



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

Introduction

1. This document provides a summary of the issues and representations submitted in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan (ODNP). This document is produced in compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum) Regulations 2012.
2. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) carried out a seven week period of public consultation from the 17 August 2015 to 5 October 2015 on the submission version of the ODNP. The consultation documents consisted of the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan, Sustainability Appraisal, Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement (which included an Equalities Impact Assessment).
3. The representations submitted during the consultation period have been published on the borough council's website, and can be found by clicking on the following link - <http://basingstoke-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>. Paper copies of the representations can be viewed on request at Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, Civic Offices, London Road, Basingstoke, RG21 4AH.
4. A total of 149 representations were received from 85 individuals, organisations and statutory consultees (excluding BDBC's comments on the ODNP). These can be summarised as:
 - Support: 98 representations made
 - Oppose: 49 representations made
 - General comment: 2 representations made
5. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised by consultees during the consultation. Appendix 1 of this document provides a summary of the representations made by consultees.

Summary of issues raised by consultees

General Comments

6. A number of general comments were made, which included the following:
 - Too many houses proposed.
 - Concern over the consultation process undertaken during the production of the plan.
 - Concerns over historic flooding in the parish.
 - Lack of a policy in the plan to deliver new/improved infrastructure.
 - Plan should provide further information on how the masterplanning of Manydown will be referred to.

Policy 1 – New Housing Development Volume

7. A number of concerns were raised in relation to the policy including:
 - That the number allocated to the policy is not flexible and does not allow for a responsive supply of housing.
 - Clarification in the policy that the requirement does not include Manydown.

Policy 2 and 3 – Allocation of Affordable Housing and Mix of Dwellings

8. Representations suggested either deletion of both policies or re-wording as the current wording was unclear.

Policy 4 – Site Allocations

9. A number of concerns were raised in relation to the sites allocated in the plan, in particular:
 - The policy does not identify a sufficient level of housing.
 - That the numbers allocated in the policy will be exceeded and lead to overdevelopment.
 - The scale of development proposed in comparison with the site area.
 - The ability of the sites to deliver any community benefits.
 - The details included in the policy criteria, for example access into the sites.
 - The impact of the sites on the conservation area.
 - The deliverability of the sites.
 - Vehicular access onto the proposed development.

Policy 9 – Conservation Areas

10. Concerns were raised regarding the
 - Protection of the setting of the conservation area
 - Protection of heritage assets.

Policy 10 – Protection and Enhancement of the Environment

11. Representations suggested that proposed Local Green Spaces do not meet national policy requirements and therefore should be deleted from the policy.

Policy 11 – Protection of the Green Gap

12. Representations recommend that the policy should be deleted as it is unviable and could prevent development in the designated neighbourhood area.

Policies 15 and 16 – Protection of Employment and Protection of Local Facilities

13. There are concerns that the policy:

- Does not allocate employment land to meet the requirements of both policies.
- Should include criteria to promote economic growth in the plan area.
- Should provide further clarification on the definition of employment sites.

Sustainability Appraisal

14. There are concerns over the conclusions of the sustainability appraisal in terms of the:

- Lack of justification over the selection of the site options
- Limited testing of the reasonable alternatives.

Site Selection Process

15. A number of representations challenged the process by which the Oakley and Deane neighbourhood planning group had selected the sites identified in the Plan.

Support for the Plan

16. A number of representations support the plan in general. Support was also expressed for specific policies including the housing requirements, the housing site allocations (in particular the spread of homes around Oakley village), affordable housing, housing mix and traffic and safety.

