

Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011 to 2029

**Report by Independent Examiner to Basingstoke
and Deane Borough Council**

Janet L Cheesley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

CHEC Planning Ltd

14 November 2017

Contents	Page
Summary and Conclusion	4
Introduction	4
Legislative Background	5
EU Obligations	5
Policy Background	6
The Neighbourhood Development Plan Preparation	7
The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan	8
Policy H1 New Housing	9
Policy H2 New Housing To Meet The Requirement Of Local Plan Policy SS5	9
Policy H3 Provision Of Housing To Meet Local Needs	14
Policy D1 Preserving And Enhancing The Historic Character And Rural Setting Of Sherfield On Loddon	15
Policy D2 Design Of New Development	17
Policy G1 Protection And Enhancement Of The Natural Environment	20
Policy G2 Protection And Enhancement Of Local Green Spaces	21
Policy G3 Reducing Flood Risk	23
Policy T1 Improving And Enhancing The Footpath Network	24
Policy T2 Creating A Cycle Network	24
Policy T3: Improving Road Safety In Sherfield On Loddon	25

Policy CF1 Local Community-Valued Assets And Facilities	26
Policy CF2 Provision Of New Community Facilities	26
Policy E1 New Employment Development	27
Policy C1 Enabling Fibre Optic And Telecommunications Connections	28
Referendum & the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan Area	29
Minor Modifications	30
Appendix 1 Background Documents	32

Summary and Conclusion

1. The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan has a clear vision and sets out strategic aims.
2. I am satisfied that the overall housing strategy meets the Basic Conditions. My suggested modifications to Policies H1 and H2 do not fundamentally alter the housing strategy within the Plan. They simply clarify the objectives of these policies to provide a practical framework for decision making.
3. I am satisfied that the proposed Local Green Spaces meet the criteria for designation.
4. I have recommended modification to some of the policies in the Plan, for the reasons set out in detail below. Even though I have recommended a number of modifications, these do not significantly or substantially alter the intention or nature of the Plan.
5. **Whilst I have set out my reasoning under individual policies, my overall conclusion is that, subject to my recommendations, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. It is appropriate to make the Plan. Subject to my recommendations being accepted, I consider that the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan will provide a strong practical framework against which decisions on development can be made. I am pleased to recommend that the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan, as modified by my recommendations, should proceed to Referendum.**

Introduction

6. On 22 March 2013 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) approved that the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Area be designated in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The neighbourhood area was then amended on 10 August 2015 to remove the Sherfield Park development. This amendment took into account the proposed redrawing of the Parish Boundary from April 2016. The amended area is the whole of the Parish as designated from April 2016.
7. The qualifying body is Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council. The Plan has been prepared by the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Plan Working Party on behalf of the Parish Council. The Plan covers the period 2011 to 2029.
8. I was appointed as an independent Examiner for the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan in October 2017. I confirm that I am independent from the Parish Council and BDBC. I have no interest in any of the land affected by the Plan and I have appropriate experience to undertake this examination.

Legislative Background

9. As an independent Examiner, I am required to determine, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, whether:
 - the policies in the Plan relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004;
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 PCPA where the plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area; and
 - that the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under the Localism Act 2011 and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
10. I am satisfied that the Plan meets these legal requirements.
11. I am obliged to determine whether the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions. The Basic Conditions are:
 - having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
 - the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan for the area of the authority; and
 - the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations and human rights requirements.
12. Subject to the modifications I have recommended in this report, I am content that these requirements have been satisfied.

EU Obligations

13. Directive 2001/42/EC and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (as amended) set out various legal requirements and stages in the production of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

14. BDBC produced a *Neighbourhood Planning Screening Report – Sherfield on Loddon Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)* in March 2017. It concluded that an Environmental Assessment was not considered to be required to accompany the Neighbourhood Plan. The statutory consultees concurred with this view.
15. In a Screening Opinion letter dated 14 March 2017, BDBC confirmed to the Parish Council the reasoning being: *following analysis undertaken to assess the effects on the environment resulting from the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Plan including from the scale of development and other policies proposed, it is considered significant effects on the environment are not likely and therefore a SEA is considered to not be required.*
16. Based on the Screening Report and consultee response, I consider that it was not necessary for the Plan to require a full SEA Assessment. The SEA screening accords with the provisions of the European Directive 2001/42/EC.
17. As regards HRA, the Screening Report concluded that the Plan would not need to be subject to HRA. The reason in the Screening Opinion letter states: *it is considered that the impacts of the plan are likely to be fairly localised, and would not impact on the SPA or any European sites.* The Screening Opinion letter concludes: *it is considered that there are not likely to be significant effects on any European sites flowing from the Neighbourhood Plan and therefore a HRA is considered to not be required.* Natural England agreed with this conclusion.
18. Based on the Screening Report and consultee response, I consider that the Plan did not require a full HRA under Articles 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive.
19. A Neighbourhood Plan must be compatible with European Union obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant. I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with EU obligations and does not breach the European Convention on Human Rights obligations.

Policy Background

20. *The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF)* sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. *The Planning Practice Guidance (2014) (PPG)* provides Government guidance on planning policy.
21. Paragraph 7 in the NPPF identifies the three dimensions to sustainable development:

There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

•an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;

• a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and

•an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

22. Sherfield on Loddon is within the local authority area of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC). The development plan for the Neighbourhood Development Plan Area includes the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (BDLP) (2011 to 2029) adopted on 26 May 2016. The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan was prepared in the context of this Local Plan. The strategic policies in this Local Plan include policies regarding housing, the environment and the economy.

