
SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

2011 TO 2029



ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

AUGUST 2017



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

	Pages
The consultation comments are separated into the following categories:	
1. Residents' Responses	2
(Residents are numbered and list is available linking the response to name)	
2. Statutory consultees' responses	10
3. Non-Reply from Statutory Consultees	22
4. Developers and Landowners	25
5. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	40



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

1 RESIDENTS' RESPONSES

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
A	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan, for the NPWP a big thanks for all the time and effort, a very comprehensive documents	Noted	No action
B	A lot of hard work has gone into this. Thank you.	Noted	No action
C	<p>Already there are road safety problems, eg speeding on Bramley Lane, ignoring the right of way at the White Hart, bus route on Bow Grove.</p> <p>Building more properties without adequate transport infrastructure would be a disaster for the village. Any development should also support the village with leisure facilities, eg a swimming pool.</p>	<p>The NDP recognises the traffic hazards and road safety issues and seeks to mitigate these where possible. (Policy T3 & Annex D).</p> <p>Developer contributions, including from the CIL fund will be used to improve facilities within the Parish.</p>	No action
D	<p>I would like to see the grass verge along the north-east of Old Reading Road included in the Local Green Space designation. I believe this is HCC owned, adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary (similarly to the BDBC-owned plot, behind Wheelers Court, as shown on the map.) As a resident, I believe the grass verge is an important space to be retained as it presents a pleasant vista when walking to the north of the village, to access the footpaths at the edge of the village.</p> <p>5.3.7 is TO ensure that...</p> <p>6.2.11 Policy H3 box – remove full stop before “and” in 3rd line.</p> <p>6.3.3 Policy D1 box – sense of first sentence?</p> <p>Also the bullets are from f) to i). Is this correct?</p> <p>Table 6-2 N Car Park – add “recreation in right column</p> <p>“Best butcher’s counter for miles around is mentioned twice in document.</p> <p>6.7.4 Policy E1 box – bullets are from J to l)</p>	<p>The PC will be asked to ask HCC for their views about designating the verge as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>The policies have been reworded.</p> <p>Correction made</p> <p>Correction made</p> <p>1 reference removed</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	Tree preservation order is mentioned glossary but nowhere else in the document		Removed
E	Would like to see a footpath/pavement alongside the Bramley road towards Bramley and bus connections into/from Basingstoke after 7pm	The NDP seeks to create a safe footpath and cycle way network. (Policies T1 and T2) Support for improved bus timetable (para. 6.5.8)	New map showing pedestrian and cycle paths throughout and continuing beyond the Parish.
F	We both applaud the hard work put into a good cause. Hoping it will be for the benefit of the whole village.	Noted	No action
G	<p>I applaud the development of a neighbourhood plan for the parish and in setting out a vision for the community of Sherfield on Loddon. My observations and comments are: Policy H2 6.2.11. Where is the evidence to support the statement in the second sentence please, as it is not referred to.</p> <p>While it is noted that residents wish to maintain the rural and historic character of the village it is also noted that additional housing stock is required. From the information provided this is primarily to support those currently living in the village looking to downsize? Bearing in mind that we have an ageing population locally and nationally, I would like to ask if consideration has been given to those people in the older age brackets and to whether they would be willing to move from a community that they know, with relevant support and social networks, to move 1 mile down a busy main road where it would not be easy for them to access the village? I don't think the neighbourhood plan should make the assumption that Redlands and East of Basingstoke developments will meet this need?</p> <p>With regard to policies for transport, improving road safety especially along the A33 within the area is paramount. I support any proposals to help with this while also supporting the development of cycle ways and adequate footpaths between the neighbouring areas. Local businesses</p>	<p>This is one of the Key Conclusions (D) which was identified from community engagement and consultation.</p> <p>There are limited opportunities for development within the main village settlement.</p> <p>The adopted Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) Local Plan (LP) Policy CN3 Housing Mix for Market Housing requires development proposals to take local requirements into account.</p> <p>The NDP seeks to create safe foot and cycle paths throughout the Parish and supports these continuing beyond the Parish to</p>	No action



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>would benefit greatly from a safe way for pedestrians and cyclists to travel between Bramley, Church End and Sherfield Park to the village.</p> <p>As part of support health and wellbeing of the residents there is a need to add to, as well as, improve the village amenities for example, building adequate sports facilities for young and old can only help build the community spirit so it is good to see a ‘wish list’ included (Appendix A) and look forward to hearing about any progress on this.</p> <p>In reading the document it is not clear how the Strategic Aims and conclusions will be measured from adoption of the plan to 2029? It is not clear what the next steps will be to meet these especially as the national and local political landscape changes and evolves over time. How will residents know this plan has made a difference to their community other than being used as well as a document to determine future planning applications for the village?</p>	<p>neighbouring settlements. (Policies T1 and T2)</p> <p>Developer contributions from the CIL fund will be used to improve facilities within the Parish. (LP Policy CN8)</p> <p>This is not the responsibility of the NDP. It is the responsibility of the Parish Council and BDBC to monitor the extent to which the policies set out in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) are being achieved.</p>	
H	<p>Firstly, I wish to congratulate the team for formulating a very comprehensive and informative Neighbourhood Plan and I fully support it. Policy H1/H2- I do not think that the proposal for the extra 200 houses in the East of Basingstoke is a good idea as I believe that it encroaches on the Strategic Gap and more importantly will significantly increase the amount of traffic on the already overloaded A33.</p> <p>Policy H3- Any new housing development in Sherfield-on-Loddon should be in accordance with the villages requirements as determined from previous surveys conducted in the village.</p> <p>Policy D1/2- New houses need to be designed with adequate plot sizes and adequate parking to meet today's families’ needs i.e. 2 parking spaces per dwelling off road.</p>	<p>Two housing sites, one wholly and one partly within the Parish, are allocated in the adopted LP. (Policies SS3.7 & SS3.9)</p> <p>The NDP has based its policies on the views of residents from the consultation events and surveys.</p> <p>Criterion (h) of LP Policy CN9, Transport, requires parking provision in accordance with</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>Also ensure that new developments are not denuded of natural /indigenous trees and shrubbery.</p> <p>Policy G1/2- The village green and strategic Gap must be retained to preserve the character of the village and not let it become a suburb of Basingstoke/Chineham.</p> <p>Policy G3- There are some houses in the village that are already susceptible to flooding/backing up of waste drainage and any development must ensure that this risk is not exacerbated.</p> <p>Policy T1/2- The footpath network needs to be enhanced as do the facilities for introducing cycle paths to encourage greener means of connectivity with adjoining communities. At present it is likened to taking your life in your hands if you try to cycle from the village to the doctors or dentists in Chineham.</p> <p>Policy T3- The quantity of traffic flowing through the village is now close to becoming dangerous. Older folk have difficulty crossing the roads safely and most weekday mornings the A33 and the road from the post office crossroads are gridlocked for minutes at a time. Any new developments must include major improvements to the road infrastructure and signage.</p> <p>Policy C1- The village needs enhanced broadband over the whole area as reception is poor and even non-existent in many areas and if we are to encourage new business/employment opportunities this is an essential service.</p>	<p>the adopted Parking Standards.</p> <p>Policy D2 (criteria g&h) supports planting of indigenous plants.</p> <p>The NDP supports the views of residents from consultations to protect the village green and strategic gap. (Policy G2 of the NDP and LP Policy EM2 - Strategic Gaps)</p> <p>Policy G3 of the NDP and LP Policy EM7 address this issue.</p> <p>The NDP recognises the need for improving cycle and foot paths within the Parish and to neighbouring settlements.</p> <p>The NDP recognises the traffic hazards and road safety issues and seeks to mitigate these where possible. (Policy T3 & Annex D).</p> <p>Policy C1 of the NDP supports this view.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
I	Please note Northfield Road not Northfield Avenue	Noted	Northfield Avenue changed to Northfield Road
J	<p>We have concerns about the flooding which occurs around our property. Clearing debris from the river is mainly left to householders. Neighbours are having to “fortify” their properties, not always in a sympathetic way to the environment.</p> <p>Crossing the roads for our grandchildren is also a hazard which I am happy that the neighbourhood plan is supporting.</p> <p>Very pleased that housing is being limited. We were going to be adversely affected by previous proposals. Thank you for all proposals.</p>	<p>Policy G3 (Reducing Flood Risk) seeks to require developers to show they have taken measures to minimise flooding risks.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	The Policy changed to incorporate comments by Thames Water and H&loW Trust
K	<p>Ref policy H2. If we are required to only build 10 houses, we should use land which is not of visual or; agricultural use (the triangle) instead of greenfield sites.</p> <p>Policy H3. This policy must be adhered to, with smaller affordable houses and bungalows, for the young and elderly, with priority for local people.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	No action
L	<p>SSA1-10 All the main issues and the aims are fully covered</p> <p>H2 (b) Great attention needs to be paid to the design of houses to avoid such monstrosities as at Sherfield Park. Town houses have no place in rural areas.</p> <p>d) The strategic gap was agreed on decades ago but since then building has appeared in the gap.</p> <p>H3 There is an imbalance between the needs of the village and developer’s need to make money! Many of the old villager families are in danger of being lost because insufficient affordable housing. There is a danger of the village becoming a dormitory settlement where people wish to live because it’s attractive, but do not contribute in any way to social matters, eg Parish Council, local clubs etc.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Policy D2 specifies sympathetic design for the rural character of the Parish.</p> <p>LP Policy EM2 – Strategic Gaps, allows small scale development subject to it meeting specific criteria, ie the proposal must not diminish the physical and/or visual separation of the strategic gap.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>D1 (a) – (d) All aims are very important</p> <p>D2 (a) – (m) Well thought out.</p> <p>G1 Planting should be restricted to native trees and hedgerow shrubs.</p> <p>T1 Footpaths should be covered appropriately – no tarmac on rural footpaths and wild flowers given opportunities to flourish.</p> <p>T2 Car drivers need to respect the National Cycle Ways.</p> <p>T3 Car parking on the major roads should be limited as there are car parks provided and along the “dead end” roads parking should be encouraged. People still have two legs for walking.</p> <p>E1 New businesses should be encouraged as they bring people into the village which could be of benefit to local businesses like The Shop, the pubs, House28 and the Village Hall. Adequate parking needs to be provided adjacent to the business.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Policy D2 (criteria g&h) supports planting of indigenous plants.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The NDP recognises the problems with car parking.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>
M	<p>Excellent work and my thanks to all involved. Only 2 minor comments both relating to H1: New Housing. Page 3:</p> <p>1 “Proposals for new housing...will be in principal be supported”. (Change spelling of principal to principle).</p> <p>2 Proposals for new housing outside the defined...will only be support there “they” (instead of “it”).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Changed to “principle”</p> <p>Changed to “they”.</p>
N	<p>I would like to thank everyone who has spent so many hours, days, weeks, months and years working towards this Neighbourhood Plan for Sherfield on Loddon.</p> <p>You have produced a fair and comprehensive document and I cannot see any omissions.</p> <p>I much appreciate all the work which has been done to keep the village with its distinctive character and open spaces.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No action</p>
O	<p>I have read the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, its appendices and annexes, with great interest. The Working Party is to be congratulated on its endeavours.</p> <p>There are two areas which would benefit from more detailed consideration.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>The first relates to design advice, where I note the absence of any mention of a requirement for design of new homes in the village to meet the criteria of Lifetime Homes http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/. Yet, as the plan makes clear, families and individuals tend to stay in the village, growing older and staying put.</p> <p>The second is the need to more seriously address the issue of footpaths and cycle paths to Bramley. This road is so dangerous for walkers and cyclists that before long there will be a fatality. I trust that we will not have to wait for such an event before positive action is taken.</p> <p>Although many people in the village would not contemplate walking to Bramley, or even to the village shop, and others would not raise the need, having become accustomed to there not being a path, there is a pressing need to be able to walk to Bramley Station. Users of such a path would include: commuters to Basingstoke, Reading and beyond (who presently are unable to park in Bramley, so are forced to use private cars to their places of work as the bus service is infrequent, slow and has limited destinations), students attending schools and colleges in Basingstoke and Reading (who presently are reliant on private transport to either Bramley or these final destinations), and residents who quite simply want to travel to Basingstoke, Reading and beyond when it is convenient and not limited by an unsatisfactory bus service. Teenagers in particular are denied the independence they should have, for example, to visit school friends - most</p>	<p>The LP Policy CN4 – Housing for older people/Specialist housing, supports specialist accommodation for older people and those with special needs. LP policies CN1 and CN3 require development proposals for new housing to provide accessible and adaptable homes (that meet requirement M4(2) of the Building Regulations (2015) or any subsequent government standard.</p> <p>The NDP recognises the need for improving cycle and foot paths within the Parish and to neighbouring settlements, including to Bramley. It is the aim of Policy T3 and is on the Project List in Appendix of the NDP.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>of whom will live in other parts of Basingstoke and to pursue activities outside of the village. Quite simply they are either marooned in the village or develop an unhealthy over-dependence on private transport.</p> <p>So, by having a footpath, more people would be able to access the train service, car journeys and hence pollution would be reduced, youngsters would be able to exercise some independence (and their parents would be freed from the tyranny of the family taxi service) and more residents would be able to have a night out in Basingstoke or Reading without needing to worry about using a car or needing to take expensive taxis, especially in the summer months. One result would be very useful exercise for workers, students and other residents, who in turn would reap the benefits of a less sedentary life style.</p> <p>I am aware that creating a footpath would require some deft negotiation with landowners and "the authorities". I am also aware that in the past the need for a path has been subjugated by a supposed threat to the school bus service to Bramley School. If this is the case then the benefits which would accrue to many people, including children beyond primary school age, have been sacrificed to the convenience of this service for a few.</p> <p>To conclude, the Neighbourhood Plan should at the very least have a clear aspiration to develop a footpath to Bramley. In particular this would recognise that footpaths are not just for recreation but are an important and healthy ingredient in a joined up transport system for workers, students and the public in general.</p>		
P	<p>H2: With the potential of housing coming forward for the triangle, should a consideration be to move the settlement boundary to include the "triangle land"?</p> <p>I am very happy with the structure of the NP and the policies that have been developed for the Sherfield on Loddon Parish.</p>	<p>Policy H2 has been revised to support the requirement in LP Policy SS5 for "at least 10 dwellings" within or adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB). It is understood that the area of land referred to qualifies as "adjacent" to the SPB.</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
Allotment Association	Village Facilities Projects List No mention whatsoever of Sherfield allotments, such as toilet facilities being provide or any funding for general improvement projects etc.	The Allotments are a leisure facility for the Parish and are supported by the Parish Council.	Added item “Improvements to the Allotments” to the Project List

