

ES&BG NP Submission Plan - Consultation Statement Appendix I
Responses to Community Comments on the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Plan

All community comments were received in writing via the dedicated NP email n.plan.esbg@gmail.com

Comments - counting individuals represented	
"Support"	45
"Reluctant Support" - common group of comments	19
Comment Only	11
"Object"	8
NP SG Team (presumed to support as residents)	7
Owner/Promoter Comment	1

Overall	
"Support" (+ 7 member NP Team as residents)	64 + 7
"Object"	8
Comment only	11
Total community responding (exc NP Team)	83

What follows is a summary of the comments (with similar ones grouped), points made in the NP SG Review and the Actions/Responses and then the text of the resultant feedback given to the community on 14th October.

ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan

Comment	SG Review	Actions/Responses
BGI is greenfield site outside BG village and is joining BG and NS	Yes it is greenfield but no brownfield option available/deliverable. North Sydmonton is not well-defined.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
Housing on BGI would ruin views/peaceful environment and reduce value of our house	Landscaping plans as mitigation. Individual house valuation in not a consideration for the NP SG.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
Choice of BGI as the site vs BGB – BGB received more support in the May 2022 consultation	May event was a consultation (not a “vote”) to help define the final shortlist of 3 sites. SA and “deliverability” assessments were then added to the selection process. “Deliverability” considerations knocked out both BGB & BGH leaving BGI as the allocated site. The Site Assessment Report has the full detail	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
BGI inappropriate - size + infrastructure problems - roads narrow/dangerous	All need to be addressed/mitigated @ detailed planning stage. PC to work with HCC on general infrastructure issues.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
BGI could overload sewage, create flood problems, create low water pressure	No issues/concerns raised by Thames/Southern Water	Email responses sent as part of general infrastructure review.

ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan

Comment	SG Review	Actions/Responses
<p>There is belief that there is an opportunity/room for “negotiation” with the owner/developer of site BGB to arrive at option (as alternative to the BGI that better suits the NP, the developers and the B&DBC LPU.</p> <p>(In parallel with the development of the ES&BG NP, the BGB site is part of a bigger site “Woodside View” for which White/Hathor are seeking permission (22/00174/OUT) to build 42 homes.)</p>	<p>The NP mandate based on Sept 21/May 22 community consultations is for ~ 15 homes in Bishops Green that are “affordable to buy”.</p> <p>White/Hathor initially offered site BGB for 15 homes plus green space as part of their bigger Woodside View site.</p> <p>When asked to withdraw the current planning application for their site in order to proceed within the NP (normal practice) they declined.</p> <p>Then asked to commit unequivocally the BGB part of Woodside View to the NP to meet “deliverability” requirements, they also declined. With advice taken from B&D BC, the BGB option was therefore deemed “non-deliverable”.</p> <p>Our understanding is that a recent discussion between some residents and White/Hathor is based on ~ 30 homes of a size/style different to the ES&BG NP proposal in order to optimise commercial return on the Woodside View site. If such numbers/type were to be considered, this would require a new community consultation showing support vs current plan, new documentation and re-run of Reg 14 PSC. Our consultant has since advised that that a re-run of the entire Call for Sites would most likely be required to secure successful examination.</p> <p>The current Hathor planning application for 42 homes has received a large number of strong objections and no support from the community.</p> <p>Given the wider community mandate for the policies in the plan, the ES&BG NP will proceed with the allocation of BGI for housing in Bishops Green</p>	<p>Extract below sent as part of email to residents who mentioned this.</p> <p><i>“There has been mention from some that there could be “an opportunity to negotiate with the promoter/owner of the Woodside View” to arrive at an option that “better suits the NP, the developers and the B&DBC LPU” perhaps based on a greater number of homes than the 15 proposed in the plan. We are advised that for successful examination, such a step would require a complete reset of the plan process most likely requiring re-run of community consultation, the call for sites and the Reg 14 Consultation. This would take many months and set against the imperative to get a plan in place ASAP and so is not supported by the PC in the light of the wider views of the community. Details on how the allocation of the BGI site was made are laid out in the Site Assessment Report.”</i></p>

ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan

Comment	SG Review	Actions/Responses
<p>Housing mix – we already have enough/too much affordable/social housing in the parish.</p>	<p>We have tried to be clear that proposal in the plan is for a mix of “homes to buy” of different sizes (1-3+ bedrooms).</p> <p>The plan does not propose increasing the amount of “social housing to rent” as there is already a large stock of such housing in the parish.</p> <p>The consultations held in September 2021 and May 2022 made it clear that the community wanted to see “some but not a lot” of extra housing that would be a) affordable to buy and b) of a type suitable for first/second time buyers, families and those seeking to downsize.</p> <p>“Affordable to buy” in this context means homes that are limited in size/facilities with a proportion (25% - in line with B&D BC policy) targeted to be bought via the Government’s new “First Homes” scheme and the rest sold at “market” value.</p>	<p>Extract below sent as part of email to residents who mentioned this.</p> <p><i>“Housing mix. We fully recognise that the parish has a high proportion of social housing to rent and the plan does not propose adding any more. The consultations held in September 2021 and May 2022 made it clear that the community wanted to see limited extra housing that would be a) “affordable to buy” and of range of sizes suitable for first/second time buyers, families and those seeking to downsize. All will be “market” homes but limited in size/facilities to ensure affordability. We anticipate that 25% will be under the First Homes shared ownership scheme (in line with B&D BC policy). The final policy wording will better reflect this.”</i></p> <p>Wording in Submission Plan clarified.</p>

ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan

Comment	SG Review	Actions/Responses
<p>Why is there Green Space in the BGI proposal - who will own/manage - could become spot for Anti-Social Behaviour – also potential for development creep</p>	<p>All greenspace needs to be designed/managed to avoid/prevent mis-use. Police now want to be involved in the design of new spaces.</p> <p>Designation as Green Space provides some protection against development.</p> <p>Policy ESG3 will be more explicit that the surrounding community are to be involved in the “design” for the balance of BGI taking into account the Green Corridor and other environmental & landscape objectives. Based on this, ownership and management can then be determined.</p> <p>Owner is in agreement with this approach.</p>	<p>Extract below sent as part of email to residents who mentioned this.</p> <p><i>“Concern over the proposal for the Green Space component of the BGI site is recognised and we propose moving forward as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>o All Green Space needs to be designed/managed to avoid/prevent mis-use. The Police now want to be involved in the design of any new spaces.</i> <i>o Designation of an area as Green Space provides good protection against development – this is important when it is adjacent to a Settlement Boundary.</i> <i>o The relevant policy in the plan will be more explicit that the community is to be involved in the “design” for the green space balance of the BGI site taking into account the Green Corridor and other environmental & landscape objectives and the need to prevent mis-use. Based on this, ownership and management can then be determined.</i> <i>o We have discussed this with the owner who is in agreement with this approach.”</i>
<p>Review plan if Hathor gets permission for Woodside View</p>	<p>Any decision to trigger a “Review” of the NP once made is for the PC as “Qualifying Body”.</p> <p>The B&D BC LPU once made may create need for a review. Likewise, changes in Gov policy.</p> <p>Should a development of the scale proposed by Hathor get permission despite community objections and an established NP then it is likely the PC would want to trigger a review.</p>	<p>Email explaining what might trigger a review of the NP sent to residents who mentioned this. This link attached</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</p> <p>Paragraph: 106 Reference ID: 41-106-20190509</p>

ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan

Comment	SG Review	Actions/Responses
No to EX as in AONB and creates rural economic loss	Conversion of this type of brownfield site to housing is acceptable in the AONB. The livery stable is little used and in need of major repairs to be competitive.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
No to EX as outside parish boundary and creates "spread"	Is well within parish boundary and between other housing	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
No to EX - road safety	Extensive improvement/mitigation of this is proposed	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
No to EX as habitat for many species	To be addressed in detailed planning	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
LPA only seeks 150 via NP process - disproportionate # in this NP	The number of homes allocated in ESBG3 and ESBG4 reflects community consultation. The borough-wide numbers in the LPA do not need to be considered.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
No to EX – new housing should be closer to village hall etc	Closest deliverable site offered Settlement is not highly concentrated.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
No to EX - premature vs LPU and LPU allocation is zero	Community-led numbers from consultations Having an evidence-based plan for some housing provides some protection against unwanted proposals.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
EX proposal very/too dense vs neighbouring homes	A point of view.	No response
Windfall development will meet needs for Ecchinswell	Windfalls are by definition not planned. Tight SBs do not allow much potential windfall in either settlement.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.

ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan

Comment	SG Review	Actions/Responses
"affordable" misleading - use better/clearer terminology	<p>We have tried to be clear that proposal in the plan is for a mix of “homes to buy” of different sizes (1-3+ bedrooms).</p> <p>The plan does not propose increasing the amount of “social housing to rent” as there is already a large stock of such housing in the parish.</p> <p>The consultations held in September 2021 and May 2022 made it clear that the community wanted to see “some but not a lot” of extra housing that would be a) affordable to buy and b) of a type suitable for first/second time buyers, families and those seeking to downsize.</p> <p>“Affordable to buy” in this context means homes that are limited in size/facilities with a proportion (25% - in line with B&D BC policy) targeted to be bought via the Government’s new “First Homes” scheme and the rest sold at “market” value.</p>	<p>Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.</p> <p>Wording in Submission Plan clarified.</p>
More concrete EV charging policy	Will review but cannot risk over-reach	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
Total # of extra homes in Ecchinswell if village hall scheme happens	Village Hall scheme is a tentative concept and may not happen and even if it does may not contain housing. Would constitute “windfall” if it does happen.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
2.10 - should say flooding closes road/housing increases run-off	Will review	Added to plan
2.20 - layout & missing heading loses impact of important section	Will review	Improved in final plan
Build homes to highest env standard (recognising this makes them less affordable)	Plan aspires to this but likely to be guidance rather than policy given precedents on attempted NP over-reach.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.

ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan

Comment	SG Review	Actions/Responses
Why are Ratts Cottages outside Ecchinswell North (LLCA 05) in Design Code??	Will ask AECOM to revisit this – may just be an omission on their part. Ratts Cottages are protected by being in the Conservation Area.	AECOM added this row of cottages to the Design Code Report
More support in NP for renewable energy sources in housing and in the parish - add policy which provides guidelines for assessing future energy development of Winchester	Plan aspires to this for housing but likely to be guidance rather than policy given precedents on attempted NP over-reach. Cannot add a new policy (would need to re-run Reg 14) but will look at adding/reinforcing wording in existing policies. AONB rules make large scale renewable energy difficult for a large part of the parish.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
Better integration with WBC on strategic/environmental matters	Yes – but history indicates little return for significant effort.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
Settlement Boundaries make development on adjacent land more "acceptable"	Agree....but.... Settlement Boundaries are required by NPPF and ALP and specifically for BG & Ecch in LPU	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
C155 road is inadequate and WBC unwilling/unable to improve their bit because next to SSSI	PC will continue to work this with help of County Councillor.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
Flooding risk on C155 and back lane could impair emergency services access	Matter for normal PC business – they will address with Highways.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.
Why any more housing – we are a rural area - more housing reduces sustainability - farmland needs farming	A small level of community supported growth is better than leaving ourselves open to large scale unwanted development that is and will remain a real risk in this area. NPs that do not include housing allocations carry less weight in the planning system.	Emailed review response to residents who mentioned this.

Feedback to the Community

1) All the residents on the parish/NP email list were sent this general email. This message was also put on parish notice boards, in the local magazine and uploaded to the PC website and Facebook.

Thank you to all who have responded to the consultation that completed last Friday. We are pleased to report that we received a higher level of community input at this stage than many parishes.

The overall result of the process is support for proceeding towards submission of the ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan for the official Regulation 15/16 Consultation/Examination. Once this process is successfully completed, the final plan can go for referendum and will then be fully "live". Our objective remains for the referendum to be included in the Local Elections on 4th May 2023.

