

Serial	In support	Areas of concern	Suggested amendment
<p>We have identified three key areas of focus for our Corporate Plan, Planet, People and Place. Are we focusing on the correct priorities? Do you want us to focus on something else for the next four years and if so, what?</p>			
1	forget focusing on Planet- what Hart does or does not do will not impact Global Warming one bit. Focus instead on member accountability	no impact on global	member accountability
2	<p>Yes, however it is not clear how you are identifying the areas of priority need - where is the evidence which shows where the need is greatest? The whole of the Corporate plan lacks evidence, evidence of need, evidence of budget spend, evidence of how you will identify success.....</p> <p>You mention 'a sustainable economy' but how much focus do you have on supporting the local economy - how much does the Council spend on economic development? How committed are you to creating local jobs, for local people, that reduces the need to travel? Please tell me your entire focus is not 'Maintaining the Hart Employment and Skills hub' as this is a. something you already provide, b. lacks any ambition and actually won't improve the district beyond that what you already do - please have a plan for something that will make a real difference to employment, skills and employability!</p> <p>In your final consideration of the feedback from this consultation, and in confirming the final Corporate Plan, please identify how much budget, specific to economic development is spent and what the KPI's are, which would denote success.</p>	Focus not specific enough	
3	I support the three key areas of focus in this order of priority - People, Place, Planet. I don't like the word planet for two reasons 1. We can't save the planet on our own. 2 Most people recognise Environment to generically mean reducing our environmental impact on global warming locally and we can only have an affect locally.		call it environment not planet
4	Yes these are the correct priorities		
5	Yes, I think you have identified the right areas'		
6	<p>These 3 are good focus points.</p> <p>Under Planet and people I would like to see a commitment to a 20 is plenty through rural villages used as cut throughs.</p> <p>On the housing front - with so much help for 1st time buyers I would like to see help for us over 50's that still have huge mortgages through circumstances, and still have dependent children. We are completely invisible and need help too?</p> <p>Under planet - how about a commitment to improve the recycling facilites in Hart - which are poor compared to other boroughs? What about a commitment to tree planting?</p> <p>People: where is the word community in this target? Community needs funding - parks with play facilities for kids, and youth centres for teens with decent funding to keep our teenagers engaged and happy? Whats happened to youth centres really as well as funding social gatherings for elderly poeple who may never get out?</p>		1)commitment to "20 is plenty in rural areas" 2) help for the over 50s with hugh mortgages 3)more recycling in town 4) tree planting programme 5)funding for parks, youth centres and over 50s get togethers
7	I think these are the key areas and support those.		
8	<p>The "Climate Emergency" is just plain nonsense. Right now the ficus must be on people, many of whom are in desoarate need. Each pound spent on "Climate Emergency" is a pound that is not bring spent on a desperately needy family or individual. This is plain heartless.</p> <p>Therefore your priorities must be, in order, people, place, planet.</p> <p>In simple terms, for example, stop the purchase of electric charging points for vehicles (which tend to be used by the more wealthy individuals which can afford an electric car) and divert ALL of this money to foodbanjs and community pastries to help put food in front of the most needy.</p>	People before planet	Feels should be People, Place, Planet. All money that would be spent on electrical charging points should be spent on [foodbanks] and comminuty [pantries]
9	Agree		
10	'Planet' affects everyone and should be the primary priority.		
11	Focus is good but should have more on children provision	Planet before People	more provision for children
12	No. These cover the key issues well.		
13	No I think what you describe is appropriate		
14	Yes		
15	Efficiency. Any District Council has finite resource and working out the optimal methods to achieve the outcomes is significant. Efficiency is not cost saving, it's about how to achieve the most in the context of resource limitations.	efficiency	
16	Yes but Place - specifically providing affordable homes in sustainable locations should be the highest priority, planet and people naturally flow from that.		place should be 1st then planet and people
17	The key areas of the corporate plan focus on topics that could cover a wide range of issues. This is good. I think it's important to establish areas we can have a lot of influence and manage projects accordingly. I do not think it is necessary to focus on different topics than the		