2 STATUTORY CONSULTEES RESPONSES

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
Marine Management Organisation	The MMO has no comments to submit in relation to the NDP	Noted	No action
Chineham PC Assistant Clerk	Our Planning Committee considered your draft Neighbourhood Plan at their meeting last night and agreed that they have no specific comments to make. They would like to congratulate your Parish Council on the completion of the plan and thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Noted	No action
Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Savills UK Ltd) Statutory Sewage Undertaker for northern part of BDBC, hence “specific consultation	Thames Water seeks to work closely with the local authorities to plan for the necessary sewerage/wastewater [and water] infrastructure to service development in its area in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: <i>“Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater....”</i> Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: <i>“Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within</i>	Noted	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p><i>their areas.”</i></p> <p>The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that <i>“Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).</i></p> <p>The scale and location of development in Sherfield-on-Loddon will determine the scale and location of any potential sewer network upgrades. However, it is important to consider the net increase in wastewater demand to serve the development and also any impact that developments may have off site, further down the network. It is therefore important that developers demonstrate that adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate reports and appraisals to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be delivered prior to any occupation of the development.</p> <p>Thames Water therefore recommend that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developments demand for Sewage Treatment and sewerage network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met • The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met. <p><i>“Water Supply, Wastewater & Sewerage Infrastructure Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply, waste water capacity and surface water drainage both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not</i></p>	<p>The NDP supports the requirement for adequate infrastructure for wastewater. Policy G3 and supporting text.</p>	<p>This wording has been included in the supporting text of G3.</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p><i>lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and/or waste water infrastructure. Drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows. Where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Council will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered.</i></p>		
	<p>G3 Policy G3: Reducing Flood Risk SuDS</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the wastewater system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewage to reduce the risk of sewer flooding.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises the environmental and economic benefits of surface water source control, and encourages its appropriate application, where it is to the overall benefit of their customers. However, it should also be recognised that infiltration based SuDS are not appropriate in areas with a high water table or limited permeability, but lined attenuation techniques can still be used. SuDS also require regular maintenance to ensure their effectiveness. Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change. SUDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve water quality • Provide opportunities for water efficiency • Provide enhanced landscape and visual features • Support wildlife • And provide amenity and recreational benefits. <p>With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following</p>	Noted	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan: <i>“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”</i></p>	<p>The NDP supports this request.</p>	<p>The proposed wording added to the supporting text for Policy G3.</p>
<p>National Grid (Amec Foster Wheeler)</p>	<p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>About National Grid</p> <p>National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customer. National Grid own four of the UK’s gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines and also National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified the following high voltage overhead powerline as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4VX Route – 400kV from Bramley substation in Basingstoke and Deane to Fleet substation in Hart From the consultation information provided, the above overhead powerline does not interact with any of the proposed development sites. <p><i>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No action</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</p>		
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment on the Sherfield on Loddon, Hampshire – Neighbourhood Development Plan Regulation 14 Consultation. Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the M3. We have reviewed the plan and supporting documents. There is unlikely to be a direct impact to the safe and efficient operation of the M3 (specifically junction 6) from proposals set out in the plan, therefore we offer no comment at this stage.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting the Wildlife Trust on this Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation; we welcome the opportunity to comment. As you will be aware the Wildlife Trust is the co-host of the Loddon Catchment Partnership, and given that the river runs through the north-eastern corner of the parish then along its eastern boundary, we have a particular interest in the area. Like many rivers, the Loddon and its tributaries face numerous pressures, including rural and industrial pollution, water abstraction, the introduction of invasive non-native species and impacts associated with climate change.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that residents value and overwhelmingly support the rural character provided by the natural habitats within the parish as this will help protect the natural environment and the species it supports.</p> <p>There are 16 Local Wildlife Sites (SINCs) located within the parish and whilst it is</p>		



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>important that these are protected, it is also important to ensure that the wildlife outside of these designated sites is protected. There is a growing need to ensure that functioning and coherent ecological networks are secured through the planning system in order to ensure that wildlife has the space to move and adapt as it faces increasing pressure from development and, uncertainty from a changing climate.</p> <p>Section 6.4 Protection of the Natural Environment and Local Green Spaces Paragraph 6.4.1 states, that the character of Sherfield on Loddon is defined by the extent of green space at the heart of the village settlement and the surrounding open countryside, which comprises farmland, golf course and woodland.</p> <p>There is no mention of the River Loddon at this point but given the parish’s history and close association with the river in the past and its nature conservation value, we are surprised that the river and its wildlife does not take greater prominence throughout this plan, but particularly in this section and in Annex E.</p> <p>Policy G1 We are pleased to see the inclusion of this policy but consider that it needs to be more prescriptive in order to protect and enhance the natural environment. As you will be aware the Government has a commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity. The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible. Recent studies have shown that much of the wildlife outside of protected areas is declining and to simply aim for a ‘no net loss’ through the planning system is no longer acceptable and, will not stop the decline. As such all development proposals should seek to deliver ‘net gains’ in biodiversity. In addition, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006) places a duty on all public bodies in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.</p> <p>Annex E highlights that many species of principle importance under Section 41 of the NERC Act have been recorded on the site. Several of the species recorded are protected under European law (for example all bats, European otter and hazel dormouse), and as such development proposals will need to demonstrate that the</p>	<p>The NDP recognises the importance of the biodiversity and ecology of the whole Parish.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Wording in Policy G1 changed from “no net loss” to “net gain” as</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>cover a broader area than just reducing flood risk and should also seek to protect the watercourse from pollution, and enhance the in -channel habitat where possible. We suggest the following policy wording: POLICY G3: Reducing Flood Risk and Protection of the River Catchment Planning applications for developments in Sherfield on Loddon must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. incorporate robust and effective alleviation and mitigation measures for management of rain water run -off and flooding risks from all sources within their boundary and elsewhere in the parish. Where appropriate developments should employ Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for water quality and quantity management purposes; ii. protect local watercourses from adverse impact through increased water consumption, foul water discharge, waste water treatment and agricultural pollution; iii. contribute to the environmental works required to enable the River Loddon to meet the Water Framework Directive target of good status by 2027; <p>We trust that you will find our comments helpful and if you wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to do so. I also ask that you keep the Trust informed of the progress and outcome of this Neighbourhood Development Plan submission.</p>	<p>The NDP supports measures for improvement in water quality in all watercourses flowing through the Parish in line with LP Policy EM6.</p>	<p>Wording of Policy G3 revised to include recommendations.</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning. This sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. Flood Zone 2 & 3 There areas at risk of flooding along the boundary of the plan area. We note this has been referred to within the Plan and addressed within Policy G3 to ensure that any future development proposed in these areas include sufficient mitigation. Should any sites come forward within these areas of flood risk, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 100-102, the Sequential Test should be applied. We would have concerns if development is allocated in this flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.</p> <p>Watercourses A number of watercourses border the plan area namely, the River</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The LP Policy EM7 – Managing Flood Risk, follows the national guidance for sequential approach to development.</p> <p>The NDP supports</p>	<p>Wording of Policy G3</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Loddon, Petty’s Brook and the Bow Brook. These watercourses are currently failing to reach good ecological potential under the Water Framework Directive. Should any development come forward in close proximity to these watercourses we would expect them to include measures to ensure there is no further deterioration and where possible seek to improve the water quality based on the recommendations of the Thames River Basin Management Plan.</p>	<p>measures for improvement in water quality in all watercourses flowing through the Parish in line with LP Policy EM6.</p>	<p>revised to include recommendations.</p>
<p>Historic England</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the pre-submission version of the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood plan. Historic England’s remit is to provide advice on planning for the historic environment including the conservation of heritage assets and the promotion of good design in historic places. As such, we have limited our comments to those areas of the plan that fall within our areas of interest.</p> <p>We are very pleased to see how far the Parish Council have gone in weaving the historic environment into the many different policy element as a golden thread running through the plan. We have no substantive concerns with regard to the proposed plan policies but have suggested a number of wording amendments to ensure the policies conform with the requirements of the NPPF in delivering sustainable development whilst conserving the historic environment. Historic England are pleased to support the requirements for design of new development set out in Policies D1 and D2 which are robustly supported through the character assessment prepared as evidence for the plan.</p> <p>Policy G2 Historic England are happy to support the protection of Local Green Space designations that include green spaces within the conservation area that contribute to the area’s special historic interest and character including the village green.</p> <p>Policy E1 we would suggest that the term ‘minimal impact’ is ambiguous and would be difficult for planning decision makers to use with clarity. We recommend amending bullet point k) to read: “It is demonstrated that the design has sought to avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets and that any unavoidable harm that would result is clearly justified on the basis of public benefits that could not otherwise be delivered.”</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Wording proposed for Policies E1 and C1 included.</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>Policy C1: in order to achieve conformance with the government’s approach as set out in the NPPF we recommend including a clause specifically relating to built heritage requiring:” It is demonstrated that the choice of location and design of any plant has been chosen to avoid or minimise any harm to the significance of heritage assets including impacts on their settings.”</p>		
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Thank you for your consultation received by Natural England Overall Natural England has no concerns regarding this draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) area lies within the 5-7km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and this is taken into account within Annex E of the NPD. Planning applications within these areas will be considered in line with Policy EM3 of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council’s adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>There are no Sites of Special Scientific Interest within the NPD area and it is not anticipated that the NPD itself will have any impacts on SSSIs within surrounding parishes. (Of course any future planning proposals within the NPD area will consider these sites where relevant through the normal planning process.)</p> <p>It is noted that two site allocations within Local Plan lie within the NDP area – ‘Redlands’ and ‘East of Basingstoke’. These allocation sites are situated in close proximity to the ‘Whitmarsh Lane & Piece and ‘Petty’s Brook Strip’ Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs), supporting ancient woodland, and the ‘River Lodden & Lower Mill Fen’ SINC, supporting wet woodland, open water and wetland habitats, and notable species. A further 13 SINCs have been identified within the rest of the NDP area.</p> <p>Natural England requests that subsequent planning applications are supported by detailed assessment of impacts on local wildlife sites within the NDP area, and opportunities for wildlife enhancement incorporated wherever possible – for example</p>	<p>Noted</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	as part of a green infrastructure network. This would be in line with the NDP Policy G1 'Protection and enhancement of the natural environment', which sets out the requirement to avoid/mitigate any adverse impacts of development on biodiversity and the intention to incorporate opportunities for enhancement.		
Hampshire County Council General Comment – Highways matters	Hampshire County Council (HCC) as the Highway Authority agree that the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Plan needs to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least ten homes over the next 15 years in accordance with the adopted Local Plan. It is noted that they will be looking to allocate ten homes through the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the level of development, associated predicted impact on the transport network would be negligible, and thus there are no further comments to make on highway grounds from HCC Strategic Transport. However, any new development sites will be subject to planning permission, and more detailed highway matters (including appropriate highway access) could be raised at that time as part of the determination process.	The NDP is a policy led plan and no sites have been allocated for development. However it does support planning applications within or adjacent to the SPB which fulfil the requirement of Policy SS5 of the LP.	
Further comments from HCC Glenn Parkinson Children's Services Dept	General Comments The provision of additional school places necessary to meet demand from new housing sites will be considered and discussions can be held with local stakeholders.. Travel to school will be a key issue and support will be required to produce school travel plans which will include identifying and supporting through capital contributions new footpaths and cycleways, together with park and stride sites as a comprehensive and cohesive approach to reduce travel to school by car. The contributions will relate to the fact that section 106 contributions could be collected as part of the neighbourhood planning process. It is suggested early discussions are held on these matters and that the parish council contacts relevant HCC officers to discuss.	Noted	
Further comments from Neil Massie, HCC	In the HCC responses to the Basingstoke and Deane requests to feed in to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan a need for a 48 place nursery to support developments at SS3.7 Redlands and SS3.9 East of Basingstoke has been made. The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Plan below refers to these developments and states: 'However, the Local Plan proposes significant additional housing at the south-east end	There are plans for a school in the SS3.9 East of Basingstoke site but outside the Parish boundary.	No action.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to comments	Action taken
	<p>of the Parish at Redlands, where outline planning application for 150 and 15 (165) houses has already been submitted, and the East of Basingstoke site on the south-eastern border of the Parish. In order to emphasise the entirety of the Parish, this Neighbourhood Development Plan will refer throughout to the Parish as a whole rather than use the term village.'</p> <p>Throughout the draft document, the Neighbourhood Plan talks about what is available but does not refer to future needs to meet the increase in housing. However it does state 'Sherfield on Loddon Parish is to be the subject of large scale development in the south of the Parish in compliance with the Local Plan' so the Neighbourhood Plan does acknowledge the requirement outlined above.</p>		