Appendix 1 – Summary of representations made by consultees in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan (ODNP)

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mr John Glasscock	All	All			Support	Fully supports the Neighbourhood Plan as it delivers a housing solution for the Neighbourhood Area which meets the needs identified by the community.	
Mrs Georgina Grace	All	All	All	All	Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan, believes Neighbourhood Planning Group have engaged with the community and considered relevant issues.	
Mr George Elkin	All	All		All	Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan which reflects the clear wishes of the local residents	
Mr John Phillips					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan	
Mrs Audrey Phillips					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Mr John Ranger			Traffic Access and Safe Routes for Pedestrians		Oppose	Notes the potential increase in vehicles through residential areas as a result of potential development of the Land at Beech Tree Close site. Has safety concerns which believe need to be addressed and have not been met.	The whole matter of suitable routes in and around the proposed development at Land at Beech Tree Close, vehicles and pedestrians, must be re-examined and improved.
Mrs Valerie Ranger			Vehicle Access		Oppose	Notes vehicle access to the proposed new development at Land at Beech Tree Close is not acceptable to present residents due to the disruption which will arise to existing accesses necessary to present houses.	An alternative means should be found to access this new development which will remove the need to use Beech tree Close for site vehicle requirements.
Highways England (Ms Helen Batty)						Highways England has concern over the Strategic Road Network (SRN), and notes any development proposals which affect the SRN should be consulted on at the earliest opportunity, although no specific comments to make at this time.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Ms Elaine McAllister		5			Support	Supports policy 5 especially to exclude any building on any land in the Church Oakley Conservation Area with reference to Land West of Beech Tree Close.	
Mr Brian Collins	5.3.1				Support	Supports the plan and its policies. Furthermore, notes that developer appeals must not be allowed to exceed dwelling numbers detailed in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Must preserve the rural nature of Church Oakley Conservation Area; conserve its country roads, lanes and rural footpaths.
Ms Emilia Buckmaster					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan noting the high community engagement and community say. Believes that dwelling numbers should not exceed those in the Local Plan.	
Mr Jonathan Buckmaster					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan noting the high community engagement and community say. Believes that dwelling numbers should not exceed those in the Local Plan.	
Mrs Abbie Hayes					Support	Fully supports the Neighbourhood Plan and notes the extensive consultation with the local community. Favours the new housing policies which propose a spread of new housing around the village.	
Miss Shelagh Burns					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Noting that it recognises the need for new houses and protects the character of the village. Supports the number of homes proposed for Land at Beech Tree Close in policies 4 and 6.	
Southern Water (Miss Clare Gibbons)		New Policy			Oppose	Opposes the Neighbourhood Plan on the basis that there are no policies which support the delivery of new and improved infrastructure therefore not meeting basic conditions.	We propose the following new policy 'New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the development plan'.