- 18 These three areas look reasonable.
- 19 These are the correct areas for focus
- 20 I agree with many things you have put in your corporate plan, but I do feel that we must look at the situations many people in Hart are facing for the first time. We must ensure that all receive the help and support that is needed during this difficult time. People are claiming benefits for the first time, accessing foodbanks and community pantries, struggling with energy costs and trying to hold families together facing crisis as relationships breakdown in the middle of this uncertainty.
- 21 I think these priorities are correct. It would be good to also show the connection between them. For example, active travel and public transport foster better physical and mental health and interpersonal connections, as do building walkable/livable communities rather than sprawling, car-dominated estates. Insulating houses is not only beneficial for people's pockets, but vital for addressing the climate emergency.
- 22 Yes
- 23 ok
- 24 ok
- 25 Transport - we have great services and open spaces but if a lot of the people who need to access them the most can't get to them then we are failing them
- 26 Priority in reducing carbon and other toxic emissions from all vehicles and other generating activity
- 27 They are probably right - but too high level or generic - Electric charging points are not needed - people charge at home - except for people who live in Flats or housing without street access - so think wider - most housing in hart has off street parking - so why not put them in community areas?  
Place - half of Fleet does not have a convenience store within walking distance - Elvetham heath, Tavistock, Edenbrook, Harehill - this is problem with Fleet planning.
- 28 Planet needs to have its gras cut and bins emptied on time.  
It needs people to learn more and so have libraries open everyday. To care for people it needs access to Doctors who are able to talk face to face. It needs roads that are not full of pot holes and weeds growing in the gutters, and trees that are maintained to produce life
- 29 ACCEPTABLE AS AT PRESENT
- 30 ACCEPTABLE AS AT PRESENT
- 31 Yes
- 32 Affordable housing should be a top priority and also working with landlords to enforce their responsibilities for essential maintenance and repairs. Some of our residents are living in very poor conditions which are detrimental to their health.
- 33 Vital to support local people
- 34 Waste - this is of massive importance. It's almost a too bigger problem on its own.  
1. The original source at purchase point. The economy will need to go into recession for this to work. Less consumerism. Potential for more job losses. Increase in local production such as food. Back gardens (see Cuba)  
2. Making use of the resources we have and putting them into better use. I see empty buses as they are too expensive to use compared to other areas such as London, Oxford. Finding uses for waste (making bricks out of plastic waste)  
3. Making use of the retired population. It's good for health, wellbeing and friendship. We have so many talented retired in Hart we need to not let that go to waste.



should look at people facing hardship

need to show the links between, ie insulating your house will benefit the environment as well as your pocket

transport, people can't get to the open spaces and services


priority to reduce car emmisions  
electric charging points not needed, in car parks, more convenience stores

Bins emptied on time. Libraries open everyday. Doctors who are able to talk face to face. Roads that are not full of pot holes. Trees that are maintained to produce life for us.

Affordable housing top priority

suport locals  
No more waste of space or resources, plant food in gardens and fill buses

35	<p>Of the three key areas, I think the Planet section is the vaguest and least thought out.</p> <p>Obviously the plan is very topline so I look forward to the detailed version re how the council will play its part and use its influence in terms of reaching net zero goals. I would like to see year by year targets re the goals, particularly the 'long-term vision'. I would like to see quantifiable targets,</p> <p>All the draft plan says is a very vague 'Reduction in waste, increased reuse, and recycling'. This isn't good enough.</p> <p>(To drill down, one specific area needing improvement is the current recycling operation. We have to be able to recycle a wider range of plastics than the current list: food packaging including fruit and vegetable trays/punnets, yogurt pots, ready meal trays etc are taken for recycling in other districts. Also, food waste collection.)</p> <p>In terms of Place, focus needs to be given to developing the infrastructure to support new residents and ensure that they, together with existing residents, are properly provided for. Again, to give a specific example, our local GP surgeries are already seriously stretched. The staff are excellent, but they can't be expected to maintain their high standards of care with a rapidly expanding population. I am not a NIMBY - far from it - and fully support sustainable, affordable housing. However,</p>		
36	<p>Connection - there are a lot of remote houses in Hart that are not in built up areas and the internet connection and telephone signal are terrible. We live in an era where we are all working from home more frequently and everything relies on a good internet connection (TV, electronic devices, appliances, security systems etc). However this is not the case where I live, on Shapley Heath, RG27 8BU and the mobile telephone signal is also terrible. Despite trying different internet and mobile phone providers, it hasn't improved. We need more telephone masts and high speed internet fibre connection. I only receive 3G however I drive a few miles to Basingstoke and I receive a 5G connection. Very frustrating and shocking that given the high number of rural housing in Hart, that it isn't even being considered in the</p>		better internet connection in rural areas
37	NA		
38	Looks good to me.		
39	Need more emphasis on keeping services local, to ensure local provision and effective communications. Hardly any mention of transport, except Green Grid. Needs some more detail.		
40	I would like to see specific mention of provision and support for disabled people.		
41	Yes		
42	No		
43	community garden for socia wellbeing		
44	I think this covers the key areas		
45	Yes		
46	Yes		
47	Yes I think you are focusing on the right areas. I think people should be a priority.		
48	Yes - in light of the climate crisis - HDC should be focusing on becoming a net zero carbon Council and district. I also agree with the focus on fair treatment for all, particularly the explicit support for Citizens Advice Hart who will help achieve this goal alongside Hart Voluntary Action, the foodbank and community pantries. These are absolutely vital services. It is also good to see an emphasis on providing affordable housing as this is a clear need in our area.		
49	I believe this is the correct focus all the objectives are sound and I'm especially interested in the People objectives.		
50	You are giving Planet too big a priority, as nothing you can do will have any effect on the planet, given the scale of your activities compared to the rest of the world, especially China, Russia and USA. You are better to focus your resources on local issues where you can make a real difference to people.		
51	This is fine		
52	No		
53	> Increase biodiversity, wildflower and pollinator opportunities through cutting pesticide use on council managed land and ambitious programme of carbon capture, through planting and rewilding.		
	The council are also looking at increasing biodiversity in conjunction with carbon capture.		
54	Anti social behaviour! It is on the rise in hart, with proof from the number if police reports but you fail to act yet its your responsibility. Spend money wisely on things that need action and listen to the residents		
55	Yes, however there are obvious crossovers between the 'Planet' and 'Place' priorities.		