The Neighbourhood Plan Preparation

23. I am required under The Localism Act 2011 to check the consultation process that has led to the production of the plan. The requirements are set out in Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
24. *The Consultation Statement* (August 2017) explains the consultation process and cross refers to *Annex G - Consultation Events and Survey Results* (March 2017) and *Annex I - Table of regulation 14 Consultation Comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan and Responses Made* (August 2017). For the purposes of Regulation 14, I have taken all three documents to comprise the Consultation Statement.
25. The initial consultation process started in December 2013 and involved a SWOT analysis. Other main methods of community engagement included information sharing open days and evenings in the village hall, a parish-wide household questionnaire, public forum meetings, face-to-face meetings with targeted community groups, presentations at annual parish meetings and stalls at annual parish summer fetes and the Sherfield annual show. Consultation included local residents, businesses and landowners.

26. The Consultation period on the pre-submission draft of the Plan ran from 3 April 2017 to 22 May 2017. Leaflets were delivered to all households explaining the process and inviting comments. People were invited to send comments by email, by post and on the Parish Council website. There was a separate flyer sent to all registered businesses in the Parish. An electronic version of the form was made available on the Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council website. Statutory consultees were consulted via email. On 22 April 2017 and 6 May 2017 there were open sessions for the public.
27. Annex I provides details of the representations, responses to comments and action taken.
28. I am satisfied that the pre-submission consultation and publicity has met the requirements of Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The consultation and publicity went well beyond the requirements and it is clear that the qualifying body went to considerable lengths to ensure that local residents, businesses, landowners and other interested parties were able to engage in the production of the Plan. I congratulate those involved for their considerable efforts.
29. BDBC publicised the submission Plan for comment during the publicity period between 4 September 2017 and 16 October 2017 in line with Regulation 16 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. A total of 21 responses were received during the consultation period, including representations from BDBC. I have accepted a late response from Natural England. I do not consider that anyone has been prejudiced by the acceptance of this late response. I am satisfied that all these responses can be assessed without the need for a public hearing.
30. Some responses suggest additions and amendments to policies. Having been satisfied that the Plan meets the legal requirements, my remit is to determine whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. Where I find that policies do meet the Basic Conditions, it is not necessary for me to consider if further suggested additions or amendments are required. Whilst I have not made reference to all the responses in my report, I have taken them into consideration.

The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011 to 2029

Background To The Neighbourhood Development Plan

31. I have been provided with a detailed evidence base in background supporting documents in the Annexes accompanying the Plan and other publicly available documents. This has provided a useful and easily accessible source of background information.

32. The Plan has a clear vision: *In 2029 Sherfield on Loddon will continue to be an attractive historic Parish with the Village Green at its centre, surrounded by open countryside and with a range of good quality housing, recreational and other facilities that meet the needs of local people while maintaining a cohesive and integrated rural community.*
33. Ten strategic aims have been derived to address the key conclusions identified through community engagement.
34. PPG states: *A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared.* (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).
35. It is necessary for Neighbourhood Plans to provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency as stated in the core planning principles in paragraph 17 in the NPPF. I do refer to clarity and precision with regard to some recommendations to modifications to the Plan. Where I do so, I have in mind the need to provide a practical framework in accordance with the core principles in the NPPF, thus ensuring that the Plan has regard to national policy in this respect.
36. For ease of reference, I have used the same policy titles as those in the Plan. I have briefly explained national policy and summarised main strategic policies relevant to each neighbourhood plan policy. Where I have not specifically referred to other relevant strategic policy, I have considered all strategic policy in my examination of the Plan.

Policies for Housing

POLICY H1 NEW HOUSING

POLICY H2 NEW HOUSING TO MEET THE REQUIREMENT OF LOCAL PLAN POLICY SS5

37. I have made comment on Policies H1 and H2 together.
38. The NPPF in paragraph 185 is clear that outside the strategic elements, neighbourhood plans will be able to shape and direct sustainable development in their area. National policy emphasises that development means growth.
39. BDLP Policy SS5 supports the identification of housing sites through Neighbourhood Plans. Sherfield on Loddon lies within a group of 13

settlements which are required to identify sites for a total of 150 homes between them. The exact split is not defined but BDLP Policy SS5 does specify that *it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries.*

40. Representations on behalf of Mill Lane Estates are promoting a site for some 15 dwellings on 'The Triangle'. This site is outside, but adjacent to the Sheffield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary.
41. Representations on behalf of Mitchell Properties are promoting a site for up to 50 dwellings on land at Breach Lane and north of Wildmoor Lane. This site is outside the Sheffield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary.
42. Representations by Gladman Developments are promoting a site for residential development off Goddards Lane. This site is outside, but adjacent to the Sheffield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary.
43. Representations on behalf of GLO Homes Ltd are promoting land adjacent to the Redlands site allocated in the Local Plan as a strategic site for housing development. The representations specifically request that part of the site is allocated for at least 10 dwellings and the remainder identified as a reserve housing allocation. The settlement policy boundary of Basingstoke was extended in the Local Plan to include the adjacent strategic allocation.
44. BDLP Policy SS5 specifically states there is a need to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within or adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries. This list specifically excludes Basingstoke (and Tadley). Were this Neighbourhood Plan to identify this land adjacent to the Redlands strategic site for housing development, this would not satisfy the requirement of Local Plan Policy SS5 as the site is land adjacent to the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary, rather than adjacent to the Sheffield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary.
45. The Neighbourhood Plan Examination process does not require a rigorous examination of district wide housing land requirements. I note that the suggested site adjacent to the Redlands strategic site was promoted through the Local Plan process. It is not for me to re-open the Local Plan Examination debate with regard to the suitability of this site for housing development.
46. Representations on behalf of Miller Homes Ltd are promoting residential development of land at Sheffield Hill Farm. I note that this site could accommodate some 240 dwellings. This site is north of and adjacent to the Redlands strategic allocation and was an omission site put forward for inclusion in the Local Plan. The site was not allocated in the Local Plan.
47. This Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites for housing development, but instead supports in principle proposals for new housing within the

Settlement Policy Boundary and proposals that meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy SS5.

