



## **Summary of representations received by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) made in relation to the Regulation 16 version of the Overton Neighbourhood Plan (ONP) pursuant to Paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act**

### **Introduction**

1. This document provides a summary of the issues raised through representations made in relation to the submission version (Regulation 15) of the Overton Neighbourhood Plan (ONP). This document has been produced in compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum) Regulations 2012.
2. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) carried out a six week period of public consultation from 18 September 2015 to 30 October 2015 on the submission version of the ONP. The consultation documents consisted of the submission version (Regulation 16) of the ONP, Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating SEA), Consultation Statement, Basic Conditions Statement, Equalities Impact Assessment and Process of Housing Site Assessment.
3. The representations submitted during the consultation period have been published on the borough council's website, and can be found by clicking on the following link: <http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>. Paper copies of the representations can be viewed on request at Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, RG21 4AH.
4. A total of 73 representations were received from 45 individuals, organisations and statutory consultees (excluding BDBC's comments on the ONP). These can be summarised as:
  - Support: 15 representations made
  - Oppose: 44 representations made
  - General comment: 14 representations made
5. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised during the consultation. Appendix 1 provides a more comprehensive summary of the representations made. The list below identifies those issues which appear particularly significant in light of the comments received.

## **General Comments**

6. A number of general comments were made, included the following:
  - Concerns regarding insufficient public consultation.
  - Concerns in respect of the evidence base to support the plan, e.g. lack of transport assessment.
  - Concerns about how the Plan relates to issues associated with parking provision in Overton.
  - Concern that infrastructure issues have not been properly addressed.
  - Concern that a number of policies in the Plan have the potential to affect viability and the delivery of development schemes.

## **Policy H4 - Infrastructure**

7. Representations from utility provider suggested that further policy support and explanatory text should be provided in order to facilitate the provision of additional utility infrastructure.

## **Sites A and B**

8. A number of concerns were raised in relation to Sites A and B (A: NW of Overton Primary School, B: E of Court Drove). In particular:
  - The impact of the proposed allocations on traffic levels, particularly owing to the existing levels of traffic congestion in this locality.
  - The unsuitability of the vehicular access road.
  - Inappropriate location owing to proximity to the school.
  - Safety concerns in relation to emergency service vehicles and pedestrians, particularly children.
  - Concerns about the impacts on biodiversity.
  - Concerns in relation to infrastructure issues, particularly foul drainage and water supply.
  - Legal issues (restrictive covenant).
  - The ability of the sites to deliver affordable housing.
  - The deliverability of the sites.
  - The impact of the proposed development on the settlement pattern, conservation area and its setting.
  - The process by which these sites were selected/allocated.

## **Site F**

9. Representations suggested that the site was capable of delivering more than was allocated, and therefore capacity should be increased.
10. This site should be allocated for the full housing target of 150 units.
11. Concerns were raised about the potential to provide the necessary drainage infrastructure to serve this site.

## **Site J**

12. Representations have been received stating that this site is considered to relate poorly to the existing settlement pattern.
13. In addition, concerns have been raised that the site is not situated in a sustainable location, as it is an inappropriate distance away from facilities and services, and public transport connections.
14. Concerns have also been raised in relation to highways access, traffic, landscape impact, adequacy of infrastructure to serve the site, viability and deliverability of the site, the way in which the site was assessed through the allocation process, and proximity to contaminated land.

## **Site K**

15. Representations have been received requesting that site K is deleted from the Plan.
16. Similar concerns to those raised regarding site J have also been applied to this site.

## **Site QB**

17. A number of representations raised the following concerns:
  - Lack of public consultation on the proposed site allocation.
  - Lack of robust evidence to justify the inclusion of the employment allocation.
  - Impact of the allocation on traffic congestion, highway safety, pollution levels, infrastructure and residential amenity.
  - Concern over the impact of the proposed development on the appearance of the locality, the conservation area and its setting.
  - Could open up the potential to use the site for residential development in the future.
18. Representations requested deletion of the site policy/allocation.

