

Overview and Comments on behalf of ES&BG PC in relation to Representations arising from Regulation 16 Consultations on the ES&BG Neighbourhood Plan.

Consultation ran from Monday 7th November to Monday 19th December 2022

Who	Type	Key Points	ESBG NPG Comments
Boyer on behalf of Sedas Strategic Land submitted on 16 December 2022 by Chris Roberts	Agent for a Land Promoter working on a development of 27 homes on Land at Bishops Green Farmhouse. A community consultation on their proposal was initiated recently	<p>§1.9 of Reg 16 Representation says <i>“It should be noted that Sedas Land also responded to the previous Regulation 14 consultation, on 07 October 2022. Despite this, our representations do not appear to have been included within the consultee responses appended to the ‘Neighbourhood Plan. Consultation Statement’.”</i></p> <p>The Summary and Conclusions of the representation are essentially identical to those in the Regulation 14 Representation</p>	<p>§ 1.9 of the representation is not true. See § 3.3 and Appendices J & K of the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>Comments made in Appendix K of the Consultation Statement remain applicable.</p> <p>The Reg 16 Representation contains material that is likely to accompany an outline planning application that is expected to be made in 2023</p>
Boyer on behalf of Sedas Strategic Land submitted on 19 December 2022 by Stuart Crickett	As above	Representation looks identical to the one made on 16 th October although the attachments are incomplete vs the earlier version.	As above

Who	Type	Key Points	ESBG NPG Comments
<p>Turley on behalf of Hathor Property submitted on 19 December 2022 by Simon Packer</p>	<p>Agent for the Land Promoter developing the site known as Woodside View. Application 22/00174/OUT for up to 42 homes was granted by B&D BC on 7 Dec 2022</p>	<p>States that the ES&BG NP “continues not to include the BGB site as an allocation”</p> <p>Repeats their Reg 14 representation that the overall housing number and distribution for the LPU is uncertain.</p> <p>Suggests that the granting of permission for the 42 homes gives an opportunity to revisit the NP allocation</p> <p>Recognises the plan addresses a need for “affordable market dwellings” but also says the B&D BC Housing Manager says there is “a need for 24 affordable homes in the parish” and that the need for more affordable homes has increased since the NP evidence was collected</p>	<p>The Site Assessment Report accompanying the NP makes it clear that Hathor and the landowner declined to “commit” their site to the NP. Consequently the site could not be considered “deliverable”. Based on advice from B&D BC and others, it could not be considered further for allocation.</p> <p>The NP has been prepared in close collaboration with the LPA who have alongside the Reg 16 responses reiterated their indicative allocation. We understand the 42 homes might be treated as “windfall” development.</p> <p>The NP meets the clear community request for “affordable market dwellings” suited to the rural environment.</p> <p>The statement made on need for affordable housing is not precise. The B&D BC waiting list for social housing includes 24 entries for people “with connections to the parish”. Bishops Green already has more than 200 social housing units operated by Sovereign/Vivid (out of a total of around 250 homes in the settlement). Bishops Green is not seen as a good location for social housing given limited facilities and a near total dependence on car transport.</p> <p>Section C of “Supporting Evidence C” accompanying the ES&BG NP notes a number of 20 with connection to the parish on the social housing waiting list as of end 2021 – not too different to the 24 cited.</p>

Who	Type	Key Points	ESBG NPG Comments
<p>Carter Jonas on behalf of the landowners of Bishops Green Farm and Catesby Estates. Submitted on 19 December 2022 by Peter Canavan</p>	<p>Agent for Land Promoter working on a development of 350 homes at Bishops Green Farm. Outline application 21/03598/OUT is in play.</p>	<p>§1.3 of the representation claims that several aspects of the plan do not meet basic conditions</p> <p>§1.4 of the representation claims that pre-determination of the quantum of housing that might emerge from the LPU is “unhelpful” and that a commitment to review policy/housing numbers in the NP once the LPU is complete should be made in the text.</p> <p>§1.5 of the representation claims that ES&BG parish is a location where sustainable development can be delivered and can facilitate additional community benefit and that the PC should be more proactive in its approach to development delivery.</p> <p>§9 of the representation is essentially a promotion of the Catesby Estates College Copse Fields Development (now stated to be for up to 300 homes)</p>	<p>The LPA review of the Regulation 16 Submission Plan does not identify any material concerns over compliance with Basic Conditions.</p> <p>§ 3.11 & 3.12 explicitly cover an understanding between B&D BC and ES&BG PC that once the LPU advances towards completion and in the event this results in a housing allocation and/or policies that are at odds with the ES&BG NP, then the latter will undergo an early review.</p> <p>B&D BC spatial studies show that small village settlements like Bishops Green are unsuited to major development because of inherently low sustainability and a high dependency on private car transportation using narrow rural lanes.</p>
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>Statutory Consultee</p>	<p>Do not consider it necessary to comment – request that the plan and any development take account of advice on their website</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
<p>B&D BC Planning Policy Team</p>	<p>LPA</p>	<p>Tables of comments linked to their Reg 14 comments. Overall no material concerns over compliance with Basic Conditions</p> <p>Updated version of the 1st June 2022 letter with the LPA’s indicative housing allocation.</p>	<p>See separate document showing responses to Reg 16 comments and linkage to the LPA made on the Reg 14 Pre-Submission documents</p>

