



SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement R6 October 2016

Introduction

This Consultation Statement is one of the documents which must be submitted alongside the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Sherborne St John. It describes the different stages at which local residents, businesses and other interested parties were consulted and how these informed the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Consultation is an extremely important element of the Neighbourhood Plan process – the document is designed to involve local people and to allow them to make local decisions about local issues, and deliver a Neighbourhood Plan that accurately reflects their wishes, preferences and requirements, and allays their fears for the future. Indeed, the Regulation 14 consultation stage is a statutory requirement.

A wide spectrum of consultation events was completed over the period 2014 to 2016, to understand local sentiment from a number of different standpoints. Some of the feedback was strongly focussed – unequivocal – other was indicated by an absence of concern. In this context, ‘no comment’ often indicates that the consultee is content with the ‘*status quo*’.

The consultation stages completed were as set out in the rest of this document.

1 Launch - ‘Kick-Off Event (8th February 2014)

The SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Kick-Off Event was held in the SSJ Village Hall between 10.00am and 2.30pm on the 8th February 2014. Refreshments were provided and a raffle prize offered in order to encourage attendance. In the event, approximately 100 persons attended (in excess of 10% of the Parish population).

Villagers, businesses and organisations (including representatives from neighbouring Parishes) with a connection to SSJ were invited to the Village Hall to raise their concerns regarding the following NP topics:

- Community and Village Amenities
- Infrastructure Issues
- Community, Children and Youth
- Housing
- Business & Employment
- Environment & Green Space

Attendees were asked to note their specific concern(s) on a post-it note and then stick the post-it on the relevant flip chart (one flipchart for each of the topics as noted in Key Issues and /or Concerns Raised).

Laminated flipcharts, etc were also on display around the village hall displaying extracts from the CPRE – A Guide to Neighbourhood Planning booklet to act as a ‘prompt’ to focus attendees’ minds. The e-mail address/ contact details for all attendees were recorded.

All points raised on the post-it notes were collated and logged on the attached spreadsheet - highlighting:

- Concerns about the Village Shop
- Importance of maintaining SSJ identity, and physical separation from Basingstoke
- Concerns about Infrastructure deficit



25.01.06.Feedback8
.2.14 NP Launch.xlsx

The summary issues were then raised as questions for the wider NP Questionnaire to be sent out once the evidence collection/collation process is completed. The launch event thus provided some initial directions for the Neighbourhood Plan.

2 Organisation (Business) Questionnaire

There are around 54 businesses operating in the Parish, plus a number of individuals who work from home. Business premises range from offices in homes to a small number of converted business areas such as those at Kestrel Court, Vyne Rd and on Cranes and Aldermaston Roads – including engineering offices and yards, a residential home, one public house and 2 shops (one of which – the Post Office – has since closed due to the retirement of the current owner) and agricultural farms/units. The Vyne (National Trust) is an influential local employer. The emphasis is towards small businesses which employ between 1-25 people.

All registered businesses in the Parish were contacted and asked to complete a short consultation document; response to direct contact from the Neighbourhood Plan team was low, itself indicating the lack of burning issues, and did not reveal any significant problems.

Response to the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire (see 6) was slightly more informative. Here again there were no burning issues, but the ‘business community’ indicated a preference for:

- Some availability of new premises
- Availability of more-suitable premises (especially for rent)
- Better transport links
- Better internet (broadband) connections
- Access to communal office facilities within the Parish

In reviewing documents issued by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in support of the draft Local Plan – Employment Land Requirements in N Hants (2008) and Employment Land Review updated report 2013 (ELR) – the emphasis is for redevelopment and improvement of the present industrial and offices areas with little relating to rural employment or business development.

The ELR considers the neighbouring (larger) village, Bramley, in detail – *‘Agents have identified that there is no demand for additional employment land at Bramley given the Village’s proximity to established employment areas in Basingstoke and good transport links by both private motor vehicle and public transport to the established employment locations of Basingstoke and Reading’*. SSJ Neighbourhood Plan supports the view that Sherborne St John is in a similar position, and that the Parish is not in need of the provision of specific ‘employment land’.

The conclusion was that in order to achieve rural business and employment development in the Parish, a BDBC Local Plan positive policy framework, specific to rural areas is necessary. However, while consultation through the Neighbourhood Plan process did indicate some (modest) interest for an increase in the supply of business premises in the Parish, the emphasis was on ‘small’ in keeping with the rural character and on improving the existing stock. When asked, residents indicated their preference for the types of business types that should be encouraged:

- Agriculture/ food production
- Retail
- Office based
- Service trades / small scale industrial

While some parish residents were employed in the current businesses in the Parish and some people worked from their own homes, the majority of working people travelled out of the Parish to their work.

3 Young Persons’ Event

The event took the form of a competition with generous cash prizes – for three age groups between 5 and 18. The original closing date was 16th July but, due to the disappointing response, this date was subsequently extended to 15th August. Posters were distributed in the Village, on the website and at SSJ School. Sadly the School was unable to promote the competition.

5 entries were received in total – 4 drawings and 1 poem. The entries were judged by the Chairman supported by the Steering Group and announced on 15th Sept. 2014.

The theme running through all the entries was an endorsement of things ‘as they are now’, a vote for the continuity of Parish life – a vote for the Community. The subjects chosen for the drawings were:

- St Andrews Parish Church
- The Swan Public House
- The Village Green

Similarly, the theme running through the poem was the merits (delights) of life in Sherborne St John at present (although there was, of course, some doubt regarding the future if the Post Office), and it’s (continued) existence as a separate, rural community.

The conclusion, based on a small percentage return, must be that there is no burning desire amongst the young of Sherborne St John to effect change in the status of Sherborne St John as a

rural Parish. This conclusion is further reinforced by the unsuccessful attempt to engage younger residents via specific (individual) invitations to complete the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire.

4 Senior Persons' Event

The Seniors Event was held during the two-weekly Coffee Morning in the Sherborne St John Village Hall, between 10.00 am to 12.30pm. 53 Senior members were in attendance – a really excellent turn-out. After an introductory talk about the visions, aims and goals of the Neighbourhood Plan, members split up into 9 groups to consider 4 questions; they were asked to consider strategic issues, rather than 'village housekeeping':

- Q1. The Basingstoke Local Plan has asked SSJ to provide about 10 new homes between 2014 and 2029.
What type of houses should they be?
Where should they be located?
Should some of the houses be affordable/ low cost?
- Q2. The Local Plan is proposing a 'Strategic Gap' between Marnel Park and Rooksdown ('Basingstoke'), and SSJ.
Is this a good thing?
Should it be more than a 'Gap' (Country Park is one idea).
- Q3. What do you most like about SSJ?
What is missing now that you would like to see in the future?
- Q4. What worries you most about things in SSJ at the moment?
Village Shop?
Bus Services?
Other?

The discussion and degree of engagement was exemplary. At the end of the event, views were quickly collated to close the Event - and more detailed feedback was presented at a later Meeting.

In summary, there was a general consensus amongst the meeting:

- New houses should be affordable* (6 votes – out of a total of 9 groups) and targeted on elderly (3) or young (*although it was not clear whether this a general comment or referred specifically to social housing).
- The Village needs to remain an independent community with an effective Strategic Gap (8) - supported by a strong vote in favour of the Village 'as is' (7)
- The loss of the Village Shop/Post Office is a real concern – it provided an important safety net for older residents (7)
- A greater emphasis on providing for the elderly is required

In reviewing the feedback from the Seniors' Event, the requirement for a Housing Needs Survey became evident and this was then instigated.