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Southern Water (Miss Clare Gibbons)		6			Support	Notes that additional local infrastructure is necessary to serve allocated sites. Southern water request provision in the allocation policy to ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.	Additional wording proposed under policies P6.3 and P6.4: b. The development provides a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, in collaboration with the service provider.
Southern Water (Miss Clare Gibbons)		10			Support	Understands the desire to protect areas of open/green space. However, we cannot support the current wording of the policy as it would create a barrier to statutory utility providers from delivering their essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development.	We propose the following wording to Policy 10: Development in very special circumstance that results in any loss of Local Green Space or which results in any harm to their character, setting, accessibility, appearance may be permitted subject to the provision of suitable replacement Local Green Space where possible or where it meets a specific necessary utility infrastructure need and no alternative feasible site is available.
Mr Eric Askew	2.1 - 2.1.12				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and commends the community engagement from the Neighbourhood Planning Group.	
Mrs Chris Wassell		2			Support	Supports policy 2 on affordable housing and policies supporting the environment.	
Miss Jennifer Cook					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan, the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village, as voted upon by Oakley residents	
Mr Jason King		Policy 4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood plan, the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village, as voted upon by Oakley residents	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mr Roger Stacey					Support	Supports the publication of the Neighbourhood Plan which is a reflection of the wishes of the residents of Oakley and Deane. Furthermore, notes the creation of the plan has taken a huge amount of work and has been arrived at democratically.	
Mrs Grace White					Support	Supports the publication and aims of the plan.	
Mr Robin White					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood plan, the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village, as voted upon by Oakley residents	
Mrs Pauline Shead					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood plan, the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village, as voted upon by Oakley residents	
Mrs Helen Buckley					Oppose	Objects to high numbers of development proposed for Oakley. Notes lack of infrastructure currently in Oakley at present.	
Jennifer and Peter Miller					Oppose	Notes poor infrastructure in Oakley which is shown by flooding in village roads. Notes the importance of the conservation area and do not want the character of the village to alter.	
Dr Robert Craig	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and its housing allocations. Also notes the need to preserve the conservation area, country roads and footpaths. Notes safety issues as a result of increased vehicles.	
Mr John McKay	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and its housing allocations. Also notes the need to preserve the conservation area, country roads and footpaths.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mrs Jill Parry	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and commends the engagement of the Neighbourhood Planning Group with the residents of Oakley. Notes poor traffic problems in the village and safety problems as a result.	
Mrs N Beere		4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan, the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village, as voted by Oakley residents.	
Mr Tim Beere		4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan, the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village, as voted by Oakley residents.	
Mrs Helen Favell	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village. Note: Developer appeals must not be allowed to exceed dwelling numbers detailed in the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Cllr Diane Taylor			All		Support	Believes that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions and fully supports. Believes it should be adopted at the earliest possible date to ensure that the village of Oakley and Deane develops in the way that will best preserve its character, the integrity of its history and the well-being of its residents.	
T J Lowery Group Holdings Ltd (Mr Tom Lowery)		4			Support	The respondent is a landowner of the allocated site at Sainfoin Lane. Fully supports the allocation and reiterates that larger development could occur on site.	
T J Lowery Group Holdings Ltd (Mr Tom Lowery)		6 (P6.4)			Support	The respondent is a landowner of the allocated site at Sainfoin Lane. Fully support allocation of site, reiterates larger development could occur on site. Confirms that at least 40% of dwellings will be provided as sheltered accommodation.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
T J Lowery Group Holdings Ltd (Mr Tom Lowery)		1			Oppose	Opposes the policy which allocates housing numbers noting housing shortages, notes that an increase in housing provision should be allowed.	Increase the number of dwellings to be built in Oakley from 150 to a more substantial figure (250 dwellings or more).