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

3 NON-RESPONSE FROM STATUTORY CONSULTEES

ORGANISATION	ADDRESS
Bramley Parish Council	parishclerk@bramleypc.co.uk
Sherfield Park Parish Council	clerk@sherfieldparkparishcouncil.gov.uk
Hartley Wespall Parish Council	tony@tbaldy.plus.com
Old Basing and Lychpit Council	clerk@oldbasing.gov.uk
Chineham Parish Council	assistantclerk@chineham.gov.uk
Hampshire Association of Local Councils	Sue.ramage@eastleigh.gov.uk
Hart District council	planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk
Sherborne St John PC	ssjclerk@gmail.com
Stratfield Turgis PC	chair@stratfieldturgis.org.uk
Stratfield Saye PC	ssjclerk@gmail.com
West Berkshire	planningpolicy@westberks.gov.uk
Wokingham	LPU@wokingham.gov.uk
East Hampshire District	LocalPlan@easthants.gov.uk
Winchester	ldf@winchester.gov.uk
Test Valley District	planningpolicy@testvalley.gov.uk
Natural England	consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
CPRE	info@cprehampshire.org.uk
English Heritage	customers@english-heritage.org.uk
Primary Care Trust	nhccg.enquiries@nhs.net amy.elliott@hhft.nhs.uk
Network Rail	townplanningSE@networkrail.co.uk
Office of Rail and Road	DutytoCooperate@orr.gsi.gov.uk
Stagecoach	South.enquiries@stagecoachbus.com
Hampshire Constabulary	Hampshire Constabulary c/o Southern Support and Training Headquarters Hamble Lane, Hamble



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

	Southampton, Hampshire SO31 4TS Hampshire Police Authority Westgate Chambers Staple Gardens, Winchester SO23 8AW
Scottish and Southern Electricity	system.planning.south@sse.com
Southern Electric	PO Box 514, Basingstoke RG21 8WS
Southern Gas	plantlocation@sgn.co.uk
South East Water	wre@southeastwater.co.uk
Southern Water	Southern Water Southern House, Lewes Road, Brighton BN1 9PY
Homes and Communities Agency	mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk
The Coal Authority	planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk
British Telecom/Openreach	newsitereceptionnorthdowns@openreach.co.uk
O2 and Vodafone	EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk
EE/Orange	public.affairs@ee.co.uk
Virgin Media	enquiries@virginmedia.com
Talk Talk	customerservices@talktalkbusiness.co.uk
Bramley C of E Primary School	adminoffice@bramley.hants.sch.uk
Everest Community College	info@everestcommunityacademy.org
Office for Nuclear Regulation	ONRenquiries@onr.gsi.gov.uk
Local Enterprise Partnership aka Enterprise M3	info@enterprisem3.org.uk
National Trust	National Trust Planning Adviser Micheldever Hub, Micheldever Station Winchester SO21 3FL
MOD	Ministry of Defence c/o Bramley Camp, Bramley, Hampshire
Sherfield School	Sherfield School, Sherfield on Loddon, Hook RG27 0HU
The Loddon School	info@loddonschool.org
Voluntary bodies	stephenmorgan@bvaction.org.uk
Bodies representing the interests	info@bmforum.org.uk



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

of Black Asian & Ethnic Minority person in the area	
Bodies representing the interest of different religious groups in the area	Islam.jalaita@basingstoke.gov.uk
Bodies representing the interest of businesses in the area	Mark.baulch@hampshirechamber.co.uk
Bodies representing the interests of disabled persons in the area	info@bddf.org.uk
Age Concern	Age Concern, White Hart Lane, Basingstoke RG21 4AF
Transition Basingstoke	info@basingstoketransition.org.uk
Natural Basingstoke	admin@naturalbasingstoke.org.uk
Cycle Basingstoke	secretary@cyclebasingstoke.org.uk

Developers		
Redlands House	John Wilby, MD Glo-Homes	john.wilby@glogroup.co.uk
Redlands	Mr Paul Watson Phillips Planning Services Kingsbrook House 7 Kingsway Bedford MK42 9BA	paul@phillips-planning.co.uk



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

4. DEVELOPERS AND LANDOWNERS

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
Mitchell Properties Ltd	<p>Mitchell Properties, the owner of land at Breach Lane and north of Wildmoor Lane (including the Breach Farm buildings), has previously confirmed to the Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Group that it is interested in promoting a site for small to medium scale residential development.</p> <p>This site could be brought forward pursuant to a neighbourhood plan allocation if made, reflecting local need and in accordance with policy SS5 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029), adopted May 2016.</p> <p>The proposal would comprise up to 50 new homes.</p> <p>Importantly, the site is not in the strategic gap and not in the flood plain. It offers potential to improve pedestrian links across the A33 and improve access to the rural footpaths, private school and golf club. The landowner would be willing to open up access to further land to create additional walks and public open space.</p> <p>As the site lies within a conservation area, there would be a commitment to a high quality proposal with good strategic planting.</p> <p>Specific comment on the current plan content is as follows:</p> <p>- we suggest that para 3.2.5.3 presents an inaccurate summary and interpretation of Local Plan Policy SS5 and the neighbourhood plan approach requires amending accordingly, including the allocation of a specific site or sites for development. The correct wording should acknowledge that <u>it will be necessary to identify specific sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to the settlement.</u></p> <p>NB – development at Redlands is to contribute to the growth needs of Basingstoke rather than Sherfield on Loddon and should not therefore count towards meeting the ‘at least 10 homes’ requirement.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The NDP is a policy-led plan but it does accept the sites allocated in the LP SS3.7 and SS3.9 which are expected to provide at least 365 new homes in the Parish. It is the view of the Parish Council that there is no need for more homes other than those to meet LP Policy SS5.</p> <p>The NDP supports the requirement in Policy SS5 but once that has been met any proposals for development outside the Settlement Policy Boundary will be subject to relevant LP policies for new housing in the countryside. (Policy H2 of the NDP and Policy SS6 of the LP). Thus the Policy H2 is in general conformity with the LP.</p>	No action



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>- Policy H1 fails to conform with Local Plan Policy SS5 as it does not identify specific sites / opportunities to deliver at least homes. Policy H2 also fails to satisfy the adopted Local Plan requirement.</p> <p>On the basis of the above we suggest that the plan currently fails to meet basic conditions as it is not in accordance with strategic policy SS5 of the adopted Basingstoke Local Plan.</p> <p>Mitchell Properties would be happy to further discuss with the neighbourhood plan group how the allocation of residential development of land within its control can satisfactorily resolve the above.</p>	<p>The amendments to Policies H1 and H2 enable development proposals to come forward to satisfy the “at least 10 dwellings” requirement.</p> <p>Policy H1 recognises that there are no obvious potential sites suitable for meeting the requirements of SS5 within the SPB.</p>	
Savills, for Miller Homes Sherfield Hill Farm	<p>We represent Miller Homes Ltd who have an interest in land at Sherfield Hill Farm, Sherfield on Loddon, which lies within the Sherfield On Loddon designated Neighbourhood Plan Area. The site is located to the southern end of the designated area, directly north of Land at Redlands and the east (across the A33) from Sherfield Hill Park / Taylors Farm. You may recall that Sherfield Hill Farm was promoted for residential development for 240 dwellings as part of the examination into the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. The site was considered by the Inspector as an omission site and whilst not included in the adopted plan as a proposed development site, the Inspector identified it as a ‘front runner’ for development in the future. Please find the relevant extract below from the Inspectors Report (Mike Fox, date 06/04/2016): “Sherfield Hill Farm, Sherfield on Loddon Para 184. This site has capacity for approximately 240 dwellings, including AH and community/health facilities. The SHLAA states that the site would extend urban development into the countryside and it is not considered to be suitable for a strategic allocation. However, the site is well related to allocation SS3.7 Redlands, and urban facilities and services. In the event that the Council could not demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing, this site</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The LP Policy SS5 states that proposals to satisfy the “at least 10 dwellings” requirement must be within or adjacent to the SPB. Sherfield Hill Farm is not within or adjacent to the SPB. The SoL NDP is a policy-led plan and has not considered sites.</p> <p>The Plan runs from 2011 to</p>	No action



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>could be considered a ‘front runner’ in view of its sustainability credentials and proximity to eastern Basingstoke; alternatively, the site could be assessed as part of the process of site selection in an emerging NP” (Page 39). The Inspector therefore recognises the site as being well located to development, well located in relation to facilities and services, and as a ‘front runner’ should the Council not be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing in the future. The Inspector also notes that the site could be assessed as part of site selection in a neighbourhood plan. Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states that “Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan”. To this end, if the Parish Council are of the view that Land at Sherfield Hill Farm has the potential to assist in developing the neighbourhood plan, then Miller Homes are available and willing to engage with the Parish Council where this is of assistance. It is recognised at this time that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan need not allocate such a development site, however, in anticipation of the site coming forward in the future given its ‘front runner’ status, it was considered appropriate at this time to offer the ability to meet and commence with early engagement over how the development may take shape in the future. Given the Inspectors positive commentary to Sherfield Hill Farm, the site will be promoted and considered for development via the next review of the Local Plan which we believe is likely to commence within a relatively short timeline (another 1-2 years). In consequence, it is likely that there will need to be a review of the Neighbourhood Plan shortly thereafter in order to be in conformity with the Local Plan. We consider it would be helpful if the Neighbourhood Plan included reference to the likelihood of needing to reconsider the content of the Neighbourhood Plan within a relatively short period such that the reader is not misinformed regarding the likely longevity of the plan. As noted, Miller Homes would be happy to engage with the Parish and Neighbourhood Plan Working Party concerning Sherfield Hill Farm if they can be of any assistance in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, if not, we will look forward to engaging with the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Working Party in relation to the site when the next review / reiteration of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan commences.</p> <p>We would also like to take this opportunity to comment upon Draft Policy D2 ‘Design of</p>	<p>2029 and it is not possible to anticipate any changes in this timescale at this time.</p> <p>The NDP supports high</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>new development’, and in particular Criteria b which states that all new development must wherever possible ‘Provide sufficient internal space as defined in the Technical housing standards – national space standards’. The introduction of space standards can have implications on the range of product, the affordability of housing and the viability of development(s). As a result, before being introduced, space standards need to be subject to robust assessment which should be properly tested through the Local Plan process (rather than Neighbourhood Plans). As a consequence a number of Local Authorities choose not to adopt such standards, including Basingstoke and Deane. The Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan states at Paragraph 6.83 that residential development should provide ‘sufficient internal space and external amenity space’. Therefore, whilst we note the Neighbourhood Plans desire to ‘further refine this by requiring all new developments to conform to the national space standard’ (Para. 6.3.11 Neighbourhood Plan) we do not consider that this has been fully considered or subject to robust evidence and justification.</p>	<p>quality design and building for new developments.</p>	
Gladman	<p>The preparation of the SoLNP will need to be prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions as set out in Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended). Upon reviewing the pre-submission version of the SoLNP, Gladman is concerned that the Plan’s policies and objectives are not in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Accordingly, this response seeks to request further clarity on the preferred approach and where necessary recommend a number of modifications to ensure the Plan can be found consistent with the basic conditions to which the Plan will be tested against. Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan Policy H1. This policy states that proposals for new housing outside the defined settlement policy boundary will only be supported where it meets the criteria set out in other policies in the neighbourhood plan and also relevant policies in the Local Plan. Gladman does not support the use of an inflexible settlement boundary policy if it would act to preclude the delivery of otherwise sustainable development opportunities from coming forward. Indeed, as recognised by the Local Plan there is a clear need for additional housing development beyond the defined settlement boundary and this brings into question whether development will be</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The NDP has been drawn up taking the NPPF and PPG requirements into account.</p> <p>It is considered the NDP is in accordance with its Basic Conditions.</p>	No action