The business survey, young persons' event and senior person's event all helped to refine the objectives that were set for the Neighbourhood Plan.

5 Housing Needs Survey

The Sherborne St John Housing Needs Survey (Appendix II) was carried out by Community Action Hampshire; it was conducted in July 2014 (ie prior to the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire). 523 surveys were sent out to all households in the Parish; of these 523 surveys distributed, 220 were returned, a 42% response rate. This is a good response rate. The results are summarised below (*with further comment*) – the results were accepted by the Neighbourhood Plan, with some interpretation and qualification.

Support for an Affordable (Social) housing scheme:

- 74% of survey respondents would support a small affordable housing scheme for local people in the parish, should one be needed. 26% would not support a scheme.

Local Housing Need Survey Results:

- The overall findings of the survey showed that whilst 22 households completed Part 2 of the survey stating they were in need of affordable housing only 17 households were interested in either an affordable rented home or shared ownership home within the parish. The remaining 5 were only interested in owner occupation.
- The majority of households in need stated a local connection to the parish of more than 10 years.
- Housing need may arise for a number of reasons, but in the majority of cases within the parish, it is because individuals cannot afford the high cost of mortgage and rent levels locally. Other respondents stated they wished family members to return to the parish for support or be supported by families currently living in the parish. Setting up a first home and divorce and separation were also given as reasons.
- Almost half of all those giving income details earn below the national average. For those on lower incomes the opportunities to stay in the parish will be limited by the types of tenures they can afford.
- Only 2 households in the survey mentioned that they were currently registered on the local housing registers maintained by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's 'Homebid' for affordable rented housing or 'Help to Buy South' shared ownership register. The 'Homebid' register has currently 24 households stating a connection to the parish and 5 households are registered with 'Help to Buy South'.
- This means that the Housing Need Survey has uncovered a (*possible*) further 15 households who have expressed a need for affordable rented housing or shared ownership and are not currently listed on either Housing Register.

Future housing requirements for the Parish:

- Survey respondents identified affordable housing for local people, housing for older people to downsize and homes for first time buyers as priority housing groups for the parish.
- More than 80% of survey respondents currently own their own home and most live in 3 and 4 bedroom houses or bungalows, with much fewer 1 and 2 bedroom homes available in the parish. With the demographic trend moving towards smaller households, this lack of 1 and 2 bedroom homes will make it difficult for many groups, such as single people and couples, first time buyers and those on low income to enter the local housing market. (*One bedroom houses are insufficiently versatile, smaller 2 or 3 bedroom units are more appropriate*)

Adequacy of existing homes:

- 16 survey respondents stated their current homes were not adequate for their future needs. The majority of these residents were over the age of 65 and owned larger homes. Most wanted smaller housing for older people to downsize within the parish where support networks such as family and friends could be maintained.

The survey recommendations:

- The survey has indicated that a mix of new homes is needed by local residents of the parish. This is evidenced in the results of the survey and by those currently registered for affordable rented and shared ownership housing.
- Further investigation with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is recommended to confirm whether this identified need can be met through the new homes currently being planned and developed within or close to the parish boundary. (*Marnell Park Phase II is wholly located within the Parish of Sherborne St John*). These new developments will provide a mix of market and affordable housing for the Borough.
- A Rural Exception Affordable Housing Scheme for local people should only be considered for the parish if the housing need identified cannot be met through the new planned housing developments being built close to or within the parish boundary. (*Marnell Park Phase II is wholly located within the Parish of Sherborne St John*).

The Housing Needs Survey provided key evidence that was thus used to inform the development of a Neighbourhood Plan policy to meet local housing needs.

6 Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire

The SSJ NP Questionnaire was distributed by hand to all residents of the Parish in late September and early October 2014. The completed responses were posted in one of four post boxes in the Village, by the deadline in early November. There were 234 responses to the Questionnaire which was excellent - giving a 45% response rate, indicating that the Community very much want to be involved in shaping the future of the Parish.

Residents were asked to list the best three things about Sherborne St John, these were:

- Strong sense of Community (100%)
- Village atmosphere (88%)
- Rural setting (76%)

The worst three listed were;

- Traffic volume and speed (100%)
- Potential loss of identity (encroachment of Basingstoke) (72%,)
- Loss of shop/post office (49%)

The main hope for Sherborne St John is that it retains its village identity and the main fear is that it becomes enveloped by Basingstoke.

Demographic Trends

The demographic trend of those completing the Questionnaire is very interesting:

- The distribution of family groups being couples (48%), families (32%) and single occupants (19%).

- The respondents' profile indicated a higher Questionnaire return by older residents - with 77% being over 50 years old (versus 51.4% - *HCC Environment Department's 2013 based Small Area Population Forecast*) and 42% over 65 years (versus 26.8% - *HCC Environment Department's 2013 based Small Area Population Forecast*). A targeted attempt to reach younger residents was not successful.
- 51% of respondents are in full-time employment, and 45% are retired.
- It is a Parish/ Village in which people like to stay since 69% have been resident for over 10 years and an incredible 34% for over 25 years.

We divided the questionnaire into 6 separate sections; housing, business, environment, community services, children and youth and transport. The main points of interest in each section are given below.

Housing

- 20% of the respondents reported a problem in finding suitable accommodation in the village.
- 50% responded that houses were either too expensive and there was a lack of small homes.
- 78% responded that they were in favour of modest new housing (between 0-10 and 10-20 houses) as long as it would not compromise the village or rural nature of Sherborne St John.
- A large majority thought that the new housing was most important for local young people or old people "downsizing". A proportion of the housing should be Affordable (social).
- From the results it was clear that people felt that the housing should be of mixed style and size, with 1-3 bedrooms.
- 93% wanted houses to be situated on brownfield or derelict sites, and 60% on small sites.
- 94% did not want them on greenfield sites, 95% did not want them to be situated in the Strategic Gap,
- Respondents felt strongly that housing should not be located in the Conservation Area.

The Questionnaire responses gave the Neighbourhood Plan a strong mandate to deliver a limited number of houses (between 0-10 and 10-20 houses) – very much in line with the initial 'steer' (10 to 15 houses) from BDBC. Furthermore, the returns showed their preference in avoiding houses both on 'Greenfield' sites and also in the Basingstoke / Sherborne St John Strategic Gap. Smaller sites were called for, but this cannot be considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan (Hampshire CC regulations).

The Questionnaire revealed a requirement for smaller units – for younger purchasers and for older residents. The logic for this latter being the ability to allow long-term residents to down-size, thereby releasing (existing) larger houses in the Parish.

As indicated, BDBC modelling for the Ward of Sherborne St John (which covers a rural population of twice the size of Sherborne St John) and HCC research (*HCC Environment Department's 2013 based Small Area Population Forecast*) shows no expected increase in the population up to 2020. This excludes the development known as Marnel Park Phase II, currently in construction.

We can conclude that any development will be largely led by housing construction rather than anything else. At the same time, there is an indication that a quantity of Affordable (social) housing would be a benefit to those wishing to live in Sherborne St John – although the data for this (17 positive responses to the Community Action Hants Housing Needs Survey versus 2 families on the BDBC waiting list) is contradictory. Nevertheless, it is the aim of the Neighbourhood Plan to progress with part Affordable (Social) housing.

