listed building consent (under section 10 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990)
 - applications for the variation or discharge of conditions of listed building consent (under section 19 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990)
 - applications for advertisement consent (under regulation 9 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007)
 - applications for consent under tree preservation orders (under regulation 16 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012)

Criteria which must be met before a case can be considered for referral under regulation 5

- 22 . At a minimum, at least one of the following statutory criteria must be met for a referral to committee to be considered to meet that threshold:
- A. where the application raises an Economic, Social or Environmental issue of significance to the local area
 - B. where the application raises a significant Planning matter having regard to the Development Plan and any other material considerations
- 23 ...It is for the nominated officer and member to assess whether the development proposal raises any such issue, providing an opportunity for local democratic oversight where necessary. What constitutes 'significant' will vary depending on the local area

APPENDIX VIII HAMPSHIRE BUS ACTION GROUP

Email from County Cllr Richard Quarterman of 01 September...

Good morning all

I have had a recent email from Julia Wedlock of Yateley Town Council about this campaign group (Hampshire Bus Action Group) which seeks to improve bus services around Hampshire. If you go to the "About" page on their website and then click on "endorsements", you will see that several Hampshire town and parish Councils, including Yateley and Eversley, have already endorsed their vision, and so the remaining parishes in this County Division might want to consider doing likewise. The link is here: [Hampshire Bus Action Group](#)

I am also happy to endorse this vision, although I acknowledge the difficulty in getting Hampshire to move at pace on this issue. A recent update to their bus funding model has been agreed and implemented, and at a local level we have seen a few changes - such as the new Number 8 route to Farnborough from Yateley - but getting a more comprehensive review (such as the much requested route between Yateley and Fleet and addressing the fact that in more rural areas the bus services are practically non-existent) is not currently forthcoming. I am now focussing any remaining energy on this towards the prospect of new funding coming from the North Hampshire Unitary once it comes into existence in 2028, as I suspect that will be the next opportunity to achieve any further change.

Happy to take any further questions or comments on this?

Many thanks

Richard Quarterman

County Councillor Hartley Wintney and Yateley West

<https://hambag9.wordpress.com>

Hampshire Bus Action Group was formed in 2025 to campaign for better buses across Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

We aim to influence the new Hampshire and the Solent Combined County Authority and new unitary authorities which will oversee public transport from 2028.

Our founding members are involved in local campaigns for better public transport and we came together because we believe that by joining forces we can achieve wider improvements.

We hold meetings roughly once a month online. Please email us if you are interested in campaigning for better buses and would like to attend a future meeting:

hampshirebusactiongroup@gmail.com