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>supported by the neighbourhood plan to meet these ‘minimum’ housing requirements. The purpose of policy H1 should seek to add value to the existing policy framework and include policies that are distinctive to the local area. There is no need to repeat policies contained in the adopted Local Plan where these do not add value to the existing policy framework, as these will be taken into consideration regardless of whether or not they are included in the SoLNP.</p> <p>Policy H2 Gladman does not consider the criteria attached to this policy to be effective or to have regard to national and local policy. Firstly, criteria a) only offers support to individual proposals that are for 5 to 10 dwellings. Policy SS5 of the adopted Local Plan allows for development of ‘at least’ 10 dwellings adjacent to the defined settlement boundary, whereas policy H2 as currently proposed, would prevent any further development beyond 10 dwellings. Indeed, the policy states that once the 10 dwelling requirement has been satisfied proposals for new housing development adjacent to the defined settlement boundary will only be supported if they are in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside. Gladman questions whether this policy criterion is sufficiently aspirational and is consistent with the Local Plan’s approach. The Local Plan does not state that satisfying the requirements to deliver ‘at least’ 10 homes should represent some form of cap or limit on further housing development, indeed it suggests that further sustainable development above this figure could and should be accommodated. This approach is also considered to be contrary to paragraph 184 of the Framework which states: “Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community. The ambition of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. The</p>	<p>Policy H2 has been revised to satisfy the requirements of LP Policy SS5. The NDP is a policy-led plan and does not allocate sites but Policy H2 supports development proposals which come forward to satisfy the “at least 10 dwellings” requirement within or adjacent to the SPB.</p> <p>Once this requirement has been met, any further proposals will be subject to relevant Local Plan policies for housing in the countryside.</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>adopted Local Plan does not seek to limit further growth. In order to meet full objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing, policy SS5 states that a further 150 homes will need to be identified in areas outside of those listed under the policy to deliver ‘at least’ 10 homes within and adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries.’ The use of minimum housing targets has previously been considered in examiners’ reports for ‘made’ neighbourhood plans, For example, the examiner’s report for the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan¹ in Mid Sussex stated that: “Given that the strategic objective of the plan refers to “at least 130”, I assume it to be a minimum. If it were to be a maximum this would not allow for the flexibility the Framework seeks in responding to changing condition.” (deed, the position is further supported in the examiner’s report to the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan which stated that: “Core Strategy Policy CS2 refers to the overall housing provision for the District as a minimum, using the wording ‘at least’ I recommend that reference to a target of 45 dwellings in Policy BP2 be stated as a minimum....” Accordingly, the housing policies contained in the SoLNP should be seen as a minimum figure to be achieved in order to allow for sufficient flexibility going forward should other settlements in the district be unable to accommodate any further growth. The Neighbourhood Plan’s policies should recognise that there will be opportunities to deliver further sustainable growth, over and above the requirement to provide ‘at least’ ten homes outside of the village’s settlement boundary.</p> <p>Secondly, Gladman also raises concern with criteria (d) which suggests that development will not be supported if it is located in the Strategic Gap or in the River Loddon Flood Plain. The adopted Local Plan makes clear that ‘development in gaps will only be permitted where it would not diminish the physical and/or visual separation, it would not compromise the integrity of the gap either individual or cumulative with other existing proposed development or it is proposed through a NDP or Neighbourhood Development Order, including Community Right to Build Orders’.</p> <p>However, Policy H2 as currently proposed would instead act as a blanket restriction to future growth contrary to the Local Plan Policy EM2 and the PPG3. The policy should instead recognise that the principle of development will be supported provided that it would not diminish the purpose of the strategic gap. Indeed, this issue was discussed</p>	<p>The NDP supports LP Policy EM2 which maintains physical and visual separation between settlements. Policy H2 has been revised and no longer refers to the strategic gap.</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>in the Officer’s Report for Land to the north of Goddards Lane, which confirmed that: “...the site is located 2km from the nearest settlement to the south west, Sherfield Park and over 800m from the eastern edge of Bramley to the north west. Between the application and Bramley is the Bulls Down Camp, which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. These distances between the application site and the nearest settlements would negate any coalescence of settlements resulting from the proposed development and any perception of the proposal leading to continuous built development between Sherfield on Loddon and Bramley, or Sherfield on Loddon and Sherfield Park. Furthermore the location of Bullsdown Camp between Bramley and Sherfield on Loddon would prevent further sprawl of residential development beyond the application and would therefore prevent the amalgamation of the two villages and retain their identities. On this basis it is considered that the proposals would not be contrary to Policy EM2 of the adopted Local Plan”.</p> <p>Thirdly, criteria e) states that development will only be supported where there are no adverse impacts on strategic views, green spaces, valued areas of woodland and ecologically sensitive habitats. In this regard paragraph 113 of the Framework refers to the need for criteria based policies in relation to proposals affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas, and that protection should be commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and contribution to wider networks. As currently drafted Gladman does not believe that this element of policy H2 is consistent with the approach set out within the Framework and therefore jeopardises the Plan’s ability to be found consistent with the basic conditions.</p> <p>Policy H3 In principle, Gladman support the general thrust of this policy but it is important to note that the evidence prepared by Action Hampshire only received a response rate of 46% and therefore could result in an under representation of housing need. This evidence merely provides a snapshot in time and we would therefore suggest that reference to ‘the most up-to-date assessment of housing need’ is included in the policy text to ensure that this policy remains up-to-date and effective over the plan period.</p> <p>Site Submission The Parish Council is aware of Gladman’s land interest in Sherfield-on-Loddon at Land north of Goddards Lane (Application reference: 16/00265/OUT).</p>	<p>Criterion e) is no longer part of Policy H2.</p> <p>The housing need identified by the Action Hampshire Housing Survey Report would be more than met by developments in SS3.7 and SS3.9.</p> <p>The views of the residents from various consultations</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>site. Mill Lane Estates are now working with the administrators to bring forward the site for development. Prior to entering administration, GBDSL attended a meeting with the Parish Council and local residents in March 2015 to present initial proposals for development, and subsequently, Mill Lane Estates have provided an update to the Parish Council and residents in September 2016.</p> <p>With the necessary land agreements in place with Mill Lane Estates, the strategy has been to progress development of the site as soon as possible. A full consultant team has been appointed with a view to delivering a high quality scheme of 15-17 dwellings comprising a mix of market and affordable tenures. A third meeting was held with the Parish Council and members of the public on 12 April 17. The meeting slides attached (Appendix A) demonstrate the principles of the proposed scheme. This meeting followed the theme of the previous two meetings and demonstrated that there is support for the approach taken towards the site and the collaborative programme of engagement that the applicant has adopted with local people.</p> <p>A request for pre-application advice from Basingstoke District Council was submitted on 2May 2017. The pre-app presents two schemes one with 15 and one with 17 dwellings with associated landscaping and access. The final details of the scheme are currently being worked up, however, the principles are consistent with that proposed in the Parish meeting in April. The next steps will be for Mill Lane Estates to hold a public drop in in the next couple of months; details will be circulated nearer the time. A planning application is planned this summer.</p> <p>Policy assessment</p> <p>Each policy in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan in turn has been assessed below and amendments are proposed.</p> <p>Policy H1 - New Housing. This policy is supported as it adds significant weight to our Proposal by providing a clear position for accepting the principle of residential development in the village.</p> <p>Policy H2 - New Housing Developments Adjacent to and outside the Settlement Policy Boundary. This policy has five sub-headings. Parts (b)-(e) are supported as they too add significant weight to our Proposal. The policies ensure there is suitable growth outside the village whilst maintaining appropriate control over the sprawl of Sherfield into</p>	<p>Once this requirement has been met, any further proposals will be subject to relevant Local Plan policies for housing in the countryside. (Policy H2 and LP Policy S6)</p> <p>The revised Policy H2 does not prevent a planning application being submitted on the site. All development proposals will be assessed on their own merits and against the policies in the Local and Neighbourhood Development Plans.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>adjacent villages.</p> <p>Part (a) of Policy H2 is not supported in full. It states: “In order to satisfy the Local Plan requirement SS5 for at least 10 dwellings to be delivered outside, but adjacent, to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary within the plan period new housing proposals will only be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Individual proposals are for 5 to 10 dwellings, b) Are in keeping with the rural and historic character of the area, c) Have convenient and safe access for pedestrians and traffic, d) Are not in the Strategic Gap or in the River Loddon Flood Plain, e) There are no adverse impacts on strategic views, green spaces, valued areas of woodland and ecologically sensitive habitats. <p>Once the ‘at least 10 dwelling’ requirement has been satisfied, proposals for new housing adjacent to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary will only be supported if they are in accordance with relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside. All proposals for new housing outside, but not adjacent, to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary will only be supported if they are in accordance with relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside. ”</p> <p>We propose the wording of the policy to read: “In order to satisfy the Local Plan requirement SS5 for at least 10 dwellings to be delivered outside, but adjacent, to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary within the plan period new housing proposals will only be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) New residential developments are of a scale compatible to the village setting, b) Are in keeping with the rural and historic character of the area, c) Have convenient and safe access for pedestrians and traffic, d) Are not in the Strategic Gap or in the River Loddon Flood Plain, e) There are no adverse impacts on strategic views, green spaces, valued areas of woodland and ecologically sensitive habitats. <p>Once the ‘at least 10 dwelling’ requirement has been satisfied, Proposals for new housing adjacent to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary will only be supported if</p>	<p>Policy H2 has been revised.</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>they are in accordance with relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside. All proposals for new housing outside, but not adjacent, to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary will only be supported if they are in accordance with relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside.” Below are our reasons as to why we believe part (a) of policy H2 should be amended to remove the lower and upper limit of dwellings that can be delivered adjacent to the settlement boundary. It will set out why the policy should be amended to enable the Proposal to come forward as a Neighbourhood Plan policy compliant scheme, and is structured in line with guidance set out by the National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG) to demonstrate that it is the only suitable, available, and achievable site either within or adjacent to Sherfield-on-Loddon. It is also the only scheme in the last five years that has received the full support of the Parish Council; this will be explained further below.</p> <p>Housing need Policy SS5 requires “150 homes will need to be identified in areas outside of those listed above and it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries”. Sherfield-on-Loddon is one of said settlements. The Council’s AMR (2016) provides an update on this target and states that: “Monitoring for 2015/16 concluded that 201 qualifying units have been completed/committed over the plan period to date (2011 - 2016) that meet the criteria of SS5 as it relates to smaller settlements with SPBs. The settlements of Ashford Hill, Old Basing, St Mary Bourne, Tadley/Baughurst/Pamber Heath, Upton Grey and Woolton Hill have met their Policy SS5 requirement. 7 settlements have yet to fulfil their requirement including Burghclere which has 6 qualifying units to date. The policy states that each of the named settlements will need to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to the settlement, and therefore 'at least' 64 homes are left to be delivered (10 units at each of the 6 settlements where no development has qualified for SS5 over the plan period and 4 homes at Burghclere).” Accordingly, there is a responsibility for Sherfield-on-Loddon to make its commitment to the District-wide shortfall against Policy SS5, to enable to proper implementation of the Local Plan. The assessment of developable sites to contribute housing supply is found within the</p>	<p>Policy H2 has been revised to satisfy the requirements of LP Policy SS5. The NDP is a policy-led plan and does not allocate sites. There is no need for further new homes beyond those required to meet LP Policy SS5. Policy H2 supports development proposals which come forward to satisfy the “at least 10 dwellings” requirement within or adjacent to the SPB. Once this requirement has</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>NPPF and NPPG, which define the criteria of suitability, availability and achievability. This assessment is undertaken below.</p> <p>Suitability</p> <p>In accordance with the NPPG a site is considered ‘suitable’ for development when assessed against its:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physical limitations; - Landscape impact; - Appropriateness and market attractiveness; - Contribution to regeneration priority areas; and - Environmental/amenity impacts on occupiers and neighbouring areas. <p>When assessing the suitability of sites within the defined settlement boundary of Sherfield-on-Loddon, using Figure 6.5 Settlement Boundary of the draft Neighbourhood Plan as a guideline, there are 10 possible sites to consider for development (Appendix B). These are all classed as allotments, local sports pitches, or Village Greens. Draft Neighbourhood Plan policy G2 does not permit development on local Green Spaces ‘unless there are very special circumstances’. This demonstrates the high value of this land and the strong need to keep it undeveloped. In this respect, there are no sites considered suitable within the defined village boundary. When assessing the suitability of sites adjacent to Sherfield-on-Loddon, attention is drawn to policy H2 part (d), which states proposals will only be supported provided they are not in the Strategic Gap or in the River Loddon Flood Plain (Appendix C). When overlaid over a map, the areas cover the entire west and north of the settlement boundary leaving just the eastern edge; at this edge the settlement is bounded by the A33. Here lies a clear physical barrier; any proposal outside the A33 would create a distinct gap in development causing residents to be isolated from the main village and harming residential amenity. A proposal in this area would therefore not be in accordance with Local Plan Policy SS6 New Housing in the Countryside which states ‘development proposals for new housing outside of settlement policy boundaries will only be permitted where they do not result in an isolated form of development’. It also does not accord with part (c) of the policy H2 that requires all development to be safely accessed by pedestrians and vehicles. By process of elimination, the land where the</p>	<p>been met, any further proposals will be subject to relevant Local Plan policies for new housing in the countryside. (Policy H2 and LP Policy SS6)</p> <p>There are no obvious potential sites within the Settlement Boundary which would meet the requirements of SS5.</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>Proposal lies is the only suitable area as it is not within the defined constrained areas and lies on the western side of the A33, providing a natural small-scale extension to the village. Moreover, a map produced by the Neighbourhood Group provisionally identified four potential sites that were preferable for ‘small-scale development’ (Appendix D). When assessing these against policy H2 part (d), the three sites to the south and west would all be omitted, leaving the Proposal as the only remaining suitable for development. This further reiterates the suitability of the site.</p> <p>Availability A site is considered available for development when there is confidence that there are no legal ownership problems, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners. The availability of land within and around the settlement boundary is unknown and therefore cannot be commented on, however it is known there are no landownership issues with the Proposal at Reading Road and is therefore available immediately for development.</p> <p>Achievability A site is considered achievable when there is reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. The viability of the site and the capacity of the developer to complete and let/sell the development over a certain period should be factors in assessment. When considering a site’s achievability is the accordance with development plan policies and level of support received by the Parish Council are relevant. As mentioned previously, the Proposal has received strong support from the outset from the Parish Council. This stands in contrast to two other proposals that have come forward also at the edge of the defined settlement boundary in the last five years. A site currently in planning for the erection of 5 no. dwellings with associated garages, landscaping and access to the rear of Little Bowlings, Goddards Lane (ref. 17/00820/FUL), falls within the Strategic Gap and is contrary to the development plan. It has received strong objection from the Parish Council despite the principle of residential development being agreed from a previous planning permission for 4 houses, approved on 14 July 2016 (ref.15/01460/OUT). The Parish objected on eight counts, of note was that the proposal is located in the Strategic Gap. Another significant reason was the lack of</p>		