## **Sustainability Appraisal**

19. Concerns were raised regarding the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in terms of the:
  - Inconsistency between the principles underpinning the SA and the submitted version of the ONP.
  - How the SA assess the approach of favouring smaller sites, and it's assessment of the North Field site.

## **Site Selection Process**

20. A number of representations challenged the process by which the Neighbourhood Planning Group selected the sites allocated in the Plan. In particular, concerns were raised regarding the public consultation process and the consistency between the sites allocated and the original goal of meeting the housing target through the use of smaller sites.
21. Representations were received that additional/alternative sites should have been allocated for development.

## **Support for the Plan**

22. A number of representations support the plan in general.
23. Support was also expressed specifically for the way in which the Neighbourhood Planning Group engaged with the community. Support was also received in relation to the way in which the Neighbourhood Planning Group has sought to address infrastructure issues, particularly in relation to drainage. Support was also received for some of the site allocations.

**Appendix 1 – Summary of representations made by consultees in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Overton Neighbourhood Plan (ONP)**

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
Mrs Samantha Baron			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Mr Andrew Keeling			Oppose	Opposes the allocation of Quidhampton as an employment site. Also, has concerns over the lack of consultation on the sites allocated in the plan. Lack of justification for the allocation. The proposed allocation could open up the potential for the site to be developed for residential use in the future. There would be a detrimental impact on neighbour amenity and the character of the area (including Conservation Area). Also concerned about pollution, water run-off and flooding.	
Highways England (Ms Helen Batty)				No comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Mr SM Ambrose			Oppose	Opposes the allocation of Quidhampton as an employment site. Concerned that there was a lack of consultation on the proposed site. Requests that the site is deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Hannah Savage			Oppose	Requests the deletion of the employment allocation at Quidhampton. Concerned that there has been no community engagement undertaken on the proposed allocation.	
Mr S Savage			Oppose	Opposed to the proposed employment allocation at Quidhampton. Notes the potential increase of industrial vehicles along Station Road as a result of the potential development of Quidhampton.	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
Ms Susan Orgar			Oppose	Opposes the allocation of the employment site at Quidhampton. Highlights the poor infrastructure in the area, the lack of parking at Overton train station and the safety issues as a result of increased industrial vehicles. Requests the deletion of the site from the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Andrea McIver			Oppose	Request the deletion of the proposed allocation of the employment site at Quidhampton from the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Scottish and Southern Energy (Mr Terry Davies)				Provides comments on general guidance on the provision of electricity infrastructure for new developments. Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the increased demands from new development, the costs of any necessary upstream reinforcement required would normally be apportioned between developer and Distribution Network Operator. To ensure certainty of delivery of a development site, any anticipated relocation of existing overhead lines should be formally agreed with Southern Electric Power Distribution prior to submission of a planning application.	
Mr Dave Storer			Oppose	Opposes proposed employment site at Quidhampton. Concerned about the potential impacts of the proposed allocation on the existing traffic congestion and pollution levels.	Requests the removal of the Quidhampton employment site from the Neighbourhood Plan.
Corinne Marsh			Oppose	Opposes the proposed employment site allocation at Quidhampton. Considers that there is a lack of evidence to support the allocation of that site for more employment floorspace. Notes the current pressures on the existing road network and infrastructure. Requests deletion of the site from the Neighbourhood Plan.	Requests the removal of the proposed Quidhampton employment site from the Overton Neighbourhood Plan.