Mr Tom Lowery	6.16				Oppose	Opposes the figure gained by the Neighbourhood Planning Group regarding Oakley Hall. Notes community engagement questions were worded to assume support for the development.	
T J Lowery Group Holdings Ltd (Mr Tom Lowery)		6 (Part 6.5)			Oppose	Opposes the allocation of Oakley Hall as a retirement village, believes it should be noted as a separate entity to the Neighbourhood Plan as it would not be affordable housing and is isolated from Oakley itself.	Suggestion for Oakley Hall to have its own policy.
Mrs Conchita Collins	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan which shows new homes spread around Oakley in sustainable numbers.	
Mrs Pamela Stone		4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan, the numbers and the sites for dwellings that are spread around the village, as voted upon by Oakley residents	
Mrs Pamela Stone		4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan for the numbers and sites for the dwellings spread around the village of Oakley as voted upon by Oakley residents	
Mr James Lough		1			Support	Supports policy. Notes the policy is well founded and based on good evidence which provides a good basis on which to confirm 150 as being the number of houses that the village can support in the Plan's life.	
Mr James Lough		4			Support	Supports policy and considers that is an appropriate response to the evidence base on which to allocate the 150 dwellings over the plan period.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mr James Lough		18			Support	Supports policy. Furthermore, notes it is well founded on the evidence base and provides an appropriate way forwards for development in the village.	
Lynda Pickering			Section 6		Support	Fully supports the proposed Neighbourhood Plan including the designated number and types of houses to be built in Oakley. Also supports community engagement.	
Mr Tim Parry					Support	Fully supports the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Mrs Elizabeth Hutchings	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Mrs Nicola Roberts	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village	
Mrs Nicola Roberts	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the conservation area should be conserved with country roads, lanes and footpaths. Notes that building materials should be in keeping with the character of the village.	
Mr Kevin Roberts	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Mr Kevin Roberts	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the conservation area should be preserved with country roads, lanes and footpaths. Notes that building materials should be in keeping with the character of the village.	
Mr Colin Huntley		Policy 4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan with the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village as voted upon by Oakley residents.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mrs Celia Huntley		Policy 4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan with the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village as voted upon by Oakley residents.	
Dr S Birtwistle	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Dr S Birtwistle	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan, notes the importance of preserve the rural nature of Church Oakley Conservation Area.	
Mr Tim Hutchings	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Mr Rodney Birtwistle	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Mr Rodney Birtwistle	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the importance of the rural nature of Church Oakley Conservation Area which must be preserved.	
Mr John Gilmore	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Mr John Gilmore	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes that the rural nature of Church Oakley Conservation Area should be preserved.	
Mrs Cynthia Gilmore	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes that the Neighbourhood Plan must conserve the rural nature of Church Oakley Conservation Area.	
Annette Chatten		4			Support	Supports the housing allocation policy and notes the importance of constraints of access which must be taken into account with each development site.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mr Michael Condron		4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers and sites for new homes spread around the village as voted upon by Oakley residents.	
Mr Daniel Hayes	All	All	All	All	Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the way development is spread evenly across the village.	
Mrs Carole Miles	All	All	All	All	Support		
Mr Gordon Miles	All	All	All	All	Support	Commends the manner in which the Neighbourhood Plan was arrived at democratically and therefore supports.	
Dr Lisa Collins		4			Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Dr Lisa Collins	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the importance of preserving the Church Oakley Conservation Area.	
Environment Agency (Ms Donatella Cillo)					Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan in its current form.	
Mr John Oakley			Other		Oppose	Objects to the Beech Tree close site allocation and believes it would change the character of the village. Notes the infrastructure and traffic problems believing hazards would be encouraged with increased traffic.	
Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)		1			Oppose	Concern that the Neighbourhood Plan is over reliant on the policies of the emerging Local Plan when identifying the housing requirements. Promoting a Neighbourhood Plan that relies on an emerging Local Plan does not demonstrate a positive approach to plan making, and is therefore not in accordance with the NPPF. In addition, the SA for the emerging Local Plan supports the promotion of 200 units in the plan, whilst the submission Neighbourhood Plan promotes an allocation of 150 units.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)		4			Oppose	Concern that the Neighbourhood Plan is over reliant on the policies of the emerging Local Plan when identifying the housing requirements. Promoting a neighbourhood plan that relies on an emerging Local Plan does not demonstrate a positive approach to plan making, and is therefore not in accordance with the NPPF. In addition, whilst we support the allocation of Park Farm, we question the scale of development proposed relative to the site size. A large allocation would ensure more community benefits.	
Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)		6			Oppose	Objects to the proposed allocations at Andover Road and Oakley Hall. Concerned that the allocations are unsustainable and would conflict with the principles of the NPPF, and should therefore be deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)			Sustainability Appraisal		Oppose	Concern over the methodology and conclusions of the SA. The merits of comparing a single site approach to a multiple site approach are open to challenge and could lead to an unsustainable pattern of growth. There is no evidence that a multiple site approach is beneficial. We feel a single site approach by allocating 150 dwellings at Park Farm would provide more positive benefits associated with the proposed site allocation.	
Wates (c/o Judith Ashton Ass.)			Appendix C		Oppose	The Neighbourhood Plan does not appear to account for a contingency above the 45 units identified in policies 1 and 4. In addition, the alignment of the proposed access onto the Park Farm site is not included on the maps, and therefore is not flexible.	
Mr Richard Clarke	9				Support	Believes a change in wording should occur from 'be informed by Church Oakley Conservation Area Appraisal' to 'any impact to Conservation Area' from developments.	
Mrs Letek Wakeford					Support	Notes that smaller developments should remain outside of conservation area, and should have their own infrastructure installed. Notes that flooding should also be taken into consideration.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mrs Jane Philip	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village. Notes development will increase traffic problems and the risk to pedestrians.	
Mrs Jane Philip	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the importance of preserving the conservation area and character of Oakley which believe will not happen with large developments. Notes issue with traffic and the negative affect on pedestrians.	
Mr Gordon Calland-Scoble					Support	Supports the strategy set out in this plan.	
Mr Charles Curtis	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Mr Charles Curtis	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the importance of preserving the conservation area and how affordable housing is necessary.	
Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Harris)		15			Support	Support the Neighbourhood Plan. However, there is concern that the draft policy 15 seeks to prevent the change of use of employment sites. Also there is no definition in the Neighbourhood Plan of what an 'employment site' is, and clarification is sought on this.	
Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Harris)		16			Support	Reference should be made in the Neighbourhood Plan to the retail tests set out in the NPPF in order for the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the basic conditions. In addition the plan should clearly define the village centre boundary within which new retail and community facilities should be focused. This should include land at 32 Oakley Lane which provides existing local services and can contribute towards an upgrade and/or provision of additional local retail services.	
Mrs Jane Redgrave	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mrs Jane Redgrave	6.1.7				Support	Supports the allocations of dwellings to sites for the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes high community engagement and that it is a democratically agreed plan.	
Mrs Jane Redgrave	3.2				Support	Notes that development should be properly managed so that transport, community and other infrastructure meet the changes in demand.	
Mrs Jane Redgrave			Goal 7		Support	Notes that all the proposed sites in the Neighbourhood Plan are outside the Conservation Area. Notes the importance that Oakley maintains its rural character.	
Mrs Jessica Cochrane	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village. Notes it is democratically chosen by the residents of Oakley.	
Mrs Susan Butler					Support	Supports the democratic decision for the good of Oakley Village.	
Mr Robert Butler					Support	Supports a democratic decision for the good of the village.	
Mr David Cook					Support		
Mrs Penelope Cook		4			Support		