Business

- There were no burning issues for business.
- Better mobile phone and broadband connectivity were the most popular responses for developing business.
- The type of activity it was thought we should encourage was retail, agricultural/food production, offices and pubs and cafes.

Environment

Most wanted to see more of:

- Landscaping public areas
- Planting more woodland trees
- Recreating wildlife meadows
- Public seating (at the village pond)

There was strong support for:

- the Strategic Gap to be maintained as agricultural land
- protecting existing wildlife habitats
- minimising noise and light pollution
- more foot and cycle paths
- sustainable water management

Community Services

- the most used facilities were the village shop (74%) and public footpaths (68%).
- questioned about why the playground facilities were not being used more, most responded stating that their children were now too old for those facilities.
- although Sherborne St John has an ageing population most respondents found that healthcare facilities were generally easy to obtain outside the village.

Children and Youth

- There was overwhelming support (91%) from the Community for the pre-school nursery and the Village School.
- Most thought measures to slow the traffic down were the most important to improve the safety of the children in the Parish.

Transport

- The majority of people use a car or van for transport, the second most popular is walking.
- Parking was seen as something which could be improved upon particularly in the centre of the village for the school.
- Most respondents were concerned with

- the speed of the traffic
- condition of the pavement
- vans and lorries travelling through the village
- children getting to and from school
- traffic control at Elm Bottom.
- Future improvements seen as most popular included:
 - traffic control at Elm Bottom(74%)
 - more and better pavements(65%)
 - cycle paths (64%)
 - more traffic chicanes (60%).

The results of this questionnaire, in combination with other information, enabled the Neighbourhood Plan to decide on the policies to be developed (and in some cases community actions, where they did not relate to land use issues).

7 'Call for Sites'

Local landowners and developers were invited to submit potential locations for development sites within the Parish Boundaries. The Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire was distributed in September / October 2014 with a Parish Map identifying a 'long-list' of 17 different potential sites. The purpose of this map was to give residents an idea of the possible locations of any development.

The long-list was reduced to 11 sites in September 2014 on the basis of further correspondence with landowners and developers. Following analysis of the results of the Housing Needs Survey and Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire, and taking into account the requirements of the NPPF, HCC and BDBC policies (in particular the minimum requirement for 5 houses for any development to be considered under the Neighbourhood Plan) this long list was reduced to a short-list of 6 potential sites.

All sites were available – although there was a lack of clarity regarding number 06 Aubrey Place which was subject to probate. One site 05 Kiln Rd had a potential problem with flooding due to the high water table / spring line which runs east-west immediately to the South of Kiln Rd. Not all sites abutted the Village.

These sites were visited, in the presence of the land owners / developers where possible and Site Assessments were completed for each site (see Appendix XVI). It was realised that not all the sites on the short-list met the national and local acceptance criteria; however, it was felt that local residents should be allowed to make their own judgement – at the Consultation and Feedback Event.

Based on the voting at this consultation event (see below) and the previous feedback from the Housing Needs Survey and questionnaire, the options for developing the preferred choice – 'Bob's Farm' – was pursued.

8 Consultation and Feedback Event (March 2015)

The event was held at Sherborne St John Village Hall on Saturday 14th March 2015; it was widely advertised in 'The Villager' Magazine, on the Neighbourhood Plan website and with notice boards located throughout the Village. 120 Residents attended on the day and, without exception, gave strong positive approval to the format and content of the information presented. In order to allow those unable to attend on the day to have their say, the Event was then moved to the website, closing on the 17th April, allowing a further 9 residents to complete returns.


The presentation comprised the following documentation:

- The Results from the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire – displayed as a pdf copy of a power-point presentation (Appendix IV)
- SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Draft Report March 2015 R4 (Appendix V)
- Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites Discussion Paper 08.03.15 R6 including Figure B (see below) (Appendix VI)
- Plan Showing the Location of the Short-Listed Sites (Appendix XIV)
- Developers' proposals for each site
- Proposals for the SSJ Wildlife Map.

Figure 'B'

Name / Ref	Avail-ability	Relationship with Village	Protects Strategic Gap?	Access	Utilities	No. of Houses	Mix of Houses	Affordable (Social) Houses	Community Benefit	Comments
Rydon - Cranesfield & Cranes Rd / 01	Yes	Good but abuts Village Pond and affects view for existing Residents	Not fully	Good	All	Package 1 = 35, Package 2 = 30	1-5 bedroom	Package (option) 1 = 14** Package (option) 2 = 0	Yes Village Shop Possible provision of a landscaped country park' to the North of Site A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twice the number of houses indicated by the Questionnaire responses. • Greenfield village edge site • At the edge of the Strategic Gap • Housing Mix (1-5 bedrooms) incorrect • ** Affordable housing could be replaced by Sheltered housing • Relatively big impact on other residents. • Possible useful site for replacement Village Shop/ PO. • Size of 'Country Park not defined.
Horton – Bob's Farm/ 02	Yes	Good	Yes	Good	All (tbc)	15	2-5 bedroom	6	Removes existing eyesore Permissive footpath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-derelict (greenfield) site • Housing Mix (2-5) incorrect • Would greatly improve the look of the Village. • Positive impact for residents • Permissive footpath will allow foot access across site
Hatt – 'Tin Sheds' behind 14 Aldermaston Rd/ 03	Yes	Poor	No	Good	No Mains Gas or Sewers?	15	SK01=2-5 bedroom SK02=1-4 bedroom	tbc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaces existing sheds • In the middle of the Strategic Gap. • Housing Mix (1-5) incorrect • Out of sight except to 15&16 Aldermaston Rd. • Not attached to the Village.
Hilltop – Lewis/04	Yes	Poor	No	Good	No Mains Gas or Sewers?	10-20	1-3	8-10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield Site • Does not protect Strategic Gap • Not attached to Village • Housing Mix (1-3 beds) correct. • No detailed drawings available
Kiln Rd / 05	Yes	Good	No	OK	All (tbc)	10-12	2-3	10-12	Provides 10-12 Affordable (Social) Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield site • Does not protect Strategic Gap • Housing Mix (1-3 beds) correct • Affordable (Social) housing only ie no market housing

Aubrey Place/06	No	Good	Yes	Poor	Good	?10	?	?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on residents in Kiln Rd • May become available for development in next 6 months – no guarantee it will suit N Plan.
-----------------	----	------	-----	------	------	-----	---	---	--	---



Residents were directed to review the Questionnaire results and then asked to choose their preferred development site – either by voting for acceptable sites in order, or by ranking all the sites – as well as commenting on the proposed Key Policies.

The key feedback from this event comprised two items:

- a. The result of the 'Call for Sites' Ballot (listed in order of total votes)

Option	Total Votes		1st Choice	
	No	%	No.	%
Site 2 Bob's Farm	622	38%	79	61%
Site 3 Aldermaston Rd	359	22%	26	20%
Site 4 Hilltop	198	12%	4	3%
Site 5 Kiln Rd	166	10%	8	6%
Site 6 Aubrey Place	158	10%	1	1%
Site 1 Cranesfield	151	9%	11	9%

- b. Comments on proposed Key Policies. These were generally supportive across the board – providing the mandate to continue to develop the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.