Who	Type	Key Points	ESBG NPG Comments
<p>Ministry of Defence</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation</p>	<p>Statutory Consultee</p>	<p>The MOD have an interest within the area covered by the Ecchinswell, Sydmonton and Bishops Green Neighbourhood Plan, in a new technical asset known as the East 2 WAM Network, which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system in the Eastern areas of England.</p> <p>The MOD have no concerns with the Ecchinswell, Sydmonton and Bishops Green Neighbourhood Plan but would wish to be consulted wherever the criteria associated with the East 2 WAM Network is triggered in order that appropriate assessments can be carried out and, where necessary, requests for required conditions or objections be communicated.</p>	<p>Acknowledged in relation to tall structures (inc wind turbines) and sources of electromagnetic fields (power lines/PV arrays)</p>
<p>National Grid</p> <p>Energy Infrastructure Operator</p>	<p>Statutory Consultee</p>	<p>National Grid has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site specific proposals that could affect our assets.</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
<p>National Highways</p> <p>Strategic Road Network (SRN) Operator</p>	<p>Statutory Consultee</p>	<p>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A34.</p> <p>We have reviewed documents in relation to the above consultation and have 'No Comments'.</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Statutory Consultee</p>	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Points to advice to those involved in neighbourhood Planning and development</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>

Who	Type	Key Points	ESBG NPG Comments
Office for Nuclear Regulation	Statutory Consultee	<p>Please note that ONR's land use planning processes published at http://www.onr.org.uk/land-use-planning.htm may apply to some of the developments within the Ecchinswell, Sydmonton and Bishops Green Neighbourhood Plan. If you are a Local Authority or neighbourhood with areas that are within an ONR consultation zone please be aware that in order for ONR to have no objections to such developments we will require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confirmation from relevant Council emergency planners that developments can be accommodated within any emergency plan required under the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019; and • that the developments do not pose an external hazard to the site. 	Acknowledged
North & Mid Hants Primary Care	Statutory Consultee	The North and Mid Hampshire locality Primary Care Team do not have any comments to offer on this consultation.	
Southern Water	Statutory Consultee	Repeats Reg 14 input that Southern Water want the NDP to have policy inclusion that homes should be built to achieve the higher optional Building Regulations water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day on the basis that SE England is an area of serious water stress.	§ 2.5 of Appendix K to the Consultation Statement acknowledges this request and points out that policy EM9 (Sustainable Water Usage) in the B&D BC ALP (page 121) makes this requirement so does not need repeating in the NDP.

Who	Type	Key Points	ESBG NPG Comments
Thames Water	Statutory Consultee	<p>No specific comments about the development sites</p> <p>Requests for policy wording on surface water drainage and on conditions applicable for developments requiring off-site upgrades to water/waste-water network/facilities</p> <p>Comment on § 2.25 in the NP referring to concerns over Bishops Green STW capacity</p>	<p>§ 2.6 of Appendix K to the Consultation Statement acknowledges this request and points out that policies EM6/CN6 in the B&D BC ALP cover these points.</p> <p>§ 2.25 of the ES&BG NP reflects observations by local residents that removal by road tanker of waste that cannot be treated is a frequent occurrence at the Bishops Green STW (not ideal given the constrained access and narrow bridge). In addition, Thames Water have stated that any significant development in Bishops Green would require expansion of STW capacity.</p>