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
The Overton Society (Dr Valda Stevens)			Support	The queries that were raised during the pre-submission consultation have now been satisfactorily dealt with. I support the plan as submitted.	
Mr Dave Kersley			Oppose	Requests the removal of the proposed employment allocation at Quidhampton. Notes that there are existing problems with traffic and the road networks in the parish, particularly in close proximity to Quidhampton.	Requests the removal of the proposed Quidhampton employment site from the Overton Neighbourhood Plan.
Ms Janet Exley	All		Support	Fully supports the Overton Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, notes that the Neighbourhood Planning Group has complied with the basic conditions, undertaken extensive community engagement and considered relevant issues.	
Mr Stephen Foot		Quidhampton Units	Oppose	Concerned over the inclusion of the proposed employment allocation at Quidhampton, and the lack of technical evidence and community engagement. There is no evidence to suggest the employment allocation is required. Furthermore, notes the safety issues as a result of increased vehicles.	Requests the removal of the proposed Quidhampton employment site from the Neighbourhood Plan.
Margaret Oram	Development near school		Oppose	Notes the potential impacts of two of the site allocations (Sites A and B) on the village. In particular, the proximity of the site allocations to the school and the potential safety issues as a result of increased vehicles. Also concerned about the impact of the allocations on parking and biodiversity in the village	Recommends that the policy is revised in light of comments made.
Natural England (Francesca Barker)				No comments to make on the Overton Neighbourhood Plan.	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)	Allocated Sites			HCC recommends that early contact is made with the Children's Services Strategic Development Officer to discuss the implications for school place planning in the area and how this links in with travel to school.	
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)	Getting Around			HCC are concerned that there is no evidence that any Transport Assessments (TA) have been undertaken as part of the Neighbourhood Plan making process.	Recommends that in terms of the level of development and associated impact on the transport network a TA will be required.
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)	T1			HCC advises the Parish Council that it would be a more flexible approach to describe the paths available to pedestrians and other non-motorised users, given that the local rights of way network includes bridleways and byways as well as footpaths. There may also be other non-motorised routes that are not recorded as rights of way.	The following amendment to Policy T1 is recommended: Developments will provide multi-use paths linking the development to existing and new planned routes to amenities, public transport routes, and existing footpaths, rights of way and other forms of non-motorised access unless the applicant can demonstrate that there is already adequate and convenient access.
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)		Key issues for enjoyment and recreation		HCC advises the Parish Council that it would be a more flexible approach to describe the paths available to pedestrians and other non-motorised users, given that the local rights of way network includes bridleways and byways as well as footpaths. There may also be other non-motorised routes that are not recorded as rights of way.	The following amendment is suggested to the supporting text bullet point as set out below: <del>Footpaths</del> "The rights of way network within and beyond the village are is highly valued but can be improved."
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)	Site specific policies (Sites F and J)			HCC recommend an amendment to the site specific policy wording to provide further clarity on the use of paths in this policy context.	HCC recommends amending the site specific policy wording to state: "There will be a multi-use path for pedestrians and cyclists linking the development with..."

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)		Potential projects to be funded from developer contributions- Enjoyment and Recreation		HCC recommends further clarification to the supporting text.	HCC recommends the following amendments: <i>“Obtain <u>new access</u> to link together existing footpaths and established rights of way to facilitate further circular walk routes. These will integrate the village with the countryside with publicity to encourage walking for health and leisure. OPC to work with landowners.”</i>
Southern Water (Miss Clare Gibbons)	H4: Infrastructure		Support	Supports the provision of new and improved utility infrastructure listed on the supporting text of Policy H4. However, recommends that there should be specific policy provision for utility infrastructure in order for the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the basic conditions.	Proposes the following amendments to policy H4 (Infrastructure): <i>“Development proposals will be supported provided that: Adequate drainage infrastructure is provided for sewage and surface water according to best practice guidance. <u>New and improved utility infrastructure for water supply, surface water drainage and foul water will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.</u>”</i>
Southern Water (Miss Clare Gibbons)	Site F: specific policies		Support	Notes the provision of additional local infrastructure under the site specific policies. Recommended minor amendments to the policy to provide further clarification.	Proposes the following amendment to Policy F: 2. <i>“The <del>applicant</del> <u>development</u> will provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.”</i>
Southern Water (Miss Clare Gibbons)	H4: Infrastructure		Oppose	Considers that further text is required in the Neighbourhood Plan in respect of the local sewerage system. Southern Water wishes to stress that even if the existing capacity of the local sewerage system is currently insufficient to serve new development, this is not a constraint to development, as additional capacity could be provided. Furthermore, SW wish to emphasise that they would seek to ensure that as a minimum the risk of foul water flooding is not increased as a result of	SW recommend a number of changes to policy H4 in order to reflect the points made in their response, please see full representation for details.