48. Paragraph 4.67 in the Local Plan specifies: *if developments of a qualifying size come forward within or adjacent to the named settlements via alternative means to neighbourhood planning, for example via a planning application, this will contribute towards the targets set out within the policy.*
49. Policies H1 and H2 allow for development in accordance with BDLP Policy SS5, but do not go as far as identifying sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and/or adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary of Sherfield on Loddon. It is not for me to identify development sites for allocation in the Plan.
50. In representations, BDBC has confirmed that paragraph 4.68 in the Local Plan applies where a Parish has not met the requirement for the identification of sites/opportunities for at least 10 dwellings. In these circumstances, *the council reserves the right to identify opportunities to address any shortfall through appropriate means such as the adoption of suitable Development Plan Documents.*
51. In these circumstances, the Neighbourhood Plan has missed the opportunity for the local community to decide exactly where new development of at least 10 dwellings will be located. But, in doing so, it does not prevent these dwellings from being delivered through appropriate means via the identification of opportunities by BDBC, or via planning applications on suitable sites.
52. It is pertinent that the Regulations require the Plan to be in *general* conformity with strategic policy, rather than in conformity with a particular strategic policy. The approach to housing development in this Neighbourhood Plan does not undermine the strategic objectives for housing provision in the Local Plan. In this context, I am satisfied that the housing strategy in Policies H1 and H2 is in general conformity with strategic policy, but only because of the proviso that there are opportunities to address any shortfall, as outlined in the BDLP, through future Development Plan Documents or via planning applications on suitable sites.
53. Figure 6-1 identifies the Settlement Policy Boundary for Sherfield on Loddon village but omits the part of the Settlement Policy Boundary for Basingstoke that lies within the Parish. Policies H1 and H2 refer to the Settlement Policy Boundary and from the accompanying text, it is apparent that this is only the Settlement Policy Boundary for Sherfield on Loddon village. In the interest of precision, the name of the Settlement Policy Boundary should be identified in these Policies. Therefore, I recommend that Policies H1 and H2 are modified accordingly.
54. For the same reasons as above, the second sentence in H2 needs to be modified to take into consideration both Settlement Policy Boundaries within the Parish. Otherwise, as the policy currently reads, the land within the

Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary is classified as countryside. Supporting text in paragraphs 6.2.9 to 6.2.14 needs to be modified accordingly. It is not for me to rewrite the Plan. I will leave this matter to the Parish Council.

55. My suggested modifications to Policies H1 and H2 do not fundamentally alter the housing strategy within the Plan. They simply clarify the objectives of these policies to provide a practical framework for decision making.
56. BDBC has suggested modification to paragraphs 3.2.5.3 and 6.2.4 in their representation at the Regulation 16 stage. These paragraphs attempt to summarise BDLP Policy SS5. As part of the fact check of my draft examination report, BDBC suggested as further modification.. This is simply a clarification point to ensure that the end of the third sentence refers to the settlement policy boundary. In the interest of precision, I recommend modification to these paragraphs as suggested by BDBC.
57. In the interest of precision. Figure 6-1 requires a key, particularly as it includes the Conservation Area Boundary. As there are two Settlement Policy Boundaries in the Parish and I have recommended reference to both of them in Policy H2, in the interest of precision, they should both be identified in Figure 6-1.
58. Subject to modifications suggested above, Policies H1 and H2 have regard to national policy, contribute towards sustainable development and are in general conformity with strategic policy. As such, they meet the Basic Conditions.
59. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions,**

I recommend the inclusion of a Key on Figure 6-1 and the inclusion of that part of the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary that lies within the Parish.

I recommend modification to paragraphs 6.2.9 - 6.2.14 to make it clear that the Settlement Policy Boundary being referred to is that for Sherfield on Loddon.

I recommend modification to paragraphs 3.2.5.3 and 6.2.4 to read as follows:

Policy SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) of the adopted Local Plan also requires that a further 150 homes will need to be identified across the Borough in areas outside of the specific areas (Bramley, Kingsclere, Oakley, Overton and Whitchurch) listed in the policy. Policy SS5 adds that it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries in the borough. It is therefore necessary for sites/opportunities for at least 10 homes to be identified within and adjacent to Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary. Policy

SS5 adds that this can be identified through means such as neighbourhood planning, rural exception schemes or a review of Settlement Policy Boundaries.

Paragraph 4.67 of the adopted Local Plan clarifies that “Small residential developments of less than ten units (net gain of nine units or less) within the defined Settlement Policy Boundaries of the settlements listed will not qualify towards the targets outlined in the policy. Outside of the Settlement Policy Boundaries, developments of less than five units (net gain of four or less) will not qualify. If developments of a qualifying size come forward within or adjacent to the named settlements via alternative means to neighbourhood planning, for example via a planning application, this will contribute towards the targets set out within the policy. At April 2017, no dwellings have been granted planning permission within and adjacent to the defined Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary in the period 2011-2016 that satisfy the policy SS5 requirement. Therefore the requirement of policy SS5 has not yet been met, and the ‘at least 10 homes’ requirement continues to need to be identified through appropriate means.

I recommend modification to Policy H1 to read as follows:

POLICY H1: NEW HOUSING

Proposals for new housing will in principle be supported within the Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary and the use of brownfield sites will be especially welcomed.

I recommend modification to Policy H2 to read as follows:

POLICY H2: NEW HOUSING TO MEET THE REQUIREMENT OF LOCAL PLAN POLICY SS5

The Parish Council will support appropriate proposals for new housing within or adjacent to the Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary which meets the requirements of Local Plan Policy SS5.

Once the requirement for Policy SS5 has been met, proposals for development on sites outside the village of Sherfield on Loddon that are adjacent to the Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary, will be subject to relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside.