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>consideration for local housing need, for 3-bedroom units or below.</p> <p>The withdrawn appeal at the land at Goddards Lane (ref.16/00265/OUT) for an “outline application with 5 access to be considered for residential development of up to 95 dwellings (including 40% affordable) and demolition of garages to form a vehicular access point from Bow Drive and associated ancillary works; replacement garaging, planting and landscaping, informal open space, children's play area and surface water attenuation” was refused on 24 June 2016 for 5 reasons. The Parish council strongly objected, citing the Strategic Gap as one of the reasons for objection. The appeal was heavily reliant on the Council being unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing. Given that the Council can demonstrate a sufficient housing supply, development plan policies relating to housing hold full weight. Accordingly, this site is not achievable.</p> <p>The Parish support for the Proposal currently stands in conflict with draft policy H2 part (a), which has the potential to affect the approval of planning permission and the achievability of the site. Amending the wording of the policy would align with what the Parish believe is best for the pattern of development of the village and the site would thus be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Type of housing required</p> <p>In conjunction with the Parish’s support, the Proposal coming forward brings about multiple planning benefits to Sherfield-on-Loddon. Principally, it responds directly to housing need in the village. Table 6.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs shows a high demand for 2 and 3 bed dwellings is 54% of the total market and affordable need. Our draft proposals will provide 80% 2 and 3 bed dwellings and therefore seeks to address the significant need for this size of family housing. Bearing the above in mind and taking into account the adopted Local Plan Policy SS5 stating ‘it is necessary to identify sites to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to settlement policy boundaries’, the Site proposed by Mill Lane Estates is considered the only site appropriate and capable of delivery of development within or adjacent to Sherfield-on-Loddon. Therefore we urge the re-wording of the policy to allow for the Proposal to be acceptable.</p> <p>Policy D1 Preserving and Enhancing the Historic Character and Rural Setting of</p>	<p>Policy H2 has been revised.</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>Sherfield-on-Loddon is supported as it recognises the importance to conserving the historic and rural character of the village when accommodating for growth. Our emerging proposals will be formed around these principles.</p> <p>Policy D2 Design of Development is supported. It is essential that new proposals coming forward embody good design practices and are of an aesthetic suited and appropriate to the village. The policy ensures the unique character of Sherfield is preserved in all new development, which is supported, and so our emerging proposals will seek to incorporate all of these elements listed.</p> <p>Policy G1 Protection and Enhancement of the Natural Environment is supported as it suitably prevents adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecology that may result from new development. As such, our emerging proposals will be supported by robust ecological, arboricultural and landscaping surveys that will identify assets and incorporate necessary mitigation to support the key features.</p> <p>Policy G2 Protection of Local Green Spaces is supported and adds weight to our position that Local Green Spaces in the village are sacrosanct and not an option when seeking to meet Sherfield’s housing target.</p> <p>Policy G3 Reducing Flood Risk is supported and adds weight to our position that areas of fluvial Flood Risk in the village are not an option when seeking to meet Sherfield’s housing target. Furthermore, a localised drainage strategy will be prepared to ensure that sustainable principles are installed and the development will give rise to no surface water flood risk.</p> <p>Policy T1 Improving and Enhancing the Footpath Network is supported, but not applicable to our scheme.</p> <p>Policy T2 Creating a Cycle Network is supported and we would be willing to discuss a cycle lane provision as part of our access strategy.</p> <p>Policy T3 Improving Road Safety in Sherfield-on-Loddon is supported and a comprehensive highway safety assessment will accompany our planning application.</p> <p>Policy CF1 supporting Local Community Facilities is supported, but not applicable to our scheme.</p> <p>Policy E1 New Employment Development is supported, but not applicable to our scheme.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response to Comments	Action taken
	<p>Policy C1 Enabling Fibre Optic and Telecommunications Connections is supported.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The policies set out in the draft Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan are strongly supported by my client and only a minor, yet important, amendment to part (a) of policy H2 is recommended. This is in order to enable a scheme that has been long supported by the Parish Council to come forward as policy compliant. My client has demonstrated their intention to work together with the Neighbourhood Group to help Sherfield-on-Loddon ensure future development is appropriate, sustainable, and in accordance with local and national policies.</p> <p>The Proposal coming forward has been demonstrated to be on the most suitable, available, and achievable site both within and around Sherfield-on-Loddon however the most appropriate scheme for this site is currently constrained by part (a) of policy H2 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. It is the desire of my client to re-word this policy so officers at Basingstoke and Deane Council can support the scheme.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>There has been no planning application for such a scheme put forward to the Planning Authority so has not been discussed by the Parish Council. All they have done is allowed the developers to present their hypothetical schemes to residents at public meetings.</p>	

6 BASINGSTOKE AND DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Respondent	Comments	Response	Action
Basingstoke and Dean Borough Council	<p>Basic Conditions</p> <p>Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Policies D1, G1, CF1 and C1 need improved clarity.</p> <p>Need for more relevant information to be provided in the introductory text to each section to be related more directly to particular policies.</p> <p>Concern that there could be potential areas of conflict between the SoL NDP and the NPPF and PPG. Policies need to be “clear and unambiguous”. Refer to policies H2 and D2, which require added flexibility to ensure they plan positively to support local development. Some policies need greater precision and detail to ensure they can be applied consistently and with confidence in the determination of planning applications.</p>	Noted.	Changes made to the specified policies.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Respondent	Comments	Response	Action
	Contribute to achievement of sustainable development The majority of the policies seek to support sustainable development. Some policies, eg design, may affect the viability and deliverability of new housing development.	The policies reflect National Guidelines and the Local Plan.	
	General conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan The SoL NDP does not identify any specific sites of opportunities for SS5 requirement for at least 10 houses within or adjacent to the SPB.	Noted	No action
	European obligations and human rights requirements There is no requirement for a SEA, HRA. The inclusion of the EIA is welcomed.	Noted	No action

Part 2 – LPA detailed assessment of the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan and supporting documentation

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Foreword – page 4	The second paragraph should be amended to more accurately reflect the Basic Conditions. One of which is “whether the neighbourhood plan has regard to national planning policy and guidelines” and another “whether the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the borough council’s development plan	It was agreed to change the wording to reflect the comments by BDBC.	Wording changed as recommended.
Foreword – page 4	Change the date that the Neighbourhood Planning Area was changed to 2015	Agreed	Changed
Foreword – page 4	Change the number of dwellings to be built on the Redlands site to 167. The outline planning application for 150 homes on the majority of the Redlands site has been granted permission. A full application on the Redlands Garden site for 17 dwellings is currently being considered by the LPA. Make clear that the Redlands and East of Basingstoke sites are Local Plan allocated housing sites.	Agreed	
Section 1	It is not fully clear what is meant by the following sentence in the paragraph: “Its purpose is to produce an agreed version of the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan taking into	Amend the wording of the final sentences.	Changed to “It comprises the evidence and supporting arguments for