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				new development.	
Mr Stuart Chessell	Allocated Sites		Oppose	Concerned that the level of development allocated in the neighbourhood plan cannot be accommodated by small sites in the village. Also raised concerns about access arrangements in respect of the Court Drove site, along with associated issues regarding congestion and lack of accessibility for emergency vehicles.	
Mrs Christine Chessell	Site Allocations		Oppose	Concerned that level of development allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan cannot be accommodated by small sites in the village. Also raised concerns about access arrangements in respect of the Court Drove site, along with associated issues regarding congestion and lack of accessibility for emergency vehicles. Also concerned about the impact of the proposals on water supply.	
Mrs Christine Chessell	Site Allocations		Oppose	Concern over the sites selected for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the potential increase in vehicles through already very congested areas as a result of the potential development at Court Drove (Sites A and B). Considers that the site has severe access problems and safety issues.	Recommend the allocation of Two Gate Lane, as has been previously proposed by the borough council.
Mr Tony Williams	SS1		Oppose	Sets out a detailed explanation concerning problems with the rationale for the sites selected, leading to in appropriate choice of sites allocated. Also highlights concerns	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				about the way in which the consultation process evolved over the course of preparing the neighbourhood plan, especially owing to the inability to deliver the initially preferred option of smaller sites.	
Mr Tony Williams			Oppose	Raises issues concerning the adequacy of the Plan in relation to highways and infrastructure matters.	
Ms Jackie Dawson			Oppose	Concerned about the allocation of the West of Sapley Playing Field site and the reserve site at Pond Close, as these are not well related to facilities and services or the railway station. The West of Sapley Playing Field site is also not considered to be well related to the village. Also concerned about sewage infrastructure, impact of proposed phasing on viability and affordable housing, and the lack of representative nature of the consultation process.	
Mrs Sophie Salvidge			Oppose	Concerned about the allocation of the West of Sapley Playing Field site as this is not well related to facilities and services or the railway station. Accordingly the allocation of the site will exacerbate the existing traffic congestion in the village. The West of Sapley Playing Field site is also not considered to be well related to the village. Also concerned about sewage infrastructure, impact of proposed phasing on viability and affordable housing, and the lack of representative nature of the consultation process.	
Mr Brian Langer		Neighbourhood Plan - General		Highlights a range of issues concerning the accuracy of the Plan, which he considers need to be amended.	Recommends a number of corrections/amendments to the Plan.
Mr Brian Langer		Sustainability Appraisal		Identifies some inaccuracies in relation to the transport aspects of the SA.	Suggests a number of modifications to the SA in order to address the issues