POLICY H3 PROVISION OF HOUSING TO MEET LOCAL NEEDS

60. The NPPF seeks to ensure that there is provision of a wide choice of quality homes. BDLP Policy CN3 seeks a range of house types and sizes to address local requirements.
61. Policy H3 seeks a balanced mix of housing. The Housing Survey Report (November 2015) provides useful background housing need evidence for the Parish. Background evidence in the production of Neighbourhood Plans needs to be proportionate. I am satisfied that the Housing Survey is proportionate and provides justified evidence to support Policy H3. The Plan concludes that *current needs are likely to be easily catered for by the Redlands and East of Basingstoke developments*. Thus, the Plan concentrates on ensuring the right balance of house sizes, styles and tenures.
62. BDLP Policy CN1 seeks the provision of affordable housing. Although PPG subsequently identifies different thresholds to BDLP Policy CN1, the tenure requirements in BDLP Policy CN1 remain strategic policy. The supporting text to BDLP Policy CN1 explains: *the provision of affordable housing to meet required needs is a key priority for the council in order to ensure that those households in need are able to access housing in the borough*.
63. Policy H3 seeks priority for affordable housing occupancy in accordance with the BDBC Allocations Scheme. This is in general conformity with strategic policy.
64. For the reasons stated above, Policy H3 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the environmental and social roles of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Policy H3 meets the Basic Conditions.

Policies for Design

65. The NPPF at paragraph 58 requires neighbourhood plans to include policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.
66. BDLP Policy EM1 seeks to ensure that new development is sympathetic to the character and visual qualities of the landscape. BDLP Policy EM10 seeks high quality design based upon a robust design led approach. BDLP Policy EM11 requires all development to conserve or enhance the quality of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

POLICY D1 PRESERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC CHARACTER AND RURAL SETTING OF SHERFIELD ON LODDON

67. The Sherfield on Loddon Character Assessment (July 2016) has been prepared as background evidence to support the Plan. This is a comprehensive document providing a detailed understanding and evaluation of the defining characteristics of Character Areas in the Parish. As such, it provides comprehensive robust evidence to support Policy D1. This is a very useful and detailed document. In the interest of precision, I recommend that this document is referred to in Policy D1.
68. A large part of the village lies within the Conservation Area. Policy D1 seeks to preserve, conserve or enhance all the Character Areas. In the interest of precision, as 'preserve' and 'conserve' have such similar meaning, I suggest that that one of these is deleted. As BDLP Policy EM11 refers to 'conserving' I suggest that references to 'preserving' are deleted from Policy D1. For the same reason, paragraph 6.3.4 should refer to conserving, rather than preserving the historic rural character.
69. In the interest of precision, I recommend that Policy D1 refers to 'relevant' Character Area(s), within or adjacent to which the proposed development is located as many development proposals, particularly small scale proposals, may only have an impact on one Character Area.
70. Policy D1 criterion e) refers to strategic views and vistas defined in Annex E and Figure 6-3. The Sherfield on Loddon Conservation Area Appraisal Map identifies *vistas – important general view especially of the wider landscape setting*. BDBC has brought to my attention that not all the vistas identified on the Conservation Area Appraisal Map are identified in Annex E and Figure 6-3. As Annex E specifically refers to the vista views in the Conservation Area Appraisal, in the interest of precision, I recommend that both Annex E and Figure 6-3 are amended to include all the vistas identified on the Conservation Area Appraisal Map.
71. The remaining views on Figure 6-3 are strategic views, defined as parish views not in the Conservation Area. Annex E identifies the locations of the strategic views outside the Conservation Area and provides photographs of these views. These views have been chosen within areas of medium and medium/high visual sensitivity as defined in the *Basingstoke, Tadley and Bramley Landscape Capacity Study* (February 2008). Landscape Character Areas BA06, BA07 and BA08 in that landscape capacity study lie within the Parish.
72. A representation by Gladman Developments Ltd has questioned the appropriateness of the Parish Views 18, 21 and 22 over land off Goddards Lane. This site lies within Character Area BA07 which is defined within the 2008 Study as an area with low landscape capacity with medium visual sensitivity. It is significant that Vista C is also an identified important general view over this area, as defined in the Conservation Area Appraisal.

73. I have been referred to the *Landscape Capacity Study 2010: Site Options* undertaken for BDBC. Site SOL 002 within that study has subsequently been allocated as a strategic site in the Local Plan. That site lies within Character Area BA08 defined in the 2008 Study as an area with low landscape capacity with medium to high visual sensitivity.
74. It is not for me to assess the reasons behind a strategic allocation in the Local Plan. The views chosen in Policy D1 are considered as very important by the local community. This local knowledge together with the findings of the *Basingstoke, Tadley and Bramley Landscape Capacity Study 2008*, support the identification and inclusion of these views. Evidence does have to be proportionate. In my opinion, the evidence in support of the Strategic Views in Figure 6-3 is sufficient and proportionate.
75. Development proposals within the strategic views areas are required to show that the proposals conserve or enhance the relevant Character Area, having regard to these views and the other criteria in Policy D1. As such, I do not see reference to strategic views in Policy D1 as necessarily preventing development.
76. The last sentence of Policy D1 refers to avoiding harm to the significance of heritage assets. Section 12 in the NPPF states in some considerable detail how to assess the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset. The last sentence of policy D1 is not an accurate reflection of national policy and I have no clear evidence before me to justify this approach. I have considered modification to this sentence, but it would require lengthy repetition of national policy, which is not necessary. Therefore, to have regard to national policy, I recommend deletion of the last sentence in Policy D1.
77. Subject to the suggested modifications above, I consider that modified Policy D1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the environmental role of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy D1 meets the Basic Conditions.
78. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions,**

I recommend modification to Policy D1 to read as follows:

POLICY D1: CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC CHARACTER AND RURAL SETTING OF SHERFIELD ON LODDON

Development proposals must show how they would conserve or enhance the relevant character area(s) identified in The Sherfield on Loddon Character Assessment (July 2016) within or adjacent to which they are located with regard to:

- a) the scale and form of the development,**
- b) the density of the development,**
- c) the materials used in the development,**

- d) the distinctive character of the open landscapes of the parish,**
- e) the strategic views and vistas valued by the public as defined in Annex E and shown in Figure 6-3 below,**
- f) the tree and hedgerow planting that reinforces and reflects local biodiversity in the parish,**
- g) the local historic environment,**
- h) the Conservation Area.**

I recommend modification to paragraph 6.3.4 to read as follows:

The purpose of policy D1 is to ensure that new development serves to conserve or enhance the historic rural character of the Parish as a whole, not just the Conservation Area.