Key points from the consultation:

- 1. Written input was received from 83 residents. 64 support the plan, 8 object to the plan and another 11 only made comments. Of the 8 objections, 6 were from immediate neighbours to the proposed sites. Overall, there was strong support for the plan, for getting it "made" as soon as possible to block unwanted development and recognition that the plan is a good representation of the inputs from the community in the Sep 2021 and May 2022 consultations.*
- 2. A proportion of the 63 "support the plan" group expressed some reluctance about the selection of the site for Bishops Green but recognise there is not a deliverable alternative that meets the community vision and they all agree that the imperative is to get the plan approved as soon as possible.*
- 3. Basingstoke and Deane are supportive of the draft plan and the fact that we are developing it based on strong community input. They also welcome the fact that the draft plan anticipates and embraces the evidence/potential policies emerging in their Local Plan Update. B&D BC Planning have made a number of suggestions to improve/clarify the plan and this work is now underway.*
- 4. Other Statutory Consultees had no comment or made minor points for improvement.*

Residents who submitted substantial comments or questions will receive an additional response.

In meetings on 11th and 12th October, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and the Parish Council have reviewed the outcome of the consultation and agreed to proceed towards formal submission of the plan as soon as possible. There is significant work to be done to update the documents in the light of comments received and to complete some of the extra material that is required. With the support of the working team and our consultants, we are targeting submission to happen before the end of October.

Marian Dain

Chair ES&BG PC and ES&BG NP Steering Group

2) The residents who offered “reluctant support” sent in comments with a common content/format. They were sent an additional email addressing their specific concerns.

Dear Resident,

You may already have seen the general feedback message to residents (repeated below) on the outcome of the Regulation 14 Consultation. The PC and Steering Group acknowledge the points you and a number of others have made in supporting the plan albeit with some reluctance over the choice of the “BGI” site and would like to respond to you all as follows:

- 1. Your message that getting a Neighbourhood Plan in place ASAP is the real imperative to block proposals like Catesby and as this is widely shared across the community it is driving our actions.*
- 2. Concern over the proposal for the Green Space component of the proposal is recognised and we propose moving forward as follows:*
 - All Green Space needs to be designed/managed to avoid/prevent mis-use. The Police now want to be involved in the design of any new spaces.*
 - Designation of an area as Green Space provides good protection against development – this is important when it is adjacent to a Settlement Boundary.*
 - The relevant policy in the plan (ESBG3) will be more explicit that the community living around the BGI site are to be involved in the “design” for the green space balance of the BGI site taking into account the Green Corridor and other environmental & landscape objectives and the need to prevent mis-use. Based on this, ownership and management can then be determined. The same will apply to all other new Green Space per policy ESBG7 – Community Engagement in Design.*
 - We have discussed this with the owner who is in agreement with this approach.*
- 3. Housing mix. We fully recognise that the parish has a high proportion of social housing to rent and the plan does not propose adding any more. The consultations held in September 2021 and May 2022 made it clear that the community wanted to see limited extra housing that would be a) “affordable to buy” and of a range of sizes suitable for first/second time buyers, families and those seeking to downsize. The objective is that all will be “market” homes but limited in size/facilities to ensure affordability. We anticipate that a proportion will be under the First Homes shared ownership scheme (in line with B&D BC policy). The final plan wording does however need to pass examination. With advice from our consultant, we believe we now have a combination of policy and explanatory text that will deliver the above objectives without being tripped up in examination.*
- 4. There has been mention from some that there could be “an opportunity to negotiate with the promoter/owner of the Woodside View” to arrive at an option that “better suits the NP, the developers and the B&DBC LPU” perhaps based on a greater number of homes than the 15 proposed in the plan. We are advised that for successful examination, such a step would require a complete reset of the plan process most likely requiring a re-run of community consultation, the call for sites and the Reg 14 Consultation. This would take many months and set against the imperative to get a plan in place ASAP and so is not supported by the PC in the light of the wider views of the community. Details on how the allocation of the BGI site was made are laid out in the Site Assessment Report.*

Thank you again for your response to the consultation. In line with the widely held desire to get the plan “made” as soon as practicable, we are working to refine the documentation to ensure early and successful examination.

Marian Dain

Chair ES&BG PC and ES&BG NP Steering Group

3) Other residents who sent in specific questions and comments had an individual response by email.