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mr Robert Poynter		5			Support	Believes that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of the village and that the spread of development is appropriate.	The proposed pedestrian crossing in Barn Lane requires further investigation by the highways authority. Its current position is extremely dangerous as it would be located on a blind bend. The pedestrian access via the western edge of the existing treeline and access from Rectory Road require further consideration. The footpath and associated lighting is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
Mrs Rebecca Edwards	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village.	
Mrs Rebecca Edwards	8.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan. Notes the important of preserving the conservation area.	
Miss Amy Parry	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village. Supports allocation number. Notes current infrastructure is unsuitable for large developments.	
Mr David Parry	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread across the village. Notes current infrastructure is unsuitable for large developments.	
Dr Ian Prescott		All			Support	Absolutely supports the plan. Notes that it offers a potential solution and the process has a strong democratic mandate.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Joan Neve			All		Support	Supports the overall plan and commends the work done by the Neighbourhood Planning Group.	
Mr Charles Philip	5.3.1				Support	Supports the Neighbourhood Plan and the numbers of new dwellings it contains spread around the village. Notes that large developments will add to traffic problems which would endanger pedestrians.	
Gladman Developments (Mr John Fleming)		1			Oppose	Concerned that the policy is ineffective and inflexible and will be unable to respond rapidly to changes in the housing market, and is therefore contrary to the NPPF. It is recommended that this policy is deleted in its current form.	
Gladman Developments (Mr John Fleming)		2			Oppose	Recommends the 50% requirement should be deleted.	
Gladman Developments (Mr John Fleming)		3			Oppose	Recommends the policy is deleted.	
Gladman Developments (Mr John Fleming)		4			Oppose	Concerned that there is no certainty the allocation of 150 dwellings will account for the local and wider area housing needs.	
Gladman Developments (Mr John Fleming)		10			Oppose	Policy should be deleted	
Gladman Developments (Mr John Fleming)		11			Oppose	Question the purpose of designation of the gap, as it could prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet boroughs need.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Gladman Development s (Mr John Fleming)		15 and 16			Oppose	Neighbourhood Plan has failed to allocate sufficient land to meet its employment needs. Not sufficient land for housing or economic growth, this is likely to have a significant impact to the viability and vitality of the settlement.	
Barton Willmore (acting on behalf of The Fogarty Group)			Section 3.2		Support	The Fogarty Group welcomes the objectives set out at section 3.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan. In particular, the Fogarty Group welcomes the objective of providing dwellings suitable for the older members of the community.	
Barton Willmore (acting on behalf of The Fogarty Group)		1			Support	The Fogarty Group understands that the Neighbourhood Plan is drafted on the basis that it seeks to identify enough sites to deliver the level of housing required within the Parish through the draft Local Plan for Basingstoke	
Barton Willmore (acting on behalf of The Fogarty Group)		4			Support	The Fogarty Group welcomes the identification of Oakley Hall within Policy 4, the Group consider that the Policy should be more explicit in supporting the allocation of land at Oakley Hall to provide a retirement village which would represent a positive response to the issue of the ageing population.	Proposes that the bullet point for Oakley Hall under policy 4 should read 'contributing approximately 30 dwellings from the overall Vision of between 120 and 150 dwellings'.
Barton Willmore (acting on behalf of The Fogarty Group)		6			Support	The Fogarty Group support the plan but believe it should be amended to include full support of the development of the retirement village around Oak Lodge Care Home with Nursing.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Barton Willmore (acting on behalf of The Fogarty Group)		15			Support	The Fogarty Group also considers that it is necessary to encourage measures which support economic growth within the Parish, such as through ensuring the long term viability and success of the Oakley Hall Hotel business which provides local economic growth and employment opportunities.	
Natural England (Mr Piotr Behnke)	All				Support	Natural England has assessed the allocated sites and is happy that they will not have an impact on the protected landscape.	
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)		5			Support	HCC suggested amending wording to 'Where appropriate development should incorporate sustainable drainage systems'.	
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)		5			Support	HCC suggests contacting the Children's Services Strategic Development Officer to consider routes and travel to school.	
HCC (Mr Pete Errington)		4			Support	HCC suggests contacting the Children's Services Strategic Development Officer to consider routes and travel to school.	
Savills (acting for Society of Merchant Venturers)			Section 5		Oppose	To accord with the NPPF (paragraphs 16 and 184), the Neighbourhood Plan must refer to the Manydown allocation and support these proposals to meet the strategic development needs of the Borough through sustainable growth to the west of Basingstoke in both the Plan period to 2029 and in the years beyond. This will need to be acknowledged within the background and supporting paragraphs to the policies in this section.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Savills (acting for Society of Merchant Venturers)	5.2				Support	We support the amendment to the policy to exclude the Manydown strategic site from the affordable housing and housing mix requirements. These amendments recognise the importance of ensuring the delivery of the Manydown strategic site is not constrained.	