needs more drilling down

needs more emphasis on "local"

more emphasis on the disabled

community gardens

make people the priority support for CAB and HVA

too much focus on planet - it lies in the hands of Russia USA China

increase biodiversity

ASB on rise, need to be looked at

56	Combined with '1', to minimize the need for personal transport by encouraging and facilitating safer cycling and walking routes and 'joined up' public transport, especially for commuting. e.g. Provide commuter link buses between major housing sectors such as Elvathan and Edenbrook to make it more attractive for commuters to use them than to drive and park at Fleet station		better cycle paths
57	The three Ps can include virtually anything but the devil's in the detail - the hows, whys, wheres and whens!	not enough details	
58	Overall priorities are correct. What might be useful is to simplify the objectives and make them more relatable to the day to day lives of		make them more relatable
59	I think the three identified priorities form a strong base / backbone to the Corporate Plan		
60	Change the order to PLACE, PEOPLE, PLANET and add ECONOMY. If Hart gets Place right then People, Economy and Planet follow		change the order Place, People, Planet and add economy
61	Protecting the identity and community of the villages; such as Dogmersfield, Hartley Wintney, Winchfield by limiting build of house to brownfield sites only. This is also to assist in the local school and services, already being stretched from being overwhelmed. We do not need more housing with the amount of development that has already taken place over the last 10 years.		only build on brownfields
62	happy with the areas of focus but 'place' should incorporate more than just housing. See comments in the box below.	place is more than houses	
63	Yes. However what is missing is a focus on joined up thinking. E.g. The planet is key, solar farms have an invaluable role to play, however the planning process focuses on individual applications with no framework that underpins overall development of green initiatives across the district. Add in the need to make sure that we retain the right blend of towns, villages and countryside the danger is there will a significant detrimental impact on the countryside. Same for housing. If we want to retain and ensure we have Villages in 25 - 50 years time we need to make sure that developments outside settlement/in green field sites are protected. Especially those adjacent to low grade farmland where the owners are more interested in selling of their land to make money. Same in terms of size of developments		need to have joined up thinking thinking the areas
64	yes these look like the right priorities		
65	You should increase the biodiversity, help all people in the Hart area, build low to zero carbon and low maintained council		increase biodiversity
66	I get the desire for alliteration, but Planet sounds a bit too pie in the sky and detached from the needs of everyday people. The word Environment is less political and gives better with the sense that the council should be protecting the "local" environment. Which is really the scope of the council's remit to be honest. Let's stay grounded.		change planet to local environment
67	We note the key areas of focus. Whist laudable, and whilst recognising that the draft Corporate Plan is aimed at high level strategy, we consider that the draft plan is weak in substance, and at best vague: An example of which is a commitment to "Deliver more affordable homes within the district, including in our villages, and provide homes which support independent living." Given that HDC's policy is/was to require 40% affordable housing on new developments, it is unclear whether the the intention of 'more affordable homes' to mean 'some affordable homes' or 'a greater proportion of affordable homes' Our view is that HDC will have failed to achieve expectations if it falls short of 40% affordable housing provision on new builds. We consider that providing 'some affordable housing' would not score as meeting its corporate objective.	too vague	
68	As HDC cannot guarantee a good 'all round' supporting infrastructure - you are not able to make sure that the NHS delivers for our sick, that the doctors can look after their patients in this area, that our roads are fit for the purpose, you cannot make sure that good education outcomes are delivered for our young, recycling/disposing of our rubbish in a proper sustainable way, making sure houses are sustainable and that they can house our young and old properly (there is no use bringing more people into the area if you can't actually look after their needs properly and a new town won't sort it!), ensuring open spaces are there to help with the environment, making sure that we have enough power to heat and light our houses, you should not be building any more houses in this area! The only real power Hart District Council has is to grant planning permissions and encourage even more people to move to this area and not cope with the influx. It has always been the case. Personally I would do away with a layer of government (HDC offices would make a good block of flats) and I don't believe politics should come into play at local government. HDC and town/parish councils should work for the community as a whole. Politics should not come into it. These days there is no joined up thinking. Stick a few more houses and hopefully we will be able to cope with the extra people? I have had businesses in three other local council areas, worked for a local council in a senior position, and I can't really say that I have had one good experience with Hart DC	HDC has no power to change anything	
69	Yes		
70	Too bland to be useful	too bland	
71	These are the correct areas to prioritise.		
72	The overall three elements within the plan are on the surface reasonable and to be applauded. However as ever the devil is in the detail and the proposal to "undertake a settlement capacity and intensification study", for prioritisation of future opportunities may ultimately run counter to the views of the majority of Fleet voters who strongly supported the proposals for a 3500 - 5000 garden vilage in Shapley Heath as contained in the Local Plan adopted on 30 April 2020. I would not support any such outcome.		