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>account the views of Parish residents and other statutory consultees which will be the subject of a Parish Referendum.”</p> <p>Consider deleting this paragraph or rewording to make clear about the different stages of the neighbourhood plan.</p>		the Plan Policies and takes into account the views of consultees. It will be the subject of a public referendum.”
Paragraph 2.1.12	<p>Paragraph should be amended as follows to ensure accuracy:</p> <p>“...they comprise a 9 hectare site which is allocated by policy SS3.7 of the Local Plan for approximately 165 dwellings. As well as this site, there is a site known as East of Basingstoke extending from Redlands to Old Basing, which is partly within Sherfield on Loddon parish and is allocated by policy SS3.9 of the Local Plan for approximately 450 dwellings within the plan period (2011-2029). The exact number of dwellings from the East of Basingstoke site to be delivered in the parish has not yet been determined but could be as many as 200. Therefore the small parish of Sherfield on Loddon will be required under the Local Plan to absorb approximately 365 additional dwellings before 2029, this will result in a 50% increase in the total number of dwellings (736 dwellings (2011 Census)) in the parish. Policy SS3.9 states that the East of Basingstoke site as defined on the Local Plan Policies Map has capacity for approximately 900 dwellings. A potential later phase for 450 dwellings may be delivered beyond the plan period.”</p>	Agreed	Wording changed as suggested.
Para 2.2.2	<p>Amend the paragraph as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“The Neighbourhood Development Plan will when made, form part of the Development Plan for the parish and will be used by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, as Local Planning Authority, to guide planning decisions in the parish...”</p> <p>With regards to the second sentence of the paragraph, the Neighbourhood Planning Area to which this plan relates was</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Wording changed as recommended.</p> <p>Date corrected</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	designated in August 2015.		
Para 2.2.3	Although the following sentence is accurate it is considered that it is not required to state this within the Neighbourhood Plan: “...Neighbourhood Development Plans that do not closely follow the Regulations in the way they are produced may be vulnerable to legal challenge later.”	Agreed	Wording deleted as recommended.
Para 2.2.5	Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity: “Neighbourhood Development Plans are intended to be produced by local people for their own areas. Unlike national planning policy, or local planning policy, a Neighbourhood Development Plan must be the subject of a referendum by residents of the area covered by the Neighbourhood Development Plan.	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 2.2.6	Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity: “The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan, when made following a successful referendum, will, along with the adopted Local Plan, guide planning decisions in the parish up to the 2029.	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 2.3.1	Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity and factual accuracy: <u>Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. Neighbourhood plans must be in line with government legislation and guidance. All Neighbourhood Development Plans must...</u> ”	Agreed with one exception.	Wording of 1 st sentence changed as recommended with the words “direct power” substituted by “ability”.
Para 2.3.3	Consider deleting or rewording this paragraph as it is not accurately worded.	Agreed	Paragraph deleted.
Para 2.3.4	Consider amending the paragraph as follows to add clarity: “The minimum level of growth in towns/ villages is determined by the adopted Local Plan. In other words, the total numbers of new dwellings that will be built and the total area of land for new employment that will be developed are both provided by the local	Agreed	Paragraph amended as recommended.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>planning authority. Neighbourhood Development Plans can determine where these dwellings or business units will go, and it can allow a higher level of growth than the local planning authority requires.</p>		
<p>Para 2.3.5</p>	<p>Consider amending the paragraph as follows to add clarity: “The Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan will be part of the <u>Development Plan</u> for the parish. It will therefore sit alongside the Local Plan prepared by the local planning authority and decisions on planning applications will be made using both the Local Plan and the neighbourhood plan, and any other material considerations. A Neighbourhood Plan should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development (as outlined in paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework). A neighbourhood plan must address the development and use of land. Wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a Neighbourhood Plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out as a parish project in a companion document or annex.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Paragraph changed as recommended.</p>
<p>Para 3.2.5.1</p>	<p>Consider amending the paragraph as follows to add clarity and for internal consistency: The adopted Local Plan allocates 12 housing sites across the borough, of which two are wholly or partly in the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan area. One of these, a 9 hectare site in the south of the Parish and to the east of the A33 called Redlands, (Policy SS3.7), is wholly in the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan Area and is allocated for approximately 165 dwellings. East of Basingstoke (Policy SS3.9) partly in the south east of the Parish and extends into Old Basing and Lychpit Parish and is allocated for approximately 450 dwellings. The exact number of dwellings from the East of Basingstoke site to be</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Paragraph amended as recommended. Figure 3-5 renamed “Local Plan allocated housing sites Policies SS3.7 and SS3.9”</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	delivered in the parish has not yet been determined but could be as many as 200.”		
Para 3.2.5.2	Consider amending the paragraph as follows for accuracy: “The net requirement for homes indicated by the Action Hampshire Housing Survey Report (37 houses see Table 6-1) is thus satisfied by the Local Plan housing sites allocated wholly or partly within Sherfield on Loddon Parish...”	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 3.2.5.3	Consider amending the paragraph as follows to add clarity and for accuracy: “ <u>Policy SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) of the adopted Local Plan also requires (Policy SS5) that a further 150 homes will need to be identified across the Borough in areas outside of the specific areas (Bramley, Kingsclere, Oakley, Overton and Whitchurch) listed in the policy. Policy SS5 adds that it will be necessary to identify sites/ opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries in the borough. It is therefore necessary for sites/ opportunities for at least 10 homes to be identified within and adjacent to Sherfield on Loddon parish. Policy SS5 adds that this can be identified through means such as neighbourhood planning, rural exception schemes or a review of Settlement Policy Boundaries. Paragraph 4.67 of the adopted Local Plan clarifies that “Small residential developments of less than ten units (net gain of nine units or less) within the defined Settlement Policy Boundaries of the settlements listed will not qualify towards the targets outlined in the policy. Outside of the Settlement Policy Boundaries, developments of less than five units (net gain of four or less) will not qualify. If developments of a qualifying size come forward within or adjacent to the named settlements via alternative means to neighbourhood planning, for example via a planning application, this will contribute towards the targets set out within the</u> ”	Agreed to change wording to “The Local Plan also requires (Policy SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning)) that a further 150 homes will need to be identified across the Borough over and above those allocated to named sites and to satisfy this requirement it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes in and around each of the settlements with Settlement Policy Boundaries. Sherfield on Loddon is required to accept applications for at least 10 homes on one site inside the Settlement Policy Boundary or at least 10 homes on land adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary that could also be on 2 sites of 5 homes.	Wording changed to match 6.2.4



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p><u>policy. At April 2017, no dwellings have been granted planning permission within and adjacent to the defined Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary in the period 2011-2016 that satisfy the policy SS5 requirement. Therefore the requirement of policy SS5 has not yet been met, and the ‘at least 10 homes’ requirement continues to need to be identified through appropriate means.”</u> over and above those allocated to named sites and to satisfy this requirement it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes on one site within the Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary or 2 or more sites each of 5 dwellings adjacent to the Settlement Policy Boundary.”</p>		
<p>Para 3.3.2</p>	<p>Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity and to provide a factual update: <u>“The majority area including of the main village settlement is a Conservation Area which extends to the east of the A33. The Borough Council is currently undergoing a review of all the current Conservation Area Appraisals in the borough.”</u></p>	<p>The NDP has changed the wording to more accurately describe the Conservation Area. Reference to the review of Conservation Area appraisal is not felt to be relevant to the NDP.</p>	<p>Wording changed to: “There is a large Conservation Area which includes the majority of the main village settlement and extends to the east of the A33”.</p>
<p>Para 3.4.3</p>	<p>This paragraph quotes the Sherfield on Loddon Conservation Appraisal description of appearance which is considered to be too narrow. The Green is only one of the features which contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is therefore considered that the paragraph is amended as follows:</p> <p>“The Sherfield on Loddon Conservation Area Appraisal map shows some 40 listed buildings and 17 other notable buildings in the Conservation Area. One important aspect of the appearance of the Conservation Area is derived from the grouping of varied building types enclosing the oval shaped open Village Green...”</p> <p>It is recommended that a clarifying reference to areas of land</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Wording changed as recommended.</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>included in the Conservation Area should be included at the end of the paragraph as follows:</p> <p>“These date mainly from the 18th and 19th centuries, but are punctuated by individual buildings of earlier date. The cohesive arrangement of these buildings defines the 14.5 hectare Village Green, which has particular significance as the only remaining open land, out of 46 hectares of common land that existed until the end of the 19th century. Included within the Conservation Area boundary, to the west of the Reading Road, are Goddards Lane and Carpenters Farmhouse. To the east of Reading Road, two outlying historic farmsteads, a historic mill complex and a few other buildings, remote from the village centre, along with the surrounding open land and woodland are within the Conservation Area boundary.”</p>		
<p>Para 3.5.1.1 (1)</p>	<p>With regards to “Traffic on the A33 runs nose to tail in both directions for much of the day.”, consider rewording the sentence to emphasise the traffic congestion during the peak periods of the day.</p>	<p>It is an observed fact that traffic is congested at other times of day as well as at the peak periods.</p>	<p>The wording changed to: “There is a constant stream of traffic on the A33 in both directions during peak periods of the day. However, the traffic flow in both directions is high throughout the day (See HCC hourly traffic volume data in Annex D, Fig. 1-2) and so queues frequently form at any time throughout the day when anything interrupts the flow of traffic.”</p>
<p>Para 3.5.1.1</p>	<p>With regards to “Housing development in this area has greatly</p>	<p>The traffic will continue to</p>	<p>Wording changed to</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
(2)	<p>expanded the volume of traffic including HGVs.”, consider amending as follows for clarity:</p> <p>“Recent and current <u>housing</u> development in this area has greatly expanded the volume of traffic, including HGVs, on the C32.</p>	increase as more homes are built in the area.	“Recent and current housing development in this area has greatly expanded the volume of traffic including HGVs, with the prospect of further increase in traffic as more homes are built in the area.”
Para 3.5.1.1 (3 f)	<p>With regards to “This road links to the A33 at two junctions, both highly dangerous.”, consider amending as follows for clarity:</p> <p>“This road links to the A33 at two junctions, both highly dangerous <u>of which are considered by residents to have highway safety issues.</u>”</p>	Further explanation of the statement contained in the NDP is required.	Wording changed to: “This road links to the A33 at two junctions, both of which are considered highly dangerous by residents and this is supported by the police accident statistics (See Annex D, 2.1.1.1).
Para 3.6.2	It is recommended to delete the following opinion from the paragraph: “(that has the best butcher’s counter for miles around)..”	Agreed	Text deleted.
Chapter 4	Although this chapter is helpful, it could be made more concise or reduced in size by referring to Annex G (Consultation events and survey results) that accompanies the Pre Submission Neighbourhood Plan.	The information contained in this chapter is presented in a different form to that in Annex G (Consultation events and survey results).	No action
Para 4.1.1	<p>Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity:</p> <p>“Part of the purpose of a Neighbourhood Development Plan is to improve the opportunity for people to become involved in the planning of their area by making sure that local people are involved in creating the Plan and that their views are taken into account from the start and during its production.”</p>	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 4.1.3	It is not clear what is meant by “...or may be involved in implementing the Neighbourhood Plan.” It is recommended that this is reworded.	Agreed.	Words highlighted have been deleted as recommended.
Para 4.1.4	Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity: “Sherfield on Loddon Parish Council has chosen to produce a policy-led Neighbourhood Development Plan. Consequently, no sites for development have been allocated in the Plan.”	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 4.3.1	Consider deleting the following text from the first bullet point as this is explained in paragraph 4.4.1: “...– The Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Party visited a random sample of 10% of all households in the parish to carry out an analysis of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats for the Parish. The results are in the Register of Consultation Events Annex G”	Agreed	Text deleted as recommended.
Para 6.1.1	It is not clear what is meant by “...This would be applied to SS5 and any other applications.” It is recommended that this is reworded or deleted.	Agreed to delete sentence.	Sentence deleted.
Para 6.1.5	Consider deleting the following text to avoid repetition as the Basic Conditions are listed earlier in the Neighbourhood Plan at paragraph 2.3.1: “...which are that the Neighbourhood Development Plan must <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have appropriate regard to national policy; • contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; • be in general conformity with strategic local policy; and • be compatible with EU obligations, including human rights requirements.” 	Agreed	Text deleted as recommended.
Para 6.1.6	Consider amending the paragraph as follows: “The policies in this Neighbourhood Development Plan seek to deliver the aspirations and needs of the local community within the framework set by these overarching legal requirements for neighbourhood development plans.”	Agreed	Word changed as recommended.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 6.1.7	Consider alternative wording for this paragraph as follows to add clarity: “The Neighbourhood Plan should be read as whole. Proposals will be determined against all relevant policies.”	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.2.1	It is recommended that the following wording is added to the paragraph for clarity: “There are two Local Plan allocated housing sites wholly or partly within the parish: “	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.2.2	Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity: “The allocations are for a 9 hectare site in the south of Sherfield on Loddon Parish and to the east of the A33 called Redlands, (Policy SS3.7), for approximately 165 dwellings.	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.2.3	Consider amending the paragraph for clarity and to ensure consistency with the suggested wording for paragraph 3.2.5.1: “The East of Basingstoke site, (policy SS3.9) (see Figure 3.5), which stretches from the Redlands site to Old Basing and lies partly within the Parish, allocated for approximately 450 dwellings. The exact number of dwellings from the East of Basingstoke site to be delivered in the parish has not yet been determined but could be as many as 200.”	Agreed to change to match 3.2.5.1	Wording changed to match 3.2.5.1
Para 6.2.4	Consider amending the paragraph as per the suggested amendments to paragraph 3.2.5.3.	Agreed to change wording to match 3.2.5.3	Wording changed to match 3.2.5.3
Para 6.2.5	Consider amending the paragraph as follows for clarity and consistency: “The net requirement for homes within the Parish indicated by the Action Hampshire Housing Survey Report (37 homes see Table 6-1) could be easily satisfied within the Local Plan allocated housing sites that are wholly or partly with the parish and so no special provision for these is needed.”	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.2.8	Consider amending the paragraph as follows: “The BDBC Local Plan has a Strategic Gap policy, (Policy EM2–	Agreed	Amended the wording.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	(Strategic Gaps”), which states that in order to prevent coalescence...”		
Policy H1 and H2	<p>Policy SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) of the Local Plan states that it will be necessary to identify sites/ opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to the Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary. The policy then adds that the ‘at least 10’ dwelling requirement should be achieved through the most appropriate means such as neighbourhood planning, rural exception schemes or a review of the Settlement Policy Boundary. It is noted that draft Policy H1 (New housing) and H2 (New housing development adjacent to and outside the settlement policy boundary) of the SOL NP provide further detail as to where new housing (to satisfy the “at least 10” requirement of policy SS5) could be located and what size it should be. The SOL NP does not identify any specific sites or opportunities.</p> <p>At 1st April 2017, no dwellings had been granted planning permission within and adjacent to the defined Sherfield on Loddon SPB in the period 2011-2016 that satisfy the policy SS5 requirement. Therefore the requirement of policy SS5 has not yet been met, and the ‘at least 10 homes’ requirement continues to need to be identified through appropriate means.</p> <p>Where a Parish has not met the ‘at least 10’ requirement, paragraph 4.68 of the ALP applies whereby the council reserves the right to identify opportunities to address any shortfall through appropriate means such as the allocation of housing sites in a future Development Plan Document produced by the borough council. The borough council’s Planning Policy Team will continue to work with the parish council to ensure that the ‘at least 10’ dwelling requirement is identified through appropriate means and met in a timely manner.</p>	The NPWP has sought further advice from BDBC.	The wording of the policies and supporting text have been changed as recommended by BDBC