This feedback was combined with the information gained from the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire and Housing Needs Survey – plus a technical assessment of the sites, to gauge their availability, deliverability, sustainability and fit with the Local Plan – to guide the Steering Group

'policy' decision at the meeting on 30th April 2015. It should be noted that the technical site assessments can be found in a Site Selection document, which forms part of the evidence base.

Agreed Steering Group Position (post Consultation Event 14.03.15)

1. Background.

- a. Call for Sites – Discussion Paper 08.03.15 R6. Environmental. Much of Sherborne St John is designated a Conservation Area – any development should not only not detract from the existing settlement but should enhance it. This applies to
 - i. The built environment*
 - ii. The rural setting of SSJ Village and the surrounding countryside.**
- b. This led to a 'short list' of potential developments (see Appendix B attached); as previously, inclusion on the short-list did not/ does not imply approval by the Neighbourhood Plan.*

2. Key Criteria

- a. The development should preferably be an integral part of the Village*
- b. Some of these options directly contradicted the two fundamental 'no-go' rules identified by the N Plan Questionnaire:
 - i. No development on greenfield sites (94%)*
 - ii. No development in the Basingstoke – Sherborne St John Strategic Gap (with the possible exception of specific 'brownfield' sites, where development would not jeopardize separation and would enhance the environment) (95%)**

3. Proposal.

- a. The following sites fail on two counts and should be discounted:
 - i. 1 Cranesfield. In addition, the proposal submitted for these two sites is twice the number of houses identified as required by the N Plan Questionnaire*
 - ii. 3 Aldermaston Rd*
 - iii. 4 Hilltop*
 - iv. 5 Kiln Rd. In addition, the proposal is for Affordable (Social) housing only – contrary to the 'mixed' requirements identified by the N Plan Questionnaire**
- b. The following site should be pursued through discussion with the developer to establish that they are prepared to deliver a suitable housing mix, ideally 50% Affordable, 50% Market:
 - i. Bob's Farm**
- c. The following site(s) should be held in abeyance pending discussions / further progress about its availability:
 - i. 6 Aubrey Place**

9 Second Consultation Event

Subsequently, Bob's Farm was unilaterally withdrawn from the Neighbourhood Plan process by the developer, and the Steering Group were unable to reverse this decision. The site was therefore 'unavailable' and a 'second consultation' process was required. This proved problematic since 4 of the original sites had been discounted (making a total of 5 of the original sites ineligible) and one – Aubrey Place – was still unavailable.

The developer for 'Site 1 – Cranesfield' – now submitted a significantly revised scheme using only one of the two sites previously identified. A340/Cranes Rd was presented as an 18 dwelling

scheme incorporating 6 affordable (social) houses and an option for a 1,230sq ft Post Office / Shop (which could be gifted to SSJ Parish Council, if desired). Note – the existing Post Office was ‘for sale’ as a private dwelling). Given the (now) much smaller scale of this site and issues with alternative sites there was a strong case to re-consider.

It, however, presented the Steering Group with a question – the ‘new’ site was both a greenfield site and was located in the Strategic Gap. In practice, though, all site options were greenfield and A340/Cranes Rd was, at least, adjacent to the village (rather than in open countryside). Similarly, A340/Cranes Rd sits at the very northern extent of the Strategic Gap where it wraps around the village. It is not physically located between the village and Basingstoke and it cannot really be said to compromise the countryside gap between them. It is also noted that the BDBC Local Plan allows Neighbourhood Plans to allocate a site in a Strategic Gap, where this is locally justified. However, compromise would be necessary to accept this site; it was decided to offer a further (second) Consultation Event for residents to decide for themselves. Further consultation was, in any case, essential since this site option had not been previously offered in this format.

Voting was carried out via a placing (insert) in the SSJ copies of the October 2015 Villager Magazine. Residents received their copies no later than 1st October, voting was by paper voting slip deposited in ballot boxes located at 4 locations in SSJ Village, close time for returns was 6.00pm on 12th October.

Residents decided the site was suitable and voted in favour of adoption of the A340/Cranes Rd site as the (only) preferred development site for the SSJ Neighbourhood Plan:

Votes Received	199	
In Favour	134	Of which - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90 were in favour irrespective of whether the scheme provides a shop or not. • 40 were in favour only if the shop is provided • 4 undefined
Against	65	

It should be noted that there was also a technical site assessment carried out of A340/Cranes Road, which can be found in a Site Selection document that forms part of the evidence base.

The SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group resolved to support a development of 18 houses at A340/Cranes Rd., working in co-operation with the developer. This enabled an allocation site policy for housing to be included within the Neighbourhood Plan.

10 Seeking determination for SEA

Once the Neighbourhood Plan had been fully drafted the local planning authority (Basingstoke & Dean Borough Council) was asked to determine whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) was required and to consult the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England in reaching their decision.

A response was received in January 2016 and it forms another of the documents being submitted alongside the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan. Having undertaken a thorough assessment

the Borough Council decided that no SEA or HRA was required for this Neighbourhood Plan. This position was backed up by the responses from the three statutory bodies they consulted. Those statutory bodies made a few comments about the draft Plan which were duly considered by the Neighbourhood Plan group as part of their work to further refine the document.

11 Statutory Regulation 14 Consultation

The formal consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which is required by the statutory regulations, was held for slightly over six weeks between 1st April and 16th May 2016.

The draft Plan, plus the summary evidence base document and its various appendices and supporting documents, were made publically available on a dedicated web page (<https://ssjneighbourhoodplan.com/>). This made clear how people could respond and the deadline by which they should do so. The full process – including the website address – was detailed in the Village Magazine (which is delivered free of charge to every house in the Parish) for both April and May 2016. Email notification was also sent to 126 residents, whose email addresses were known from earlier consultation activity. Paper copies of the Plan were also available for viewing by those not online at either the village hall or the Chute Pavilion.

Notification of the consultation was sent to 38 statutory consultee bodies who might reasonably have an interest in this Neighbourhood Plan. They included Natural England, Environment Agency, Historic England, Basingstoke & Dean Borough Council, Hampshire County Council, the health authority and hospital trust, the local school and colleges, the police authority, the Highways Agency, the local bus service provider, the main local housing association, a wide range of utility providers (for electricity, gas, water, sewerage and telecoms), environmental interest groups, the county association of local councils and neighbouring local authorities. Contact names and addresses for these were kindly provided by the Borough Council.

Notification of the consultation was sent to around 75 local businesses and interest groups. In most cases this was by email, but in a few cases where no email contact was available this was by a posted letter. This list included Rydon who are promoting development of the Plan's allocated housing site.

Respondents were encouraged to reply online to the Parish Council Clerk and to use a form designed to help with the analysis of responses. However, it was also made clear that hard copy responses could be left in the letter box at the village hall.

A detailed response was received from the Borough Council and shorter responses were received from four other consultees. Some others acknowledged the notification, but did not have any comments to make. A meeting was held subsequently with the Borough Council to discuss its response and agree how certain comments should best be addressed.

Attached to this Consultation Statement is a log which:

- Summarises the points which were made by responding consultees;
- Gives a response of the Neighbourhood Plan group to these points; and
- Says how or if the Neighbourhood Plan has been altered as a result.