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
					identified.
Mr Brian Langer		Consultation Statement		Notes that there is some text within the Consultation Statement that requires amendments.	Recommends minor amendments to text in the Statement.
Mr Brian Langer		Basic Conditions Statement		Notes that there is some information in the Neighbourhood Plan that is inaccurate or is omitted from the plan. Also, notes that there should be a policy in the plan to safeguard sunken lanes which are locally specific.	Recommends that page 3 of the statement should state 'earlier' and not 'later'.
Mr Brian Langer		Equalities Impact Assessment		Notes that there are some inaccuracies in the data in the Equalities Impact Assessment.	Propose amending 'than' to 'that' on the second paragraph of page 3.
Romanina Real Estate	SS1		Support	Strongly support the allocation of Site F. However, objects to the definition of the built area boundary shown edged in red. Recommend inclusion of additional land at the southern end of the site, and the deletion of Site K.	Allocate the southern half of site F for 55 dwellings. Delete site K and amend site J to be a reserve site.
Lyn Oram	Site Allocations		Oppose	Concerned about the development site proposed near Overton junior school. Has concerns about the impact of these developments on what is already a very congested area in terms of traffic. Also concerned about the impact of these developments on highway safety, in particular the safety of children attending the school.	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
Dandara (Mr John Richards)			Oppose	Considers that the Plan fails to meet the basic condition of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. In particular this issue relates to the location of development, as two of the site proposed (J and K) are the furthest distance possible from both public transport and shops and services available in the village centre. This failure to ensure the sustainable location of new housing conflicts with the NPPF, PPG, Local Plan and the principles set out in the SA supporting the NP.	
Dandara (Mr John Richards)			Oppose	The NP fails to “plan positively”, and is consequently in conflict with the requirements of the PPG. This issue largely stems from failing to properly consider the North Field site or allow for it to be given appropriate consideration through the public liaison process.	
Dandara (Mr John Richards)			Oppose	Considers that the allocation of site J (West of Sapley Playing Field) will constitute an isolated, poorly considered and incongruous form of development. Consequently Dandara consider that the allocation of this site fails to meet the design standards required through local and national level policy. The North Field site is considered more appropriate by Dandara in terms of its integration into the settlement. Dandara has similar concerns to those set out above in relation to site K.	
Dandara (Mr John Richards)			Oppose	Dandara consider that the site assessment process is inadequate. They consider that the scoring system is “arbitrary and unevidenced”. In particular they raise	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				concerns in relation to how the following have been considered through the process: landscape impact; heritage impact; deliverability; agricultural land classification; inaccuracies and inconsistencies of the site assessment proformas.	
Dandara (Mr John Richards)			Oppose	Dandara state that the NP is in conflict with the PPG requirements in terms of addressing infrastructure requirements. Furthermore, policy H4 restricts new development on the grounds of infrastructure concerns. Consequently the Plan is in conflict with the requirements of the NPPF, PPG and the Local Plan.  Dandara also argue that the North Field site can be provided without placing any pressure on the existing sewage system. They consider that this accentuates the benefits of allocating this site, as it would provide a more reliable site for the delivery of housing, and the benefits of the site in infrastructure terms have not been properly considered.	
Dandara (Mr John Richards)			Oppose	Dandara also consider that there is no evidence available that the housing allocated are deliverable or viable, given the impacts of phasing, affordable housing, upgrading the foul sewage system, site mitigation measures and s.106/CIL payments.	
Dandara (Mr John Richards)			Oppose	Dandara also consider that the NP will fail to ensure the provision of the required level of affordable housing. They also consider that greater clarity is required in relation to the existing site allocations.  Dandara also set out a number of concerns	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				regarding the SA. In particular these concerns relate to way in which the SA assess the approach of favouring smaller sites, and the way in which the SA assess the North Field site.	
Mr N Barbour	Development near school		Oppose	Concerned that the development proposed near the school will utilise an inappropriate access and exacerbate existing traffic congestion, with a resultant detrimental impact on highway safety. Also concerned about lack of parking.	
Flower-Jayne Oram	Developments near school		Oppose	Notes the potential increase in vehicles through as a result of the potential development at Court Drove (Sites A and B). Has highway safety concerns, particularly in relation to the impact on children. Also concerned about the impact of the proposed site allocations on the character of the village.	Considers that more suitable alternative sites are available.