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Paragraph 6.2.9	It is considered the supporting text should be reworded to better reflect the content and approach of policy H1. For instance the policy does not refer to “brownfield sites” explicitly. In addition part of the paragraph may be better suited to the supporting paragraphs to policy H2.	Agreed that reference to “brownfield” sites should be included in Policy H1 and supporting text.	Text reworded as recommended.
Policy H2	<p>Consider amending the first paragraph of the policy as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“In order to satisfy the Local Plan requirement policy SS5 <u>requirement</u> for at least 10 dwellings to be delivered outside, but adjacent, to the defined Settlement Policy Boundary within the plan period new housing proposals will only be supported subject to the following criteria:”</p> <p>In line with the principles of the NPPF it would be beneficial if criterion a) of the policy was worded in a more positive manner to provide flexibility over the life of the neighbourhood plan. In addition, the requirement in policy SS5 is for sites/ opportunities for “at least” 10 homes to be identified and additional flexibility will help to achieve the “at least” requirement.</p> <p>Therefore to provide additional flexibility within criterion a), it is considered that the criterion should be amended as follows:</p> <p>“a) individual proposals are for 5 to approximately 10 dwellings.”</p>	Advice would be sought from BDBC.	The wording of the policies and supporting text have been changed as recommended by BDBC
Para 6.2.10	This paragraph should be reworded as it currently not clear. In addition, it is recommended that reference to policy SS1 (Scale and distribution of new housing) of the Local Plan is also made in the paragraph.	Para 6.2.10 no longer relevant to Policy H2	New supporting text for Policy H2 incorporated into para 6.2.10.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 6.2.11	<p>With reference to “...and objecting to any building in this area.”, does this mean all building or just house building? At present this statement is not in general conformity with the Local Plan. It should be made clear that policy EM2 (Strategic Gaps) of the Local Plan does permit development in the strategic gap subject to proposals according with criteria a) and b) or c). In addition, it should be made clear that paragraph 6.16 of the Local Plan states the following:</p> <p>“Small scale development that is in keeping with the rural nature of the gaps will not be prevented, provided that it is appropriately sited and designed to minimise the impact on the openness of the gap and subject to other policies of this plan.”</p> <p>Consider rewording the paragraph and make reference to the provisions of policy EM2 and paragraph 6.16.</p>	Para 6.2.11 no longer relevant to Policy H2	Deleted
Policy H3	<p>Although the wording of the second paragraph is supported, consider amending the wording to overcome typos and to also ensure consistency in wording with a similar policy in the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p>“All proposals for new housing development within the Parish must demonstrate how the types of homes provided will contribute to a balanced mix of housing in Sherfield on Loddon Parish and meet the needs identified in the Action Hampshire Housing Needs Survey. In all new housing development providing affordable housing. The occupancy of all affordable homes will be prioritised for households with a local connection with the Parish of Sherfield on Loddon as defined by the BDBC Housing Allocations Scheme and any relevant planning policy guidance.</p>	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.2.13	With regards to the last sentence of the paragraph, it is recommended that this is reworded as per the suggested wording for	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>individual buildings of earlier date. The Parish is given cohesion by the vernacular materials and domestic scale of the buildings, particularly those at prominent locations in the Parish. The cohesive arrangement of buildings defines The Green. The special character of this part of the Conservation Area is derived from the long-range views of buildings across the informal and semi-rural setting of The Green as defined by the Conservation Area Appraisal.”</p>		
<p>Para 6.3.8</p>	<p>Although the following text is not contested “New developments should also embody good design in creating sustainable settlements...”, it is considered that the paragraph should be reworded as follows: “New development should also embody good design practice in creating sustainable settlements which are integrated with their setting both functionally and aesthetically...”</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Wording changed as recommended.</p>
<p>Policy D2</p>	<p>On 25 March 2015 Government issued a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) setting out the conclusion of the Housing Standards Review. The WMS sets out new policy on the application of technical housing standards that applied immediately to all local planning authorities and qualifying bodies.</p> <p>The WMS states that “Neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply the new national technical standards”. The NPPG states that these standards should only be introduced through Local Plans.</p> <p>In light of this, amend the criterion b) as follows to ensure it accords with the Written Ministerial Statement and the NPPG:</p> <p>“b) Provide sufficient internal space as defined in the Technical housing standards – national space standard;”</p> <p>In addition, the viability implications on development of introducing</p>	<p>The NDP supports the highest technical standards for design of new housing.</p>	<p>No action</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	such a requirement has not be considered by the SOL NPG.		
Policy D2	<p>There are concerns that some of the criteria in the policy are too prescriptive and do not allow for the flexibility in the design of development permitted by the NPPF.</p> <p>The aim of Policy D2 for development to reflect the rural character of the village is welcomed. However, this can be done in a number of ways and need not be as closely defined as is proposed in the policy. For example, there are concerns that it may be unreasonable to place such a strong emphasis on clay-based products (criteria c) or tile hanging (criteria d) for new development and particularly outside the conservation area.</p> <p>Criteria (m) requires car parking to be integrated within landscaping so that it does not dominate the streets. Minimising the visual prominence of cars in the streetscene can be done through a number of ways and not just through landscaping. For example, parking spaces can be screened by buildings and boundary treatments. It is recommended that the policy should be reworded to reflect the flexibility available to minimise the visual impact of car parking.</p>	Noted	No action.
Policy D2	It is not clear if this policy is applicable to only new housing development or to all forms of development? The title of the policy and the first paragraph of the policy would imply that it is applicable to all forms of development, however the majority of the policy criteria would appear to be related to new housing development only. This needs to be carefully considered. If it is applicable to all forms of development the supporting text to the policy may also need to be amended accordingly to add clarity.	Noted. New development means new developments of one or many dwellings.	No action
Para 6.3.9	Amend paragraph as follows to add clarity:	Agreed	Amended as