These alterations have enabled Sherborne St John to produce a submission draft of its Neighbourhood Plan, in preparation for the local planning authority checks, the independent examination and the local referendum.

Log of responses received about the Regulation 14 Consultation version of the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan

Ref	Draft NP section	Point raised by	Summary of point raised	Response of NP group	Action
1	General comment	BDBC	Recommend that evidence documents called appendices are renamed supporting documents.	Agreed. Will distinguish between 'main' and 'other' supporting documents	Appendixes renamed
2	General comment	BDBC	Add the glossary to the NP.	Agreed.	Glossary added
3	Site assessment process (section 2.6)	BDBC	Supporting documentation to the NP should include some information on the sites which were initially considered. Site proformas should be publically available. Some further clarity is needed about the final site selection.	Agreed. A Site Selection document to be produced in order to clarify the site identification, appraisal and selection process. This will include the site proformas as appendices.	Site Selection document written and added to the available evidence base.
4	Housing need and provision (section 3.2)	BDBC	Add reference to meeting the requirements of Local Plan policy SS5.	Agreed.	Reference added to section (paragraph 57)
5	Maps 2 and 3	BDBC	Update these so they refer to the adopted Local Plan. Remove Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) from them, as these frequently change.	Agreed. Will accept BDBC offer to update the two maps.	Maps on pages 19 and 20 updated (and now excluding TPOs)
6	Vision and objectives	BDBC	Objective 2, suggest changing 'preservation' to 'conservation and enhancement'. Objective 3, suggest adding the word 'enhance' to green corridors reference.	Agreed. Agreed	Text amended (paragraph 98) Text amended (paragraph 98)

7	Policy SSJ1	BDBC	<p>Clarify what 'mix of homes' refers to.</p> <p>Suggest wording change to second paragraph, so starts: "Development proposals will be permitted provided that at least ..."</p> <p>Clarify whether reference to half the dwellings is counted on a net or gross basis.</p> <p>Suggest that this policy only relates to market housing.</p>	<p>Make clear that mix refers to dwelling sizes.</p> <p>Agreed, though insert "normally" after "will".</p> <p>Clarify that it is on a net basis.</p> <p>Agreed. The last nine words of the policy, referring to affordable housing, will be deleted.</p>	<p>Policy text clarified</p> <p>Policy text amended</p> <p>Policy text clarified</p> <p>Relevant words deleted from policy</p>
8	Policy SSJ2	BDBC	<p>Consider whether this policy is still needed, given strategic gap policy in adopted Local Plan. If it is retained, ensure it does not (unintentionally) weaken Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Suggest defining area referred to by this policy on a map, so it is easier to implement.</p> <p>Clarify what is special about the area referred to by this policy.</p>	<p>This policy is important to local residents as part of the NP. There is no intention to weaken the policy protection.</p> <p>Agreed. Make the same as the Strategic Gap area, except omit the Crane's Road site.</p> <p>It is its open character and the countryside views it affords.</p>	<p>NP policy retained and strengthened, adding text (two indents) from Local Plan policy EM2</p> <p>Map added to the NP (as map 4)</p> <p>Reference added to open character</p>
9	Policy SSJ3 (plus references in paragraphs 66-67	BDBC	<p>Consider expanding the scope of the Wildlife Plan (e.g. to cover the tree-scape) and refer to this wider scope in the NP.</p>	<p>The most important issues found so far, for the Wildlife Plan, will be published as an</p>	<p>SSJ has published an interim output, as a NP supporting</p>

	and 108)			interim output, to clarify its scope and lend the policy more weight.	document. This is now referred to in the NP (paragraphs 67 and 108)
10	Policy SSJ3 (local green space)	BDBC	<p>Change word 'preserve' to 'conserve'.</p> <p>Add "and enhance" to aspiration for network of green habitats.</p> <p>Start paragraphs with "Development will be permitted where ..." so more positive.</p> <p>Delete the phrase "integrity of".</p> <p>Clarify what the parish's natural assets are.</p> <p>Revise words about screening so it only applies when appropriate.</p> <p>Policy could also refer to the form of new development.</p> <p>The second paragraph could be seen as in conflict with Local Plan policy EM2.</p> <p>Consider splitting policy SSJ3 into several topic based policies.</p> <p>Consider adding key local views to the policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed. The most important open and green spaces should be named.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Complex. Content to leave to planning decisions.</p> <p>Soften the policy text to avoid confusion or the potential for conflict.</p> <p>Retain as one policy, but separate out issues more</p>	<p>Policy text amended at three places</p> <p>Policy text amended</p> <p>Policy text amended at two places</p> <p>Policy text amended</p> <p>Spaces named in text above the policy (paragraph 108)</p> <p>Policy text amended</p> <p>No change to text</p> <p>Policy text amended</p> <p>Policy text split to show separate issues</p>

			<p>Consider designating Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Consider adding heritage character to this policy.</p>	<p>clearly.</p> <p>Add local views that appear in the Village Design Statement.</p> <p>As noted above, the most important green spaces will be named. However, this will not be as a Local Green Spaces designation, as defined by the NPPF.</p> <p>This could complicate a policy that otherwise deals with the natural environment. Content to leave heritage to the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Policy text amended to name the two views highlighted in the VDS</p> <p>As noted above, the text justifying SSJ3 now names certain important spaces (paragraph 108)</p> <p>No change made</p>
11	Policy SSJ4 (site access comments)	BDBC	Consider if further information is needed to understand access arrangements to the site and whether there are visibility issues at the access junction.	Final choice of access point must balance considerations and should avoid being close to A340.	No action required at this stage (for NP)
12	Policy SSJ4 (heritage / historic environment comments)	BDBC	<p>Recommend adding the Sigma planning heritage assessment to the evidence base.</p> <p>Consider if the choice of allocation site would affect the physical separation of the main village and West End, with their different characters.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The quality of housing (as per its character) is variable. Local people typically see integration of West End as</p>	<p>Sigma report added to evidence base</p> <p>Positive local views about integration now cited in the Site Selection supporting</p>

				desirable.	document
13	Policy SSJ4 (landscape comments)	BDBC	<p>Consider further work to assess the impact of the allocation site in terms of its visual prominence from the A340.</p> <p>It would be helpful to justify the extent and size of the site (notably its southern boundary).</p>	<p>The A340 already runs through part of the settlement (where it is visually prominent). Existing trees by the A340 could be retained through planning conditions.</p> <p>A site this size seems appropriate, given the housing numbers and therefore density. A smaller site would not meet identified housing needs. The southern boundary aligns with an existing barn.</p>	<p>No action required</p> <p>Text above the policy now justifies the site size (paragraph 111)</p>
14	Policy SSJ4 (site capacity comments)	BDBC	<p>Consider whether 18 dwellings can be accommodated on the site in an appropriate manner.</p>	<p>The site density is not seen as excessive, at 15 dwellings per hectare and given that half should be smaller (two or three bedroom) dwellings. However, the policy will state a range, from 12 to 18 dwellings, to allow room for subsequent negotiation.</p>	<p>Policy text amended</p>
15	Policy SSJ4 (map)	BDBC	<p>The site location map should be revised to have a key and so its base is consistent with the newly adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>The settlement boundary could be amended on the map to include the SSJ4 development site.</p>	<p>Agreed. Accept BDBC offer to redraw the map.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Map updated (now map 5 on page 30)</p> <p>Amended settlement</p>