Savills (acting for Society of Merchant Venturers)	5.3				Oppose	We support the amendment to the policy to exclude the Manydown strategic site from the affordable housing and housing mix requirements. These amendments recognise the importance of ensuring the delivery of the Manydown strategic site is not constrained.	
Savills (acting for Society of Merchant Venturers)		13			Oppose	Policy 13 sets out any public rights of way that pass through or bound the edges of new development shall be enhanced to create green corridors. It is recommended that these requirements are removed as they impact on the future master planning process for Manydown on land within and to the north of our clients land taking into account the strategic development needs within and beyond the plan period. This also requires an amendment to the green corridors on Map 4 in order to meet the basic conditions.	
Gleeson Developments (Mr Robert Welchman)		3			Oppose	There is no evidence based which provides a justification for the mix of dwellings and therefore does not meet the basic conditions.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Gleeson Development s (Mr Robert Welchman)		4			Oppose	We support the proposed allocation of Beech Tree Close in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, we feel that the Neighbourhood Plan should allocate a higher proportion of the overall housing requirement to the site, which has the capacity to deliver a much higher figure. This would also allow the site to deliver more community benefits, and consequently enable a more sustainable form of development. In addition, we have considerable concerns as to the deliverability and sustainability of the additional proposed site allocations; in particular it is not clear how the numbers were identified for each site allocation. Criterion P4.3 should be removed from the policy.	
Gleeson Development s (Mr Robert Welchman)		5			Oppose	Concern that the policy does not meet the basic conditions.	
Gleeson Development s (Mr Robert Welchman)		6			Oppose	Concern that the site specific requirements have not been properly considered and there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate whether they are deliverable and developable. We feel that the proposed allocation at Beech Tree Close should be amended to approximately 85 dwellings.	
Gleeson Development s (Mr Robert Welchman)			Sustainability Appraisal			The SA does not fully consider all reasonable alternatives, including the reasons why the alternatives were selected, the rejected options that were not taken forward and the reason for selecting the preferred approach. The value of assessing only two options is extremely limited. The capacity of the sites allocated in the plan has not been tested and therefore it cannot be demonstrated that the Neighbourhood Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. There is also no evidence to demonstrate that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot provide for more growth than the proposed allocation of 150 dwellings, and there are also major flaws in the appraisal of the sites undertaken in the SA.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Gleeson Development s (Mr Robert Welchman)			Appendix C			We have several concerns over the proposed site allocations, in particular the lack of technical evidence. For instance in respect of Park Farm, there is a lack of information on the vehicular access to the site and no evidence has been provided as to whether the access is acceptable, and therefore whether the site is deliverable. Also, the SA does not provide a detailed consideration of the impacts of the site on the historic landscape and environment, and therefore we feel this site should be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Mr Brian Hunkin		All			Support	Supports the plan specifically in relation to the allocation of housing.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)	1.4.1				Oppose	Notes that the reference to Neighbourhood Plan being strategic in nature is incorrect and misleading in light of NPPF paragraph 16.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)	1.4.2				Oppose	Suggests this paragraph clarifies/defines how the strategic allocation (policy SS3.10 of the emerging Local Plan) and longer term masterplanning is going to be referred to later in NDP.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)			Section 3 vision (b) Goal G1		Oppose	Suggests minor word change to confirm 150 excludes any new dwellings at Manydown.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)		1			Oppose	Suggests an amendment to confirm 150 excludes any new dwellings at Manydown.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)	5.3.1.2				Oppose	Suggests an amendment to confirm 150 excludes any new dwellings at Manydown.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)		2, 3 and 17			Oppose	In each case it should be made clear whether the exclusion relates just to Strategic Allocation or the remaining Manydown Area in land ownership, within which wider masterplanning will take place.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)	5.7				Oppose	Recommend paragraph 5.7 is amended.	Amend to confirm exclusion for Manydown.
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)		4			Oppose	Identifies 5 sites that could come forward for housing development.	Suggests wording to be made clear that Manydown is strategic site, allocated by the Local Plan as opposed to NDP.
