

From: John Glasscock
Sent: 04 November 2015 11:13
To: Katharine Makant
Cc: Ros Blackman; George Elkin; Cllr Rob Golding
Subject: Local Plan policy on Neighbourhood Planning - PS/05/MF15

**** PLEASE NOTE: This message has originated from a source external to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council, and has been scanned for viruses. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council reserves the right to store and monitor e-mails ****

Dear Ms Makant,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Planning group to strongly object to the changes that the Borough is proposing to make to the Neighbourhood Planning section of the Local Plan as outlined in the subject document.

There have been a lot of discussions between our group and the Borough on the best way to describe the volumes allocated to Neighbourhood Planning areas and how these numbers should be reflected in our Neighbourhood Plan. The conclusion reached was that using 'approximately' to describe the volumes of dwellings assigned to each site was not restrictive and in the case of Oakley and Deane, it will not result in fewer numbers being delivered as all the land owners with allocations are capable of delivering higher volumes and will not offer lower volumes than those allocated. By changing the wording to 'at least' is offering the developers and land owners a free reign to propose any volumes and gives no sensible guidance on acceptable volumes. This lack of clarity is damaging to the whole planning process and against the principles of the NPPF.

The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan has been created to be the voice of the community and we have a clear mandate that developments in the area totalling a volume significantly in excess of the allocated volume of 'approximately 150 dwellings' are not welcome. The community has seen the benefits offered by the land owners that will come with higher volumes and these benefits are not sufficient to persuade the community to accept higher volumes. That said we know that planning approval has already been given for 13 dwellings that will count within the plan period and the volumes allocated to the 5 additional sites in our plan total approximately 150. Furthermore, we have undertaken a contingency appraisal of the plan to demonstrate that the volumes are deliverable even if any one of the sites in the plan doesn't deliver its required volumes.

In conclusion, the proposed recommendation is counterproductive and against the principles of the NPPF. It should not be incorporated into the Local Plan. Without this change, the desired volume of development will be achieved and the uncertainty created by the amendment will be avoided.

Yours sincerely

John Glasscock
Chairman, Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Planning Group