					boundary shown on the map
16	Text above policy SSJ4 (paragraph 110)	BDBC	<p>Insert “approximately” before “18 houses”.</p> <p>The Borough has concerns with the indicative layout by the developer.</p>	<p>See 14 above. Now altered to give a range.</p> <p>Noted, but the indicative layout is not part of the NP document and the layout will presumably be negotiated.</p>	<p>Text amended (now paragraph 111)</p> <p>No action required</p>
17	Text above policy SSJ4 (paragraph 113)	BDBC	<p>At first bullet, insert “approximately” before “18 houses”.</p> <p>At second bullet, it would not be reasonable to require the transfer of the shop facility to the Parish Council nor a financial contribution in lieu.</p> <p>At third bullet, it lists an aspiration (though not a policy) for an on-site area of public open space. This would not normally be required on a site this size.</p>	<p>See 14 above. Now altered to give a range.</p> <p>Agreed. This is not a planning policy issue and should be pursued outwith the NP.</p> <p>The area of public open space was proposed by the developer, hence reference to it as an aspiration. Its inclusion could be re-considered at the planning application stage.</p>	<p>Text amended (now paragraph 114)</p> <p>This point deleted from the text (now paragraph 114)</p> <p>No action required</p>
18	Text above policy SSJ4 (paragraphs 115-116)	BDBC	<p>SSJ4 should give a percentage for affordable housing rather than a number, since the total number of dwellings delivered on site may differ from the amount allocated in the NP.</p>	<p>Following discussion with BDBC it has been decided simply to refer to the relevant Local Plan policy (CN1), rather than state a number or a percentage for affordable housing. This removes the risk of confusion or non-</p>	<p>Text amended to refer to Local Plan policy CN1 (now paragraphs 116 and 117)</p>

			Recommend that the reference to affordable housing on-site is stated as 40%, to be the same as the Local Plan policy CN1 target.	conformity. See immediately above.	As above
19	Policy SSJ4 (policy wording)	BDBC	<p>Paragraph 1: it is not necessary to describe the site location.</p> <p>Paragraph 2: the housing mix should refer only to the market housing.</p> <p>Paragraph 2: suggest making the housing numbers for the mix less specific.</p> <p>Paragraph 3: the affordable housing reference should give a percentage rather than a number.</p> <p>Paragraph 4: clarify if the shop facility size is the net or gross area.</p> <p>Paragraph 4: suggest adding that the shop should be suitable for “a predominantly convenience floorspace”.</p> <p>Paragraph 4: it would not be reasonable to seek a financial contribution in lieu.</p> <p>Paragraph 6: it is helpful that the NP seeks to secure key elements of the Sigma heritage assessment.</p>	<p>Agreed that the site location map is sufficient.</p> <p>Following discussion with BDBC it was agreed to simplify policy SSJ4, to refer to policy SSJ1 in respect of the housing mix required on this site.</p> <p>Agreed. See above. Policy SSJ1 is less specific about the housing mix sought.</p> <p>See response at row 18 of this log.</p> <p>The figure quoted is the net (or shop floor) area.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed. See response under row 17 of this log.</p>	<p>Policy text describing location deleted</p> <p>Policy text amended</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Policy text on affordable housing deleted</p> <p>Policy text clarified</p> <p>Policy text amended</p> <p>Reference to this in policy text deleted</p>

			<p>Paragraph 6: suggest it requires a well-defined and landscaped southern boundary to the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 6: suggest adding reference to “appropriate scale” of the development, given its bearing on Conservation Area issues.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No action required</p> <p>Addition made to policy text</p> <p>Addition made to policy text</p>
20	SSJ4	Thames Water (Savills on behalf of)	Ask that policy wording includes reference to developer making proper provision for surface water drainage and avoiding drainage to the foul sewer.	This issue is already fully covered by Local Plan policy CN6 and it would not add anything to repeat this within the NP policy.	No change to policy, but reference to CN6 added to text above (paragraph 117)
21	SSJ4	Environment Agency	Ask that policy wording includes need to demonstrate sufficient sewerage infrastructure is in place.	This issue is already fully covered by Local Plan policy CN6 and it would not add anything to repeat this within the NP policy.	No change to policy, but reference to CN6 added to text above (paragraph 117)
22	SSJ4	Local resident	<p>Should allocate a brownfield site for the housing development e.g. Bob’s Farm.</p> <p>The proposed community shop has little appeal.</p>	<p>There are no brownfield sites available. Bob’s Farm is a greenfield site.</p> <p>NP questionnaire and consultations found much support for a village shop.</p>	<p>No action required</p> <p>No action required</p>
23	Not policy specific	Hampshire County	Consider if the NP should consider low carbon environment issues and reflect these in its	Whilst important issues, they were not a priority identified	No action required

		Council	policies.	through the NP process. They will, of course, still be considered as a result of relevant Local Plan policies.	
24	Community action plan	BDBC	Footpath works would be the responsibility of Hampshire County Council.	Agreed.	Reference amended from Borough to County Council
25	Policy SSJ2 (paragraph 75)	Historic England	At paragraph 75, within the review of the village's heritage assets it would be helpful to identify the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at The Vyne as an important landscape scale heritage asset surrounding the listed mansion and providing a setting to many of the listed estate buildings identified.	Agreed	Included in relevant Draft NP paragraph 75
26	Policy SSJ2	Historic England	It is also a little unclear in the preceding paragraphs whether the land south of the village is in the conservation area or not	Agreed	Included in relevant Draft NP Policy SSJ2
27	Policy SSJ2	Historic England	Given the brief allusion to the listed buildings within the parish it would be helpful to know what types of buildings these are (beyond the unique example of village church and mansion) and what the distinctive materials, scale and form the village's historic buildings have, that should inform the choice of materials, although not necessarily slavish copying, in new development.	Agreed	Included in relevant Draft NP Policy SSJ2
28	Policy SSJ2	Historic	At paragraph 76 and Map 2 it would be helpful to	Agreed	Included in relevant

		England	show the area of archaeological importance on the map and to describe them briefly. Are they, for example, mainly prehistoric monuments remote from the village, medieval monuments associated with hamlets within the parish (possibly showing where settlements shrank in the Middle Ages) or Roman remains associated with the Roman roads running through or along the boundaries of the Parish?		Draft NP paragraph 76 Policy SSJ2
29	Policy SSJ4	Historic England	We note that the Council have consulted the County Archaeologist in assessing the suitability of the site for the allocation and that consideration has also been given to the site's contribution to the conservation area and the potential impact of development on this heritage asset. Nevertheless, on the basis of the County Archaeologist's assessment that some archaeological remains are likely to be present we suggest that in order for the Council to follow the procedure set out within the National Planning Policy Framework it should be made clear within the policy that archaeological investigation of the site will be required to inform a proposal for development and the determination of a planning application (i.e. before planning permission is given or even considered). As such we recommend adding the following text to Policy 4:	Agreed	Included in relevant Draft NP Policy SSJ4

			“Development scheme proposals for the site should be informed by a heritage assessment of the site and its setting”.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Other organisations acknowledged being consulted, but did not raise any points about the draft NP i.e. Highways England, National Grid, National Trust and Wokingham Borough Council.

