



Summary of representations received by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) made in relation to the Regulation 16 version of the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan (NP) pursuant to Paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Introduction

1. This document provides a summary of the issues and representations submitted in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan (NP).
2. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) carried out a seven week period of public consultation from 28 November 2016 to 16 January 2017 on the submission version of the Sherborne St John NP. The consultation documents consisted of the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan, a Consultation Statement and a Basic Conditions Statement (which included an Equalities Impact 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 17 representations were received from 16 individuals, organisations and statutory consultees (excluding BDBC's comments on the Sherborne St John NP). These can be summarised as:
 - Support: 1 representations made
 - Oppose: 8 representations made
 - General comment: 8 representations made
5. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised by during the consultation. Appendix 1 of this document provides a summary of the representations made by specific consultees.

Summary of issues raised by consultees

General

One comment raised concern that the Plan does not maintain flexibility about housing numbers, and so is not in general conformity with the Local Plan.

SSJ Policy 2: Avoidance of coalescence with Basingstoke town

One comment raising concern that the policy repeated Policy EM2 of the Adopted Local Plan 2011 – 2029.

SSJ Policy 4: Residential development – land at Cranes Road, Sherborne St John

Concerns were raised in relation to the policy, in particular:

- The site selection process and community consultation in respect of the site allocation;
- The impact of the site on the natural environment, including the strategic gap;
- The impact of the site on the historic environment;
- The impact of the site on traffic volumes;
- Lack of a requirement in the policy to deliver adequate sewerage infrastructure;
- The proposed shop is not supported by the local community.

There was one comment of support for the plan in relation to the site allocation at Cranes Road.

A number of the representation include reference to a planning application that has been submitted on this site, that is currently undetermined (Ref. 16/04110/OUT - Outline planning application for the erection of 20 no. dwellings, consisting of 3 no. 1 bed apartments, 7 no. 2 bed, 7 no. 3 bed, 2 no. 4 bed and 1 no. 5 bed dwellings, and village shop, with associated development, including access).

Appendix 1 – Summary of representations made by consultees in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan (NP) (excluding comments from LPA)

Respondent	Policy	Paragraph	Support/ Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
Charlotte Mayall (Southern Water)			General comment	Southern Water is not the statutory undertaker for water or wastewater in SSJ. No comment to make.	
Sport England			General comment	The Neighbourhood Plan should reflect national policy for sport in particular paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF and any recommendations set out in sports strategies produced by the Council.	
Mr Terry Davies (Scottish and Southern Energy)			General comment	Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support increased demands, the cost of any upstream reinforcement required would be apportioned between the developer and the Distribution Network Operator. Maximum timescales for upgrades would not normally exceed 2 years so should not impede delivery.	
Mrs Julia Johnston (Chineham Parish Council)			General comment	No comment to make.	
Mr Elliott Newlyn (Rydon Homes)	SSJ Policy 4		Support	Rydon Homes supports Neighbourhood Plan Policy SSJ 4 (site allocation at Cranes Road, Sherborne St John). As a developer, they have undertaken an extensive programme of public consultation and engagement with Sherborne St John Parish and have worked with the Neighbourhood Plan group through the evolution of the Neighbourhood Plan. As stated in para 114 of the Submission Plan, the preferred Rydon site was selected due to its alignment with the Neighbourhood Plan objectives.	

Respondent	Policy	Paragraph	Support/ Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
				<p>The policy would secure a mix of housing to be meet local needs and a new shop that is key to the vitality of the village.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions test.</p> <p>Rydon Homes has submitted a planning application to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council for this site (Ref. 16/04110/OUT).</p>	
Mr David Wilson (Thames Water Facilities c/o Savills)			General comment	No comments to make.	
Glen Strongitharm (Highways England)			General comment	No comments to make.	
Mr David Stevens			Oppose	Opposes the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan (no reasons given)	
D (Anonymous)	SSJ Policy 4		Oppose	Opposes the SSJ NP, particularly the allocation of the site at Cranes Road for housing.	
Mrs Mandy Haworth	SSJ Policy 4		Oppose	<p>Opposes the SSJ NP, particularly the allocation of the site at Cranes Road for housing. Concern over the site selection process and the lack of community engagement on the preferred site.</p> <p>Plan should not support development within the Strategic Gap, particularly when it is so valued by the local community.</p> <p>Notes the potential impacts on the historic environment, light and noise pollution, traffic, private views and wildlife. Concern about primary school places.</p> <p>A village shop would not be viable or sustainable, and is not needed by the local community.</p> <p>New dwellings have already been approved on smaller brownfield sites around the village, that are capable of meeting local need.</p>	

Respondent	Policy	Paragraph	Support/ Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
Michael Barnett	SSJ Policy 4		Oppose	<p>Opposes the SSJ NP, particularly the allocation of the site at Cranes Road for housing. Concern over the site selection process and the lack of community engagement on the preferred site.</p> <p>New housing has already been allowed on other brownfield sites in the village.</p> <p>Concern about the impact upon the Strategic Gap, impact upon heritage assets, light and noise pollution, traffic and wildlife.</p> <p>There is no need for a village shop.</p>	
Mr Robert Deanwood (National Grid c/o Amec Foster Wheeler)			General comment	No comment to make.	
Mr Oliver Rathmill (Environment Agency)	SSJ Policy 4		Oppose	<p>The Environment Agency notes that the proposed site allocation at Cranes Road is located entirely in Flood Zone 1. Due to the presence of the chalk aquifers, SSJ is in a sensitive location in respect of the protection of water quality, and the NP makes reference to the Water Cycle Study which supports the Adopted Local Plan 2011 - 2029.</p> <p>The policy as currently worded does not meet the basic conditions as it is not in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan. At the pre-submission consultation the EA noted the importance of ensuring sufficient sewerage infrastructure is in place to support new housing development in line with national policy guidance. It was also recommended that the Parish liaises with Thames Water to check the capacity of sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>It is necessary for development proposals in affected areas to demonstrate that they would not exacerbate deterioration within the relevant catchment.</p>	<p>Respondent recommends the inclusion of the following wording (in italics) in Policy 4:</p> <p><u>'and its setting and by an infrastructure statement demonstrating sufficient sewerage infrastructure is in place to support the scheme'</u></p>
Dr Pauline Homes			General comment	No comment to make.	

Respondent	Policy	Paragraph	Support/ Oppose	Summary of comments	Respondents suggested modifications
(Natural England)					
Mr Matt Winter	SSJ Policy 4		Oppose	<p>Concerned that the site allocation at Cranes Road is within the Strategic Gap.</p> <p>The site is allocated for 12-18 homes, however, the planning application that has been submitted is for 20 homes (Ref. 16/04110/OUT).</p>	
Mr Richard Agnew (Gladman Developments Ltd)			Oppose	<p>The SSJ NP does not fully meet the basic conditions. ALP Policy SS5 states that SSJ should provide 'at least 10 homes' (as a minimum). The NP determines a figure, and this does not maintain the flexibility of the Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Also recommends the identification of reserve sites.</p>	
Mr Richard Agnew (Gladman Developments Ltd)	SSJ Policy 2		Oppose	SSJ Policy 2 repeats the ALP. It is recommended that the policy is removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.	Deletion of SSJ Policy 2