I recommend modification to Annex E and Figure 6-3 to include all the vistas identified on the Conservation Area Appraisal Map.

POLICY D2 DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

- 79. Policy D2 lists design criteria for new development. Policy D2 has muddled design criteria for new housing development with design criteria for all development. I have assumed that the first sentence only applies to new residential development. In the interest of precision, I recommend separating out the residential design criteria from that for all development. I have suggested modified wording accordingly.
- 80. In a Written Ministerial Statement of 25 March 2015 the Government announced that it is not now appropriate to refer to any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings in neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply the new national technical standards. To have regard to national policy, I recommend deletion of this reference in criterion b) and the deletion of paragraphs 6.3.10 and 6.3.11.
- 81. Criteria c) and d) are prescriptive policy requirements for a restrictive use of materials. Paragraphs 59 and 60 in the NPPF explain that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes. Criteria c), d) and part of criterion f) do not have regard to national policy in this respect. Therefore, I have recommended modification to Policy D2 by deletion of such prescriptive requirements.
- 82. Criterion g) specifies a preference for hedges of indigenous plants or post and rail fences as means of enclosure to give a sense of open space. I see the preferences as unnecessary detail as in many instances, it may be possible to create a sense of open space through other design solutions that are in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Indeed, there are many examples of low boundary walls in the Parish that give a sense of

open space. Therefore, I have recommended modification to criterion g) by the deletion of the prescriptive requirements.

83. Criterion i) refers to new development adjacent to a listed building or building of historic interest. This does not have regard to national policy outlined in Section 12 in the NPPF, particularly paragraph 133 with regard to substantial public benefits. I have considered modification to the listed building or building of historic interest section of criterion i), but it would require lengthy repetition of national policy, which is not necessary. To have regard to national policy in this respect, I suggest that criterion i) is modified to delete reference to listed buildings or buildings of historic interest.
84. It may not be possible in many circumstances for new development to enhance adjacent open space. Developer contributions can only be sought where they meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. These tests are set out as statutory tests in the *Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010*. Therefore, to have regard to national policy, I recommend further modification to criterion i) to refer to new development conserving 'or' enhancing adjacent open space, rather than being required to conserve 'and' enhance the open space.
85. Criterion k) is concerned with the security of buildings. I have no evidence before me to explain how the reference to environmental efficiency in criterion k) is directly related to the security of buildings. This creates confusion and does not provide a practical framework for decision making. In the interest of precision, I recommend the deletion of reference to environmental efficiency from criterion k).
86. Criterion m) refers to integrating car parking within landscaping. I see this as an unnecessary detail as in many instances, it may be possible to successfully integrate car parking through other design solutions. I have suggested modified wording to criterion m) accordingly.
87. Subject to the modifications I have suggested above, modified Policy D2 ensures high quality design. It has regard to national policy, contributes towards the achievement of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy D2 meets the Basic Conditions.
88. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions;**
I recommend the deletion of paragraphs 6.3.10 and 6.3.11
I recommend modification to Policy D2 to read as follows;

POLICY D2: DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

New development in Sherfield on Loddon must deliver good quality design. In order to achieve this, all new development must wherever possible:

- a) Consider the density of any new development which must be in character with the surrounding area, respect the rural nature of the parish and be designed to give an impression of spaciousness and variety with uniform houses and plots being avoided;**
- b) Enhance developments by landscaping and planting and preserving existing trees and hedges wherever possible that reflect local biodiversity;**
- c) Where any new development is adjacent to open space be sensitively designed to conserve or enhance the setting and character of the space;**
- d) Design all new buildings and/or developments with the security of the building and its occupants at the forefront in terms of personal safety and crime prevention;**
- e) Provide streets which encourage low vehicle speeds and which can function as safe, social spaces; and**
- f) Provide sufficient car parking and integrate it within the development so that it does not dominate or cause congestion in the streets.**

All new residential developments must reflect the rural character and historic context of existing dwellings within the parish. In order to achieve this, in addition to criteria a-f, all new residential development must wherever possible;

- g) In general, restrict house height to two storeys;**
- h) Avoid apparent excessive bulk of houses by careful design of roof elevations;**
- i) Where enclosure of plots is planned, create a sense of open space from plot to plot;**
- j) Recognise, in the design of developments, the distinctive local character of the parish and sensitively contribute to create dwellings of a high architectural and rural quality.**

Policy D2 will be applied flexibly when very high quality innovative designs are proposed.

Policies for the Rural Environment

POLICY G1 PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

89. The NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment. BDLP Policy EM4 is a policy regarding biodiversity, geodiversity and nature conservation. This is a long complex policy setting criteria to ensure that: *Development proposals will only be permitted if significant harm to biodiversity and/ or geodiversity resulting from a development can be avoided or, if that is not possible, adequately mitigated...*
90. Policy G1 seeks to protect and enhance the natural environment and specifies that any proposals must be in accordance with BDLP Policy EM4. The reference to mitigation measures '*through the creation of like-for-like habitats*' is not in accordance with BDLP Policy EM4. To avoid internal conflict within the Development Plan, I recommend the deletion of this reference in Policy G1. Subject to this modification, Policy G1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the environmental role of sustainable development and is in general conformity with Strategic Policy. Modified Policy G1 meets the Basic Conditions.
91. BDBC has suggested further modification to Policy G1 by the inclusion of reference to protected species in criterion c). This would be in general conformity with BDLP Policy EM4. However, Policy G1 does not need to be a repetition of the Local Plan Policy. My remit is to determine whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. By omitting such a reference, Policy G1, as modified by my suggestion above, meets the Basic Conditions. Therefore, I am not in a position to recommend such a modification.
92. Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Policy G1 to read as follows:

POLICY G1: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Development proposals will be expected, where appropriate, to conserve and enhance the natural environment and will be supported provided they:

- a) Protect and enhance wildlife areas, including local wildlife sites and SINC's and incorporate measures to provide net gains in biodiversity. Where there is a residual loss compensatory measures will be required;**
- b) Take the opportunity to protect, enhance and extend the network of landscape and wildlife corridors between existing open spaces and habitats as a means of mitigating the impacts of development on biodiversity;**
- c) Conserve the environment for nocturnal species, through the**

avoidance of street lighting and mitigating the impact of domestic external lighting and

d) Contain measures that will help to mitigate the impacts of, and adapt to, climate change.

Development proposals will be expected to ensure that there is minimum loss of biodiversity and where possible to provide a net gain. Where there is likely to be a loss of biodiversity, measures to mitigate will be put in place to ensure there is no net loss of biodiversity. Any proposals must be in accordance with Local Plan Policy EM4.

POLICY G2 PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF LOCAL GREEN SPACES

93. Paragraph 76 in the NPPF allows for neighbourhood plans to *identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.*
94. Paragraph 78 in the NPPF states: *Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts.*
95. Paragraph 77 in the NPPF states that: *The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:*
- where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*
- where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and*
- where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.*
96. Whilst the BDLP does not specifically refer to Local Green Space (LGS), Policy EM5 seeks to protect and enhance the quality of public open space and resists the redevelopment of both public and private open space.
97. I have spent a considerable amount of time looking at the areas proposed to be designated as LGS. It is clear that all of the sites identified in Policy G2 meet the criteria for designation.
98. Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 12 are all parts of the Village Green. This is in the centre of the village and is therefore in close proximity to the community

it serves. It is clear from supporting evidence in Annex E that the Village Green is demonstrably special to the local community. At the time of my site visit, it was apparent how well the Village Green was used by walkers. Each of the parcels is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

99. Site 1 is the allotments. I saw at my site visit that they are well used by the local community. It is clear that this site is demonstrably special to the local community, is in close proximity to the local community, is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
100. Sites 7, 8 and 9 are adjacent to the A33 and the informal vegetation on these sites, including trees, provide sound and visual buffers. LGS does not have to be accessible formal open space. I am satisfied that these sites are demonstrably special to the local community because of their verdant appearance. They are in close proximity to the local community, are local in character and are not extensive tracts of land.
101. Policy G2 doesn't actually designate LGS; it simply states that development on LGS will only be permitted in very special circumstances. In order to actually designate the LGS, there needs to be a policy reference to such a designation. I have suggested additional text.
102. BDBC has suggested that the LGS maps need to be of a suitable scale to aid clarity and precision. Such maps are found within Annex E. In the interest of precision, I recommend that the LGS maps in Annex E are included within the Plan to ensure that the precise boundaries of the LGS are clearly identifiable.
103. Subject to the above modifications, Policy G2 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the achievement of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy G2 meets the Basic Conditions.

104. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions;**

I recommend that the Local Green Space Maps in Annex E are included within the Plan.

I recommend modification to Policy G2 to read as follows:

POLICY G2: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF LOCAL GREEN SPACES

The areas shown on Local Green Space Maps [] are designated as areas of Local Green Space. Development on designated Local Green Space will only be permitted in very special circumstances.

POLICY G3 REDUCING FLOOD RISK

105. The NPPF seeks to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding by directing development away from areas of high risk. The PPG states that *the aim should be to keep development out of medium and high flood risk areas (Flood Zones 2 and 3) and other areas affected by other sources of flooding where possible*. Sequential tests and exceptions tests and site-specific flood risk assessments may be required for proposed development in these flood zones in accordance with the NPPF and the PPG.
106. BDLP Policy EM6 is a detailed policy on water quality. BDLP Policy EM7 seeks to apply the sequential approach and encourages the use of sustainable drainage systems. It includes criteria for development in areas at risk of flooding.
107. Policy G3 requires all planning applications to incorporate mitigation measures for rain water run-off and flooding risk, protect local water courses and contribute to environmental works.
108. To have regard to national policy and be in general conformity with strategic policy, only planning applications within an area at risk of flooding should be required to incorporate mitigation measures. In addition, it is necessary to ensure that the development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Policy G3 should be modified accordingly.
109. It is unclear how an applicant, particularly for small scale development, could be required to demonstrate conformity with criterion c). Paragraph 173 in the NPPF states: *'Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be delivered viably is threatened.'* To have regard to national policy, I recommend the deletion of criterion c).
110. I note that the wording of Policy G3 was extensively revised following suggestion by the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust as part of the Regulation 14 consultation process. Unfortunately, the revision does not meet the Basic Conditions. In seeking to modify Policy G3, I have considered the wording of Policy G3 in the Pre-Submission Draft Plan. As that draft policy satisfies all the concerns I have raised above, I recommend reverting back to the wording of that draft policy. The modified Policy G3 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the achievement of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy G3 meets the Basic Conditions.
111. Figure 6-6 identifies the Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary, but does not identify the Settlement Policy Boundary for Basingstoke that lies within the Parish. The Parish Council may wish to consider identifying both boundaries on this map. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**

112. Thames Water has suggested the addition of a paragraph explaining that a technical assessment is required for proposals for sensitive development close to the sewage treatment works. I am satisfied that BDLP Policies SS3.7 and SS3.9 cover this matter. It is not necessary for the suggested additional paragraph to be included in this Neighbourhood Plan in order for the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions.

113. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Policy G3 to read as follows:**

POLICY G3: REDUCING FLOOD RISK

Planning applications for developments in Sherfield on Loddon which are located within an area at risk from flooding must include mitigation measures giving priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems

a) to ensure that surface water run-off will not be increased and if possible will be reduced, and

b) to ensure that the development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Sustainable Drainage System, or other appropriate mitigation measures identified in relevant Flood Risk Assessments, should be satisfactorily integrated into the design and layout of the development.

Policies for Transport

114. The status of paragraph 6.5.3 in the Plan is unclear. This paragraph requires any possible revival of dualling the A33 to be routed well to the east, to bypass the Parish as far away as possible. This statement has implications for areas outside the Parish. This does not provide a practical framework for decision making. As such, I see no place for this statement within the Plan.

115. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend the deletion of paragraph 6.5.3.**

POLICY T1 IMPROVING AND ENHANCING THE FOOTPATH NETWORK

POLICY T2 CREATING A CYCLE NETWORK

116. I have made comment on Policies T1 and T2 together.

117. The NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport and highlights in paragraph 35 that developments should be located and designed where

practical to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and have access to high quality public transport facilities.

- 118. BDLP Policy CN9 seeks to promote a safe, efficient and convenient transport system. Measures include the provision of coherent and direct cycling and walking networks.
- 119. Policies T1 and T2 seek to improve the network of footpaths and cycle ways. This objective would contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development, by encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport. Policies T1 and T2 have regard to national policy and are in general conformity with strategic policy. These policies meet the Basic Conditions.

POLICY T3: IMPROVING ROAD SAFETY IN SHERFIELD ON LODDON

- 120. The NPPF at paragraph 32 states: *development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.*
- 121. BDLP Policy CN9 seeks to ensure that new development does not result in inappropriate traffic generation or compromise highway safety. It states that development will be permitted if it satisfies a number of criteria including that *it does not have a severe impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to the local or strategic road networks.* The test here is that the development should not have a 'severe' impact.
- 122. Policy T3 refers to an 'adverse' impact on road safety. I recommend that this is modified to refer to a 'severe adverse impact' to have regard to criteria in paragraph 32 in the NPPF and to be in general conformity with BDLP Policy CN9.
- 123. Policy T3 seeks to ensure road safety at known traffic hazards identified in Annex D. I have been provided with useful background evidence in Annex D as justification for Policy T3. This is summarised in paragraphs 6.5.17 and 6.5.18 in the Plan. In the interest of precision, I recommend that a map is included in the Plan to indicate the precise locations of known traffic hazards and that this map is cross referred to in Policy T3.
- 124. Subject to the proposed modifications above, Policy T3 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the achievement of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy T3 meets the Basic Conditions.
- 125. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions;**
I recommend the inclusion of a map in the Plan identifying the precise locations of known traffic hazards.
I recommend modification to Policy T3 to read as follows:

POLICY T3: IMPROVING ROAD SAFETY IN SHERFIELD ON LODDON

Development proposals will not be supported if they would have a severe adverse impact on road safety at the known traffic hazards identified in Annex D and on Map [] that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated.

Policies for Community-Valued Assets and Facilities

126. Paragraph 28 in the NPPF promotes a strong rural economy. It states that neighbourhood plans should *promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.*
127. Paragraph 70 in the NPPF requires planning policies to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities.

POLICY CF1 LOCAL COMMUNITY-VALUED ASSETS AND FACILITIES

128. BDLP Policies CN7 and CN8 list criteria against which the loss of essential facilities and services and community, leisure and cultural facilities should be assessed.
129. Policy CF1 seeks to retain local community-valued assets and facilities, subject to a list of criteria. This has regard to national policy, contributes towards the social role of sustainability and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Policy CF1 meets the Basic Conditions.
130. The third line of Policy CF1 includes 'local community assets and facilities'. This appears to be an editing error. The Policy reads better without this phrase. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**

POLICY CF2 PROVISION OF NEW COMMUNITY FACILITIES

131. BDLP Policies CN7 and CN8 support the provision of new facilities. Criterion c) in BDLP Policy CN8 specifies support for development that *provides new facilities in accordance with adopted council standards, where there is evidence of need that cannot be met by existing provision.*
132. Paragraph 173 in the NPPF states: *Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be delivered viably is threatened.*
133. Developer contributions can only be sought where they meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms,

directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. These tests are set out as statutory tests in the *Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010*.

134. Policy CF2 seeks the provision of new community facilities. In the interest of precision and to have regard to national policy, I recommend that reference to 'subject to viability' is included in Policy CF2. Subject to this modification, Policy CF2 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the achievement of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy CF2 meets the Basic Conditions.
135. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Policy CF2 to read as follows:**

POLICY CF2: PROVISION OF NEW COMMUNITY FACILITIES

When planning permission is granted for development in Sherfield on Loddon, opportunities will be taken to provide or support new community facilities, or to improve or support existing community facilities, subject to viability, in accordance with priorities determined by the Parish Council.

Policy for Employment

POLICY E1 NEW EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

136. The NPPF promotes a strong rural economy. At paragraph 28 it states: *planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development.*
137. BDLP Policy EP1 seeks economic growth and investment. BDLP Policy EP4 lists criteria for economic uses in the countryside. These include that all development proposals must be well designed and of a use and scale that is appropriate to the site and location.
138. Policy E1 sets criteria for new small businesses and the expansion or diversification of businesses in the Parish. The second criterion with regard to having minimal adverse impact on the natural or built environment does not provide a clear practical framework for decision making. I have taken this to be referring to minimal impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding environment. In the interest of precision, I have suggested modified wording.
139. Historic England has raised concern regarding this second criterion and has requested revised wording that includes reference to heritage assets. The development plan has to be read as a whole. I am satisfied that Policy E1 does not contradict BDLP Policy EM11 with regard to the conservation or enhancement of heritage assets and does not prevent development

proposals affecting heritage assets being determined in accordance with the statutory requirements.