Statutory Consultees contacted by email or by letter re Sherborne St John Draft Plan & Baseline Report 1.4.2016

Authority	Email or letter address	E Mailed letter No 04 With draft Plan 02 & Baseline report 01	Letter sent No 4 directing to website	Receipt acknowledged
Hampshire County Council	Planning.policy@hants.gov.uk Pete.Errington@hants.gov.uk planningconsultations@hants.gov.uk Chris.murray@hants.gov.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		X
Hampshire Association of Local Councils	Sue.ramage@eastleigh.gov.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		X
Environment Agency	enquiries@enviroment-agency.gov.uk Planning-farnham@environment-agency.gov.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
Highways Agency	ha_info@highways.gsi.gov.uk nawal.Atiq@highways.gsi.gov.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		XX
English Heritage	customers@english-heritage.org.uk Catherine.York@english-heritage.org.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		X

Sentinel Housing Association	info@sentinelha.org.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
Natural England	enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk consultations@naturalengland.org.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		X
Historic England	Robert.lloydsweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk	Redirected to Historic England 29/30.3.16 Updated submission draft resent with some amendments to reflect their comments 20.10.16		X Original response not received resent 20.10.16
CPRE	info@cprehampshire.org.uk becky.french@cprehampshire.org.uk Nicola.revolta@cprehampshire.org.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		X
Hants & IOW Wildlife Trust	feedback@hiwwt.org.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
SE Water Authority	customerservices@sewater.co.uk South East Water, 21-30 Sturt Road Frimley Green GU215XY South East Water 3 Church Road Haywards Heath RH16 3NY		30.3.16 30.3.16 30.3.16	
Thames Water	Developer.services@thameswater.co.uk thameswaterplanningpolicy@savills.com Thames Water	Sent 29/30.3.2016		X 30.3.16

	Clearwater Court, Reading RG1 8DB			
Police	postmaster@hampshire.pnn.police.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
British Telecom	BT Customer Correspondence Centre Durham DH98 1BT newsitereceptionnorthdowns@openreach.co.uk newsitereceptionromford@openreach.co.uk BT – OpenReach BT Centre, 81 Newgate Street London EC1A 7AJ	Sent 29/30.3.2016	30.3.16 30.3.16	
EE	Unit 4, Nicholson Centre, Nicholson Walk Maidenhead SL61LB		30.3.16	
Vodafone	ukmediarelations@vodafone.com land use Planning Dept, Vodafone Vodafone House The Connection Newbury RG14 2FN	Sent 29/30.3.2016	30.3.16	
O2	feedback@O2.com ; myO2Business@O2.com Planning Team Telefonica O2 Ltd 260 Bath Rd Slough SL14DX	Sent 29/30.3.2016	30.3.16	X
Sherborne St John School	K.PAYNE@sherborne-st-john.hants.sch.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
Stagecoach	South.enquiries@stagecoachbus.com	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
North Hants Hospital	customercare@hhft.nhs.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		

Everest Community College	info@everestcommunityacademy.org	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
Hurst Community College	theheadteacher@hurst.hants.sch.uk	Sent 29/30.3.2016		
British Gas	Customerservices @britishgasbusiness.co.uk		30.3.16	X
Southern Electric	PO Box 514 Basingstoke RG21 8WS		30.3.16	
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council	Local.plan@basingstoke.gov.uk Matt.melville@basingstoke.gov.uk Emma.betteridge@basingstoke.gov.uk	29/30.3.16		X X
West Berkshire Council	planapps@westberks.gov.uk	29/30.3.16		X
Wokingham District Council	Wokingham Borough Council PO Box 157, Shute End, Wokingham RG401WR		30.3.16	
Hart District Council	enquiries@hart.gov.uk	29/30.3.16		
East Hampshire District Council	East Hampshire District Council Penns Place Petersfield GU314EX		30.3.16	
Winchester City Council	planning@winchester.gov.uk	29/30.3.16		X
Test Valley Borough Council	Test Valley Borough Council Council Offices, Duttons Road Romsey S)518XG		30.3.16	
Scottish & Southern Energy	55 Vastern Road Reading RG18BU		30.3.16	
Southern Gas Networks	St Lawrence House Station Approach Horley RG6 9HJ		30.3.16	
Southern Water	Southern Water		30.3.16	

	Southern House, Lewes Rd, Brighton, BN19PY			
Gas & Electricity Companies	National Grid/AMEC AMEC Environmental & Infrastructure UK Ltd Gables House, Kenilworth, Leamington Spa CV32 6JX		30.3.16	
Strategic Health Authority	West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group Omega House, 112 Southampton Rd Eastleigh Hants SO50 5PB		30.3.16	
Department of Transport	Department of Transport (Rail) Strategic Planning Team, Great Minster House, 76 Marsham Street London SW1P4DR		30.3.16	
Virgin Media	PO Box 219 Newport NP10 8GU		30.3.16	

All listed above and below were contacted by e mail or letter with attached Baseline reports & Draft Plan or directed to the website by letter

Local Businesses & Groups consulted

	Name`	Notation	Email sent	Letter 05 sent	acknow	Name`	Notation	Email sent	Letter 05 sent
			letter 05 plus doc.	by post	ledgment			letter 05 plus doc.	by post
Village Hall Users			01, 02 & 02.01						
Village Hall Committee	Angela McArt	Village Events	29/30.3.16			<u>Neighbouring Parishes</u>			
	Sue Burlingham	green market	29/30.3.16			Bramley		29/30.3.16	
Dance Classes	David Smith		29/30.3.16			Pamber	Liz Knight Clerk	29/30.3.16	

SSJ Guides	Jennifer Edwards	Village Hall user	29/30.3.16			Monk Sherborne	Cally Morris	29/30.3.16	
Brownies	Helen Todd	Village Hall user	29/30.3.16			Sherfield on Loddon	Catherine Ryle	29/30.3.16	
Brownies	Tramayne Henwood		29/30.3.16			Tadley		29/30.3.16	
SSJ Cub Scouts	Jess Field	Village Hall user	29/30.3.16			Wootton St Lawrence	Cllr Leek	29/30.3.16	
	Frances Daykin		29/30.3.16			Local Farms/Landowners			
SSJ Mothers & Toddlers Group	Barbara Irving	Village Hall user	29/30.3.16			Mr Hatt		29/30.3.16	
Baby Sensory	Sharon Boyd		29/30.3.16			Mr Charles Horton			30.3.16
SSJ Women's Fellowship	Jean Linford		29/30.3.16				Jeremy Higgins	29/30.3.16	
Yoga	Mrs Jacqui Morris	01256 881336	29/30.3.16			Businesses in SSJ		29/30.3.16	
Health Groups			29/30.3.16			The Grange Nursing Home		29/30.3.16	
Podiatrist	Barbara Pawley		29/30.3.16			A Monger		29/30.3.16	
Chute			29/30.3.16			R W Armstrong	Aldermaston Road	29/30.3.16	
Chute Committee	John Edwards	administrator	29/30.3.16			Bob Berry Fencing	Braeside	29/30.3.16	
Piccolo Pre School	Claudia Cafarelli-Hunt	play school	29/30.3.16		X	F J Soper & Son		29/30.3.16	
			29/30.3.16			The Swan Public House		29/30.3.16	
Sports Groups			29/30.3.16			Gales Garage	Aldermaston Road	29/30.3.16	
SSJ Junior football	Terry Buller	local football teams	29/30.3.16				Ann ??	29/30.3.16	
SSJ Short Mat Bowls	Les Bone		29/30.3.16			Mowtech garden Machinery	Aldermaston Road	29/30.3.16	
Tennis Club	John Edwards	administrator	29/30.3.16			Alpha Micro Components	Cranes Road	29/30.3.16	
Karate	Ian Rand	07888 660225	29/30.3.16			Rocon	Cranes Road		30.3.16
Yoga	Mrs Jacqui Morris	01256 881336	29/30.3.16			Goodall Barnard Construction Ltd	Kestrel Court	29/30.3.16	
General			29/30.3.16			Connect Computer Consultants Ltd	Monk Sherborne Rd	29/30.3.16	
Parish of Sherborne & Pamber	John Hamilton Vicar	01256 850434			30.3.16	Medicess Ltd	Chineham lane	29/30.3.16	
St Andrew's SSJ	Sue marrison		29/30.3.16			Loddon School	Field House Barn	29/30.3.16	
	Jenny Cooke		29/30.3.16			Delos Partnership Ltd	Bournefield	29/30.3.16	
Sherborne St John Club		01256 850303	29/30.3.16			John W Edwards	Manor Road	29/30.3.16	