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)		5			Oppose	Add exclusion for Manydown as per policies 2, 3 and 17 since matters are addressed by policy 5.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)		10.2			Oppose	Concern that Map 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan overlaps with the Local Plan inset map 2. Part of the proposed C3 Local Green Space Designation (LGSD) falls within policy SS3.10 allocation of the emerging Local Plan. This demonstrates a lack of conformity as only the Local Plan should include planning designations or policy for this strategic site, this policy does not meet the basic conditions.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)	8.4.2.2	10.3		Map 4	Oppose	This policy should be amended to provide flexibility and to take into consideration the process of masterplanning for Manydown. In advance of detailed community consultation and further technical work it would be premature to include such policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)		13			Oppose	The approach goes further than the emerging Local Plans policies for green infrastructure. Whilst the designations are shown as indicative, this could introduce delivery risks and ambiguity. It suggests that such elements/features/spaces will be required. If these references are not removed, the Neighbourhood	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
						Plan would fail to support the strategic policies in the emerging Local Plan and would impact on the deliverability and viability of Manydown during the plan period and beyond.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)		11			Oppose	Concerned with the extent of the green gap shown in the Neighbourhood Plan. There needs to be consistency with the emerging Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 11 should be amended to acknowledge that infrastructure requirements associated with the Manydown site may be permitted in the Green Gap. Also recommend that Parcels D1, D2, D3 and D4 should be deleted.	
Mr Richard Bayley (B&DBC Landowner Director)				Appendix A, A.1	Oppose	Concerned that the map does not clearly show the designations outlined on table c.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)	1.4.1				Oppose	Reference to Neighbourhood Plan being strategic in nature is incorrect and misleading in light of NPPF paragraph 16.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)	1.4.2				Oppose	Suggest this paragraph as it clarifies how the strategic allocation (policy SS3.10 of the emerging Local Plan) and longer term masterplanning is going to be referred to later in Neighbourhood Plan.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)			Section 3 vision (b) Goal G1		Oppose	Amend section to confirm the 150 allocation excludes any new dwellings at Manydown.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)		1				Amend the policy to confirm the 150 allocation excludes any new dwellings at Manydown. Reference to Policy 5 is also incorrect and should refer to Policy 4.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr	5.3.1.2				Oppose	Amend policy to confirm the 150 allocation excludes any new dwellings at Manydown.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Matthew James)							
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)		2, 3 and 17			Oppose	In each case it should be made clear whether the exclusion relates just to Strategic Allocation or the Remaining Manydown Area in land ownership, within which wider masterplanning will take place (Policy SSS.10 of the emerging Local Plan).	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)	5.7				Oppose	Amend to confirm exclusion for Manydown.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)		4			Oppose	Manydown is not mentioned in this section/policy 4 even though part of phase 1 falls within the Neighbourhood Plan area. It should be made clear in section 6 that Manydown is a separate site that will come forward for development and that, as a strategic site, it is to be allocated by the Local Plan as opposed to Neighbourhood Plan.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)		5			Oppose	Add exclusion for Manydown as per comments on Policies 2 and 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)		10.2			Oppose	Part of the proposed C3 Local Green Space Designation (LGSD) falls within the policy SS3.10 allocation of the emerging Local Plan. This demonstrates a lack of conformity as only the Local Plan should include planning designations or policy for this strategic site, this policy does not conform to the Local Plan and fails the basic condition.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)	8.4.2.2	10.3		Map 4	Oppose	This policy should be amended to provide flexibility and to take into consideration the process of masterplanning for Manydown. In advance of detailed community consultation and further technical work it would be premature to include such policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.	

Full Name/ Organisation	Paragraph	Policy	Other	Policies Map	Support/Oppose	Summary of Comments	Respondents Suggested Modifications
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)		13			Oppose	The approach goes further than the emerging Local Plans policies for green infrastructure. Whilst the designations are shown as indicative, this could introduce delivery risks and ambiguity. It suggests that such elements/features/spaces will be required. If these references are not removed, the Neighbourhood Plan would fail to support the strategic policies in the emerging Local Plan and would impact on the deliverability and viability of Manydown during the plan period and beyond.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)		11			Oppose	The extent of the Green Gap identified in the Neighbourhood Plan appears to be (i) considerably less than that identified in the Local Plan on inset maps 2 and 32 but (ii) larger than that identified indicatively in the Vision document. The Green Gap needs to be consistent between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 11 should be amended to acknowledge that infrastructure requirements associated with the Manydown site may be permitted in the Green Gap. We recommend that Parcels D1, D2, D3 and D4 should be deleted.	
Hampshire County Council (Mr Matthew James)				Appendi x A, A.1	Oppose	Concerned that the map does not clearly show the designations outlined on table c.	