140. Modified Policy E1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards all roles of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy E1 meets the Basic Conditions.
141. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Policy E1 to read as follows:**

POLICY E1: NEW EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

Proposals for the development of new small local businesses and for the expansion or diversification of existing businesses in the Parish will be supported, providing that

a) there will be minimal adverse impact resulting from increased traffic, noise, smell, lighting, vibration, or other emissions or activities generated by the proposed development;

b) there will be minimal adverse impact on the character and appearance of the natural or the built environment as a result of the proposed development.

Policy for Communications

POLICY C1 ENABLING FIBRE OPTIC AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONNECTIONS

142. The NPPF emphasises that advanced high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth. BDLP Policy CN7 seeks to ensure that development proposals provide or improve essential facilities and services. One of the aims of this policy includes facilitating high quality broadband infrastructure provision for rural communities. Paragraph 7.6 in the Local Plan emphasises the importance of attracting new investment in broadband and mobile telecommunications infrastructure.
143. Policy C1 seeks to ensure fibre optic connections for all new development and that all development proposals provide a Connectivity Statement. The definition of development in planning policy encompasses a wide range, including residential extensions and there may be many instances where small scale development does not require broadband connection and where a Connectivity Statement cannot be justified. In the interest of precision, I suggest the inclusion of 'where relevant' at the beginning of this policy. For the same reasons, supporting paragraph 6.8.3 should be similarly modified.
144. For the same reasons as mentioned under Policy D1, reference to heritage assets is not an accurate reflection of national policy and a reference to

heritage assets is not necessary as the development plan has to be read as a whole. Therefore, I recommend deletion of this reference.

145. Modified Policy C1 meets the Basic Conditions, particularly where it has regard to national policy and contributes towards sustainable economic development.

146. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions;**

I recommend modification to paragraph 6.8.3 to explain that only relevant new development should make provision for high speed broadband connection.

I recommend modification to Policy C1 to read as follows:

POLICY C1: ENABLING FIBRE OPTIC AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONNECTIONS

Where relevant, proposals for new developments must provide a Connectivity Statement setting out how the development will help achieve a fibre optic connection to the nearest connection chamber in the public highway. Wherever possible the development must provide suitable ducting to enable more than one service provider to provide a fibre connection to the development.

Proposals for telecommunications masts will be supported providing that it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse effect on the character or appearance of the historic, natural or rural environment of the parish.

Referendum and the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan Area

147. I am required to make one of the following recommendations:

- the Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements; or
- the Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum; or
- the Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.

148. **I am pleased to recommend that the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum.**

149. I am required to consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan Area. I see no reason to alter or extend the Neighbourhood Development Plan Area for the purpose of holding a referendum.

Minor Modifications

150. BDBC has pointed out that the fourth paragraph in the Forward needs revision, as the full planning application on the Redlands garden site has been withdrawn. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
151. Paragraphs 1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.6 require updating to reflect the final stage of the Plan preparation. **I see these as minor editing matters.**
152. BDBC has suggested revised wording for paragraph 2.3.4, primarily to clarify the relationship of this Neighbourhood Plan with the Local Plan. **I see this as a minor editing matter.** The revised paragraph reads as follows:
- 2.3.4 The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan is part of the Development Plan for the Parish. It sits alongside the Local Plan prepared by the local planning authority and decisions on planning applications will be made using both the local Plan and Neighbourhood Development Plan, and any other material considerations. The Neighbourhood Development Plan supports the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plans positively to support local development (as outlined in paragraph 16 of the NPPF). The Neighbourhood Development Plan addresses the development and use of land. Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a Neighbourhood Development Plan. Actions dealing with non-land use matters are clearly identifiable in the Neighbourhood Development Plan.**
153. As part of the fact check of my draft report, BDBC pointed out that *Basingstoke and Deane Countryside Design Statement Summary 2008*, BDBC is the correct title for this document in the list in Appendix C. . **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
154. BDBC has pointed out that the protected species listing in Annex E refers to Brown - eared bat. This should be Brown long - eared bat. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
155. As I have recommended the deletion of reference to internal space standards in Policy D2, it seems appropriate to delete the space standard references in Appendix C. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
156. The Plan is a well-written document, which is easy to read. Where I have found minor editing errors, I have highlighted and identified them. It is not for

me to re-write the Plan. If other minor amendments to the Plan or Annexes are required as a result of my proposed modifications, I see these as minor editing matters which can be dealt with as minor modifications to the Plan.

Janet Cheesley

Date 14 November 2017

Appendix 1 Background Documents

The background documents include

The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) (2012)
The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
The Localism Act (2011)
The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)
The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations (2015)
The Planning Practice Guidance (2014)
Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011 to 2029 (adopted May 2016)
Regulation 16 Representations
Regulation 14 Documents

Supporting Documentation:

Consultation Statement (August 2017)
Annex A: Household Questionnaire (March 2017)
Annex B: Housing Survey Report (November 2015)
Annex C: Character Assessment (July 2016)
Annex D: Road Safety and Traffic Issues (August 2017)
Annex E: Strategic Views, Green Spaces and Natural Environment (August 2017)
Annex F: Basic Conditions Statement (August 2017)
Annex G: Consultation Events and Survey Results (March 2017)
Annex H: SEA and HRA Screening Report (March 2017)
Annex I: Table of Regulation 14 Consultation Comments & Responses (August 2017)
Sherfield on Loddon Conservation Area Appraisal, July 2003, BDBC
Basingstoke and Deane Countryside Design Statement Summary 2008, BDBC
Loddon Catchment Biodiversity Strategy 2003, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
Basingstoke, Tadley and Bramley Landscape Capacity Study 2008, BDBC
The 2009 Rural Housing Study for Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
Hampshire County Council Small Area Population Forecasts
The Case for Space: the size of England's New Homes. RIBA
Space Standards for Homes Homewise RIBA
The Basingstoke and Deane Cycling Strategy (March 2016)
The Hampshire Countryside Access Plan (2015 – 2025) Hampshire County Council