SSJ History Society	Jean Linford	01256 850264	29/30.3.16			C&T Building Services Ltd	Spring Close	29/30.3.16	
Monk Sherborne & District			29/30.3.16			Easiglas	Vyne Lodge Farm	29/30.3.16	
Horticultural Society	Kim Fleming	01256 851225	29/30.3.16			Hall & Ensom	Kestrel Court	29/30.3.16	
The Vyne	Stuart Maughan	01256 883858	29/30.3.16		X	Cellardine Ltd	Cranes Road	29/30.3.16	
					X	Watercress Beds	Dark Lane	29/30.3.16	
Police	Brian Dixon PCSO		29/30.3.16			Healthy Business Studio		29/30.3.16	
Borough Councillor	Cllr Leek		29/30.3.16			Perry Champion		29/30.3.16	
County Councillor	Keith Chapman		29/30.3.16			Basingstoke Vintage Warehouse	Mongers Yard	29/30.3.16	
	Jane Frankum		29/30.3.16			Mr Brown	Watercress beds		30.3.16
	Harvey								

Notification sent to consultees about the Regulation 14 Consultation



[Insert name of consultee, organisation or individual]

31st March 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

Sherborne St John Draft Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation, Statutory Body and Community Consultation according to Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Since February 2012, a group of volunteer residents from Sherborne St John have been working hard to create a Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan) for Sherborne St John for the Plan period to 2029, on behalf of the Parish Council. This group has consulted with the community and they have carefully reviewed all comments from residents and interested parties.

The Plan sets out the vision, objectives and policies by which the parish will manage future sustainable development. Publication of the Pre-Submission draft marks an important step in our Plan's progress, as it initiates the first formal consultation phase from a legal perspective.

As part of this process, we are required to bring the Plan to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the parish, as well as any qualifying body that might be affected by the proposed Plan. As you, or your organization, fall within one of these categories, you are invited to review and comment on the pre-submission documents at:

<http://www.SSJNeighbourhoodPlan.com>.

In addition to the copy online, paper versions of the documents are available to view in the Village Hall and Chute Pavilion when open during the consultation period.

You are invited to consider the Plan, and respond with any comments – whether positive or negative – on the form provided so that we can take these into account. Any representation you wish to make must be in writing and send to the Parish Clerk by e mail ssjclerk@gmail.com or to the address below. The period for the submission of replies is 1st April to 16th May 2016 inclusive.

Please state clearly your name, address, organization (if applicable) and the capacity in which you are responding, e.g. resident, mandatory consultee, neighbouring parish etc. As this is a formal consultation, a summary of comments will be made public in accordance with the Data Protection Act.

Thank you for your interest and involvement with our Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Yours faithfully,

Julian Crawley
Chairman, Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan

Article in Sherborne St John Parish Magazine (April 2016)

The SSJ Neighbourhood Plan
April 2016 Update



Draft Plan Consultation

Open for responses until Monday 16th May



**Reg. 14
Consultation**

The next step is the Regulation 14 Consultation. You are invited to read and comment on the Draft SSJ Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents – which can all be found on the SSJ Neighbourhood Plan website –

www.SSJNeighbourhoodPlan.com

Please use the proforma response on the website to respond, being sure to identify the section/ policy/ specific item you wish to comment on. All comments will be registered, reviewed, answered as appropriate and fed back to all by the Neighbourhood Plan Team. A limited number of hard copies of the Plan will be available for borrowing via the SSJ Clerk – tel: 01189 332379. Please stay involved in your local Neighbourhood Plan! Remember it's all on – www.SSJNeighbourhoodPlan.com - deadline Monday 16th May 2016.

Julian Crawley
SSJ Neighbourhood Plan

Screenshot of consultation webpage (as available during consultation)

<https://ssjneighbourhoodplan.com/>

Sherborne St John

Neighbourhood Plan Reg 14 Consultation

[Plan & Baseline Report](#)

[Supporting Reports](#)

[Appendices](#)



SSJ Neighbourhood Plan

🕒 March 15, 2016 [Main Page](#)

Welcome to the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation

You are invited to read and comment on the Draft SSJ Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents – which can all be found [HERE](#) on the SSJ Neighbourhood Plan website.

A laminated hard copy of the Neighbourhood Plan can also be found in the Village Hall and the Chute Pavilion, and a limited number are available from the Parish Clerk – 01189 332379.

We welcome replies by email if possible to ssjclerk@gmail.com, but you may also reply in hard copy, posting your reply in the Village Hall letter box. The period for reply is 1st April to 16th May 2016 inclusive.

The form to be used for the responses can be found below:

[SSJ Consultation Response Form Reg. 14](#)

The website also contains the following documents which can be accessed in full on the relevant pages from the menu above.

Plan & Baseline Report

SSJ Draft Neighbourhood Plan March 2016 Reg. 14
SSJ Baseline Evidence Report March 2016 Reg. 14

Supporting Reports

SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement R2
SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Review R2
SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Site Sustainability Report R1
BDBC Screening Report – January 2016
SSJ Neighbourhood Plan – Scheme of Delegation R0

Appendices

I. Evidence Base Document v7 09.03.15
II. Action Hampshire SSJ Housing Needs Survey Report
III. SSJ NP Questionnaire
IV. SSJ NP Questionnaire Results
V. SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Draft Report – Revision 4 March 2015
VI. Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites Discussion Paper 12.10.15 R7
VII. SSJ Population Prediction R1
VIII. SSJ Water Resources
IX. Landscape Capacity of SSJ
X. Wildlife Map (to be updated)
XI. SSJ Roads & Traffic Analysis (+ attachments (i), (ii), (iii))
XII. SSJ Village Design Statement 2004
XIII. SSJ Parish Map
XIV. Plan Showing the Location of the Short-Listed Sites A
XV. Plan Showing the Location of the Short-Listed Sites B
XVI. Site Assessments
XVII. Local Green Space Policy Assessments
XVIII. Business & Employment
XIX. 2003 Conservation Area Appraisal for SSJ
XX. 2003 Conservation Area Map for SSJ
XXI. Glossary