Mr Robert Oram	Development near School and in Court Drove		Oppose	Concerned about how sites A and B have been allocated, in terms of how they were selected, and the way in which the number of units allocated on those site increased prior to submission. Concerned about lack of parking around the school. The development of these sites would exacerbate traffic congestion. Developing these sites will be detrimental to biodiversity. Highlights the importance of child safety.	
Mr Kenneth MacKenzie			Support	Strongly supports the Neighbourhood Plan, in particular notes the way the Neighbourhood Planning Group has engaged with the community and considered relevant issues.	
Jane MacKenzie			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan, notes the neighbourhood planning group have actively engaged with the community and considered	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				relevant issues.	
Mr Kent Rolfe	Site Allocations		Oppose	Considers that sites A and B are not suitable for housing and should not have been allocated. Concerned about highway safety impacts in relation to children and exacerbating existing traffic congestion problems. Also concerned about parking arrangements and access difficulties for emergency vehicles. Concerned about the process by which sites A and B were chosen for allocation.	
Mr Kent Rolfe	Site Allocations		Oppose	Concerned about the process by which sites A and B were chosen for allocation, including the way in which the list of sites which could be considered was controlled by the Neighbourhood Planning Group.	Considers that during the formal voting for site allocations in the plan there should have been an option to select 'none of the above options.
Mr Rex Roberts	Site Allocations	Sections 1, 3 and 4	Oppose	Concerned about the effectiveness of the voting procedure which underpinned the site selection process. Considers that the sites allocated will fail to meet the Plan's own housing objectives and policies. Concerned about inclusion of additional sites without adequate public consultation.	Recommend that the submission Neighbourhood Plan should include summary of the Pre-submission representations and how issues were addressed. Also there should be further consultation on the site allocations before the Referendum. All of the 150 units should be allocated to site F (South of Two Gate Lane).
Bargate Homes (Mr Tom Stocker)	SS1, SS2, H1 and H3		Support	Strongly supports the allocation of Site J and the Reserve Site K. Also supports the allocation of 150 homes to the Neighbourhood Plan. Welcomes the amendments made to Policy SS2 which removes the requirement for a design brief. Has concerns about policy H1 in terms of consistency with policy CN1 in the emerging	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				<p>Local Plan, and the 'Lifetime Homes' standards in terms of how this relates to policy CN3 in the emerging Local Plan. Bargate also opposes the restriction concerning market homes to local people only for a prescribed time period.</p> <p>Highlights that the requirements for energy efficiency and generation will need to be consistent with the emerging Local Plan policy.</p>	
Cllr Ian Tilbury			Oppose	<p>Is concerned that the plan preparation has been rushed, resulting in insufficient engagement with the public. Also concerned about the process by which neighbourhood planning is being used to deliver a housing target set by the Local Plan. Questions whether there is genuine public support for this level of housing in Overton. Concerned about the site selection process, in particular the lack of transparency. Main concern relates to inadequate public consultation. Sets out a range of concerns regarding the sites which have been allocated, though does consider that the South of Two Gate Lane site is the least worst option for a large housing site in Overton. Also sets out a range of comments regarding specific sections of the Plan, please see full representation for details.</p>	<p>With the exception of the South of Two Gate Lane site, recommends the removal of the housing sites allocated, as well as the employment site.</p> <p>Sets out a number of other proposed modifications. Please see full representation for details.</p>
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)		History	Support	<p>Supports the section on the history of Overton (pages 12 – 13).</p>	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)		Strengths and Weaknesses	Oppose	Supports the section on the strengths Overton, which includes a reference to 'a long and valued heritage' (page 16). Concern that no reference has been made to the state of the historic environment.	Recommends that the plan include details on the state of the historic environment in the plan area.
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)		Vision	Oppose	Notes that the vision does not make reference to the historic environment of the parish nor include any objectives relating to the historic environment.	Historic England would welcome a specific reference to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment/heritage assets in the Plan area in the Vision for Overton.
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)		Section 3: Objectives and Policies	Oppose	Concern that there is no reference to the conservation area or the issues affecting it. Notes that the NPPG states that Neighbourhood Plans should include enough information on local non-designated heritage assets to guide decisions, including non-scheduled archaeological remains.	The Plan should be accurate and comprehensive in its references to the heritage assets (designated and non-designated) in the Plan area. HE would welcome a specific objective to conserve and enhance the heritage assets in the Plan area.
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)	LBE1		Support	Supports and welcomes Policy LBE1.	
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)	E2		Support	Supports and welcomes Policy E2. Considers that the policy should be moved to the Landscape, Built Environment and Local Distinctiveness section.	