73	The answer to this question is no, you are not focusing on the correct priorities. I wish the council to focus on becoming more helpful to small and medium sized local businesses. Listen to them and act according to the majority opinions that they have with regard to achieving this. Local employment is much more dependant on these than large national or multinational businesses. To also become as lean and non wasteful as possible in the administration of all services. All additional homes in Hart should be for those who have lived in Hart for many years, especially the young who have grown up here. Not for any outsiders until there is absolutely no housing problem for		need to focus on helping local businesses and housing local people
74	We support the four listed Key Areas of Focus, although we believe that, whilst the alliteration clearly appealed to whoever put the draft together, the title 'Planet' is too broad and it is the District's Environment that Hart can aspire to manage.		should be environment not planet
75	The Woodland Trust supports the focus on Planet		
76	Yes, however, some additional objectives are required -see below		
77	Overall yes but certain areas seem to be neglected - see below.		
78	Environment, with public engagement, and focus on not just creating green spaces, but subsequent monitoring of what's there.		monitor current green spaces
79	Rotherwick Parish Council has no further comments on the key areas of focus.		
80	I believe that the three key areas of focus make sense at a top level although some of the areas within each I would question being a priority in the current economic climate. Additionally, it would be good to see laid out what you are responsible for specifically, what is statutory and what is not and how you are currently doing against each or these areas in order to help support the case for the focus areas. This may be in your wider doc but I could not find that on your website. During this climate I don't want you taking more council tax from me to spend on things that are not statutory.		would like to see what we have to supply by statute
81	Yes. Sensible focus.		
82	Less building & chaos with the roads. A period of consolidation to assess demands. For example I've been (and am still) unable to drive to fleet without road closures (18 months!)		focus more on roads less on buildings
83	Yes		
84	More a 'Vision' than a plan. As the former all is fine, but even at this level there should still be some references to cost efficient delivery.  My further comments are influenced by the fact that I am a resident of Fleet and live in the North Fleet Conservation Area which, by its 'sylvan character' is an important contributor to biodiversity. I find it unacceptable that there is no reference to any of Hart's Conservation Areas. I trust that there is close consultation proceeding between Hart DC and all Parish and Town Councils in Hart District		more mention of conservation areas
85	More a 'Vision' than a plan. As the former all is fine, but even at this level there should still be some references to cost efficient delivery.  My further comments are influenced by the fact that I am a resident of Fleet and live in the North Fleet Conservation Area which, by its 'sylvan character' is an important contributor to biodiversity. I find it unacceptable that there is no reference to any of Hart's Conservation Areas. I trust that there is close consultation proceeding between Hart DC and all Parish and Town Councils in Hart District		
86	Yes. Ok		
87	No		
88	yes		
89	The proposed key areas of focus are supported, but the concept of the District Council's impact on the Planet is somewhat grandiose and perhaps Environment is more appropriate although it loses the power of alliteration. The order could be changed to PPE!	Concept of the District Council's impact on the Planet is somewhat grandiose	Change Planet to Environment