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)	SS2		Support	Support the policy and welcomes the reference to heritage assets.	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
Historic England (Mr Martin Small)	Site Specific Policies		Oppose	Notes that Site B extends into the Conservation Area and the site specific policy should include a requirement in relation to the Conservation Area and its setting. Also Site QB lies opposite the Conservation Area and any development should respect the setting of the CA.	The site specific policy for Site B should require that particular care be taken with the design and form of any development of this site in order not to detract from the special interest of the Conservation Area and its setting (with reference to the Character Appraisal). The site specific policy for Site QB should include a requirement for development on the site to respect the setting of the Conservation Area.
Environment Agency (Ms Donatella Cillo)	H3		Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the locations of the proposed site allocations in Flood Zone 1. Supports the inclusion of Policy H4 to deliver the necessary infrastructure. Recommend that an amendment is made to Policy H3.	Recommends that policy H3 is strengthened with the inclusion of policy EM6 "water quality" from the emerging Local Plan. In line with paragraph 109 of the NPPF, this is sought in order to ensure that within new developments, the risk of contamination to controlled waters are understood and adequate mitigation measures are out in place.
De La Rue (Mr Richard Goodall)			Support	Promotes land owned by De La Rue (DLR), which could contribute towards the housing and employment provision to meet the plan's overall vision. In addition, development of the site could provide further community opportunities such as the provision of additional open space. Supports the majority of the plans policies, however, notes these could be strengthened to support the allocation of the DLR land being promoted. Please see full response for the detailed assessment of the policies.	DLR requests that land in their ownership to the south of the railway line is included in the Plan in order to provide a mixed use scheme encompassing housing, employment, open space and car parking for the station. Alternatively this land could be included as a reserve site, as it is considered preferable to the existing reserve site allocation and proposed employment land site. Allocating this site would improve the robustness and deliverability of the Plan.
Councillor Colin Phillimore			Oppose	Opposes the Neighbourhood Plan on the basis that the policies in the plan will allow cumulative development over the plan period. In particular, is concerned that the "dispersal	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				strategy” will potentially lead to development in excess of the quantum set out in the plan, as more development can be accommodated on the sites allocated. Concerned by the consultation process undertaken during the production of the plan, and does not consider that the Plan reflects the views of the village. Concerned about the lack of transparency of the site allocation process. Also, notes the current infrastructure is inadequate and cannot sustain the development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. Raises concern about the allocation of sites A and B in terms of their impact on traffic congestion. Considers that the proposed employment allocation is not justified.	
Dr Debra Rolfe	Site Allocations		Oppose	Considers that sites A and B should not have been allocated, on the grounds of: problems in ensuring access for emergency vehicles; sewerage infrastructure; water supply; restrictive covenant on the site. Also raises significant concerns regarding the site access in respect of site A and the impact on the safety of pedestrians.	
Dr Debra Rolfe		Consultation Process	Oppose	Concerned about the site selection process by which sites A and B were allocated in the Plan.	
Mr James Crosbie Dawson	Site Allocations		Oppose	Considers that the West of Sapley Playing Fields site is not in a sustainable location, owing to the distance between this site and village centre and railway station. This concern also relates to the reserve site at	

Full Name	Policy	Other	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents suggested Modifications
				Pond Close. The West of Sapley Playing Field site is also considered to be isolated and discordant with the existing settlement pattern. Also concerned about infrastructure, site viability and the deliverability of the required affordable housing. Considered that the process of preparing the Plan has not been representative of the village as a whole.	
Sonia Hutton-Taylor		Quidhampton Employment Site	Oppose	Opposes the allocation of Quidhampton as an employment site. Concerned that there was a lack of consultation on the proposed site. Also notes the poor traffic problems in Quidhampton and the highways and safety problems as a result. Requests that the site is deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.	Requests the removal of the Quidhampton Employment site from the Overton Neighbourhood Plan.
Mrs Laura Yeates			Oppose	Objects to the inclusion of sites J and the reserve site (K). The grounds for objection are: poor highways access; proximity to contaminated land; remoteness from village centre, school and railway station; landscape impact; resultant increase in traffic and parking problems in the locality.  A petition consisting of 249 signatures opposing the inclusion of sites J (West of Sapley Playing Fields) and K (reserve site) was submitted with this representation.	