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	"...and is in keeping with the vernacular as defined by the Character Assessment (<u>Annex C</u>)."		recommended.
Para 6.3.10	Delete paragraph as a consequence of the suggested amendments to policy D2.	This is covered by the explanation for D2	No action
Para 6.3.11	Amend paragraph as follows as a consequence of the suggested amendments to policy D2: "The Local Plan recognises in paragraph 6.83, the need for sufficient internal space "Residential developments will be expected to provide a high quality of amenity for their occupants, including sufficient internal space and external amenity space". The Neighbourhood Development Plan seeks to further refine this by requiring all new developments to conform to the national space standard <u>echo</u> this approach."	As the previous comment.	No action
Para 6.3.17	With regards to "...The most recent developments have a density of between 40 and 50 houses per hectare.", it is recommended that the reference to "the most recent" is translated into a decade – was this the 1980's/ 1990's for instance? The location of the development with these densities would also be helpful for context.	Changed timescale to "Within the last 20 years"	Amended wording as recommended.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Policy G1	<p>Broadly welcome the policy and specifically support the requirement to ensure “that there is no net loss of biodiversity and where possible to provide a net gain.”</p> <p>However there are concerns with the second sentence of the first paragraph which states “...compensatory measures will be put in place to ensure there is no net loss in biodiversity, through the creation of like for like habitats wherever possible.”</p> <p>It is understood that this can only be achieved by biodiversity offsetting which requires an assessment/unit cost of the loss of habitat throughout a development and an estimation of unit cost/reinstating that habitat elsewhere.</p> <p>At present new habitat within developments is established but this is rarely like for like and does not take into account the loss of “low value” habitats such as agricultural land.</p> <p>It is recommended that this sentence is removed from the policy as it will create a conflict with policy EM4 (Biodiversity, geodiversity and nature conservation) of the adopted Local Plan. Policy EM4 is a detailed policy and has an approach whereby development proposals will only be permitted if significant harm to biodiversity and/ or geodiversity resulting from the development can be avoided or, if that is not possible, adequately mitigated. Policy EM4 sees compensatory measures as a last resort. Policy G1 makes no reference to avoid/ mitigate.</p>	Agreed.	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.4.4	<p>Consider amending the paragraph as follows for accuracy:</p> <p>“This policy sits alongside policy EM4 (Biodiversity, geodiversity and nature conservation) of the Local Plan. Policy EM4 provides a</p>	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	framework for conserving and enhancing the borough’s existing biodiversity assets while enabling opportunities to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.”		
Para 6.4.5	It is not clear how paragraph 6.4.5 and Figure 6-4 relate to policy G1.	Noted.	This paragraph is deleted. The reference to strategic views moved to Policy D1 together with the map.
Policy G2	Policy is supported. The policy could also seek to enhance local green space as well as to protect it.	Agreed.	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.4.7	<p>Carefully consider whether the explanation of ‘special circumstances’ is required in the final sentence of the paragraph. If the sentence is to remain as currently worded there are concerns that it would not accord with the approach of the policy to only permit development on designated on Local Green Spaces in very special circumstances.</p> <p>The sentence also reads as a policy requirement and therefore careful consideration should be given as to whether it should be reflected in the policy.</p> <p>If the sentence does remains, it should be amended as follows to reflect the wording of policy G2:</p> <p>“...However, in <u>very</u> special circumstances, modest or small complementary development may be appropriate, where it does not have a detrimental effect on <u>Local Green Space and</u> the rural character of the Parish.”</p> <p>If the sentence does remain and/ or is added to the policy it is recommended that the paragraph includes guidance on what is considered to be ‘modest or small complementary development’. It</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The sentence is to remain but will be amended as recommended.</p>	<p>Wording changed as recommended.</p> <p>Wording changed as recommended.</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>is assumed this means complementary development associated with a particular use on a Local Green Space (i.e cricket pitch), however this is not clear.</p> <p>It is also noted that several of the identified Community Valued Assets (in figure 6-7 and table 6-2) are within some of the proposed Local Green Spaces. Consider if this paragraph needs to highlight this.</p>		<p>Reference to Community-Valued Assets has been added.</p>
<p>Para 6.4.8 and Figure 6-5</p>	<p>Paragraph 76 and 77 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans can be used to identify special protection green areas which are of particular importance to them. However it must be noted that the designation should only be used in specific circumstances. It is important to ensure that the proposed Local Green Spaces in the SOL NP meet all the requirements of the NPPF otherwise they could be in danger of being deleted by the Examiner appointed to examine the Submission SOL NP.</p> <p>The NPPG (Reference ID: 37-019-20140306) states that: “A Local Green Space does not need to be in public ownership. However, the local planning authority (in the case of local plan making) or the qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan.”</p> <p>In order to provide clarity that all relevant landowners have been contacted, it recommended that this is explained/ evidenced in Annex E (Strategic views, green spaces and natural environment).</p>		<p>Reference to the landowners and that they have been contacted is made in Annex E (Strategic Views, Green Spaces and</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	This will help the subsequent examiner appointed to examine the Submission SOL NP.		the Natural Environment.
Figure 6-5	Large maps for each designated Local Green Space should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan to aid clarity and precision. At the very least, the neighbourhood plan should make reference to there being individual maps in the Annex E.	The individual maps are in Annex E.	Wording changed as recommended.
Policy G3	Whilst the LPA supports the intention of the policy, it questions what it adds to national policy guidance in the NPPF and NPPG on flooding/ flood risk. These both provide extensive guidance on development and flood risk and also when a flood risk assessment is required. The adopted Local Plan also includes a detailed policy (EM7) on managing flood risk.	The NDP accepts the proposed changes to the Policy for Reducing Flood Risk made by Thames Water, H&loW WT, Environment Agency in their responses to Consultation.	The wording has been changed to reflect the submissions by the 3 agencies.
Para 6.4.11	Amend paragraph as follows to make reference to policy EM7 of the Local Plan: “Policy EM7 (Managing Flood Risk) of the Local Plan follows the national guidance for the sequential approach to development...”	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.5.1	Amend paragraph as follows to add clarity: “...and congestion of traffic on the A33 (see Annex D – Road safety and traffic issues).”	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Para 6.5.2	The following text included the paragraph is an assumption “...This situation will worsen as more housing is built in the Parish, in the neighbouring Parish of Bramley and between the Parish and Basingstoke.” The sentence should read as “may worsen” rather than “will worsen”. This is particularly important to amend as there are planned improvements (associated with the planned level of housing growth in and around Basingstoke that is identified in the adopted Local Plan) to the A33. The paragraph should make reference to these improvements. The LPA will be able to assist with including appropriate wording on the planned improvements to the A33.	Noted. It is not felt that the planned improvements to the A33 will have significant effect on the Parish. There is no indication that they will help the increase in traffic.	Wording changed to “is likely to worsen”.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Para 6.5.3	<p>Is the dualling of the A33 an aspiration of the parish council? If it is an aspiration then this should be made clear and the paragraph amended accordingly.</p> <p>The paragraph states that the “chosen route should not run through the parish” and “to bypass the Parish as far away as possible”. Does this mean the parish council’s view is that an A33 dual carriageway should not be in the parish at all? Or is the word “parish” a typo and should be replaced with “village”?</p> <p>If it is meant to be “parish” then the paragraph is effectively saying any A33 dual carriageway should be located in adjacent parishes. It is therefore highly recommended that the adjoining parish council views should therefore be sought on this.</p>	This is a recommendation if the situation should arise.	No action
Para 6.5.6	<p>Amend paragraph as follows to add clarity: “...Also of great concern of residents is the lack of safe crossing places on the A33 and C32.”</p>	Agreed	Wording “to residents” added.
Para 6.5.8	<p>The second sentence is an assumption and should be amended as follows: “...This does not run after 6pm or on Sundays so is not adequate for the needs for residents who do not drive or want to drive.”</p>	The NDP is reflecting the responses from residents. Key Conclusion K.	Wording changed to include the reference to Key Conclusion K.
Policy T1	<p>The principle of the policy is supported. However, there are concerns with the wording of the policy in that it is applicable to “Any development proposals” and therefore could be overly onerous.</p> <p>The LPA would like to highlight the wording of policy T1 (Improving the footpath and cycle way network) of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan. Illustration 6g of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan maps existing footpaths and proposed/potential additional footpaths. The SOL NP could include a similar</p>	<p>Noted. Asked BDBC for assistance with such a map</p>	<p>The wording amended as recommended.</p> <p>New map has been included.</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	map.		
Para 6.5.10	The paragraph states that “...the purpose of Policy T1 is to <u>retain</u> , and where possible improve and extend, the footpaths...” whereas policy T1 states “...must <u>protect</u> and, where possible, take available opportunities to improve and extend the footpath networks.”.	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Page 58	The table under photograph 6-4 would be better placed within one of the accompanying annexes to the Plan.	Noted	The table has been deleted from the NDP.
Policy T2	The principle of the policy is supported. The LPA would like to highlight the wording of policy T1 (Improving the footpath and cycle way network) of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan. Illustration 6g of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan maps existing cycle ways and proposed/ potential additional cycle ways. The SOL NP could include a similar map.	Agreed	Maps of the public footpaths and cycle paths have been added.
Para 6.5.15	Amend paragraph as follows to add clarity: “The Local Plan Policy CN9 (Transport), the Borough Cycling Strategy...” Paragraph could refer to the standards and requirements of the Borough Cycling Strategy.	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.
Policy T3	The principle of the policy is supported. However, with reference to “...would have an adverse impact” it is noted that paragraph 32 of the NPPF states “Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are <u>severe</u> .” Policy CN9 criterion e) (Transport) of the adopted Local Plan also states “Does not have a <u>severe</u> impact on the...”. Policy T3 should be amended to state “...would have an <u>severe</u> adverse impact...”	Inclusion of the word “severe” would raise the threshold at which safety becomes unacceptable at known traffic hazards and would not be in the interests of residents and would weaken the case to improve safety.	No change



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>It should also be noted that policy T2 (Improving road safety in Bramley) of the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan states the following “Development proposals will not be supported if it is demonstrated that there will be a <u>severe</u> adverse impact...”. Paragraph 139 of the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Report (October 2016) states:</p> <p>“The wording in the second paragraph in Policy T2 does not provide a practical framework for decision making. I have suggested alternative wording to seek to ensure that new development does not have a severe adverse impact on road safety at known traffic hazards. I have specifically referred to ‘severe adverse impact’ to have regard to criteria in the NPPF and to be in general conformity with BDLP Policy CN9.”</p> <p>Policy T3 makes reference to the traffic hazards identified in Annex D, however the supporting paragraphs do not provide any detail on these traffic hazards.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Details of identified traffic hazards have been added to the supporting paragraph to Policy T3.</p>
<p>Para 6.5.19</p>	<p>The paragraph should be amended as follows for clarity: “The Local Plan Policy CN-9...”</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Wording changed as recommended.</p>
<p>Para 6.6.1-6.6.3</p>	<p>These paragraphs should explain the difference between ‘Community Valued Assets’ and ‘Assets of Community Value’. There have been no nominations for Assets of Community Value in Sherfield on Loddon parish and the Council’s Register of Assets of Community Value lists no current assets in Sherfield on Loddon parish. The LPA is concerned that without explanation of the difference between ‘Community Valued Assets’ and ‘Assets of Community Value’ could lead to confusion in planning application decision making.</p> <p>Information on Assets of Community Value and how to nominate Assets of Community Value can be found on the borough council’s</p>	<p>Add reference and explanation of the Assets of Community Value Register in the Parish.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 6.6.9 and 6.6.10 refers to and explains the Register of Assets of Community Value.</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>website here http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/community-right-to-bid. Are the parish council seeking to nominate any of the identified 'Community Valued Assets' as 'Assets of Community Value'?</p>		
<p>Paragraph 6.6.1, Figure 6-7 and Table 6-2</p>	<p>It is not clear how the Community Valued Assets defined in figure 6-7 and table 6-2 relate to a policy. Are they related to policy CF1? If so, the policy will need to be updated accordingly.</p> <p>Consider if a separate policy on Community Valued Assets is required in the SOL NP. It is worth highlighting that the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan includes a policy on Community Value-Assets (policy CVA1).</p> <p>If a separate policy is to be considered, then it is recommended that careful consideration is given as to whether policy CF1 will lead to any conflict between policies CN7 and CN8 of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Table 6-2a lists the 'Community Valued Assets' identified in Sherfield on Loddon Parish. Paragraph 5.66 of the adopted Local Plan lists essential facilities and services covered by policy CN7 (Essential services and facilities) and paragraph 5.72 provides examples of community, leisure and cultural facilities covered by policy CN8 (Community, leisure and cultural facilities). Some of the Community Valued Assets identified in table 6-2 fall under the definition of an essential service/ facility or a community, leisure and cultural facility. It is noted that policy CN7 requires development proposals to accord with criterion a) or b) or c) and policy CN8 requires development proposals to accord with criteria e) or f) or g) or h).</p>	<p>It was agreed to change Policy CF1 so it does not conflict with LP Policies CN7 or CN8.</p> <p>It was also agreed to add a second policy for the Provision of new community facilities.</p>	<p>Rewording of CF1 and inclusion of a new policy, CF2, in response to BDBC comments.</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Table 6-2	<p>The SOL NPG should consider if all the potential Community Valued Assets in the parish have been defined in Figure 6-7 and Table 6-2. It is worth highlighting that the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan identified 18 Community Value-Assets In Bramley (see Table 6-4), which included amongst others a Public House, shop, bakery and nursery. As noted on page 59, there are pubs and a general store in the parish.</p> <p>The table defines a specific Community-Valued Asset as “Community Care”. All the other Community-Valued Assets are physical assets and are defined in Figure 6-7. Consider whether this should be deleted as specific Community-Valued Asset?</p>	Noted	<p>The Table of Community-Valued Assets and Facilities has been updated.</p> <p>Community Care deleted from the table.</p>
Policy CF1	<p>The principle of the paragraph is supported, however the LPA is concerned that the first paragraph of the policy could lead to conflict between policies CN7 and CN8 of the adopted Local Plan. It is noted that policy CN7 requires development proposals to accord with criterion a) or b) or c) and policy CN8 requires development proposals to accord with criteria e) or f) or g) or h).</p> <p>There are also concerns about the clarity and potential unintentional consequences of the first paragraph of the policy. As currently worded in essence this means that <u>any</u> proposal for new development which involves a local community facility and meets the requirements of the policy will be supported. It is considered that this is not the intention the policy.</p> <p>Also with reference to the wording “Proposals for new development which involve local community facilities...”, does this mean proposals which incorporate local community facilities or proposals for local community facilities? This should be clarified accordingly.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>This has been addressed by the revision of Policy CF1.</p> <p>This has been addressed by the revision of Policy CF1.</p>	Wording changed to avoid conflict between LP Policies CN7 and CN8.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>It is also not clear if the intention of the policy is to also be relevant to existing local community facilities (i.e protecting their loss). If so, this should also be clarified accordingly.</p> <p>It is not clear how the Community Valued Assets defined in figure 6-7 and table 6-2 relate to a policy.</p> <p>The made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan includes policies on 'Community Valued Assets' (CVA1) and 'Provision of new community facilities' (CVA2).</p>	<p>This has been addressed by the revision of Policy CF1.</p> <p>Explanation given in paras 6.6.9 and 6.6.10.</p>	
Policy E1	<p>There are concerns with the wording "minimal impact" in criteria a) and b). Should this be worded as "minimal <u>adverse</u> impact" as "minimal impact" could be interpreted as negative or positive impact?</p> <p>With reference to criterion c) of the policy, it may not always be appropriate to re-use vacant or redundant historic buildings as part of a development due to the buildings historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. This should be reflected in the policy. In addition, it may not also be possible for development proposals to accord with criteria j), k) and l) as a proposal may not involve a vacant or historic building. It is recommended that criterion l) is made a standalone paragraph in the policy rather than a criterion.</p> <p>In addition, amend the criteria list to be a), b), c), d) rather than f), g), h), i).</p> <p>The LPA would like to highlight that the made Bramley Neighbourhood Plan includes a policy on new employment development (E1).</p>	<p>Agreed (a and b)</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>a) and b) Wording changed as recommended.</p> <p>Reference to historic buildings removed from E1 and added to 6.7.8.</p> <p>The criteria list has been amended</p>



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
Policy C1	<p>Consider if it is reasonable for a Connectivity Statement to be required even if it is not necessary for the business need (e.g. a self-employed carpenter, or a blacksmith, as opposed to a high tech office business employing several persons). Could this also affect the viability of a development depending on the connection?</p> <p>The LPA is aware of several recent appeal decisions regarding broadband for housing sites where Inspectors have found that such a requirement is not necessary to make the developments acceptable in planning terms. The LPA can provide further information on the recent appeal decisions if required.</p> <p>With regards to the final sentence of the policy, should housing developments also be required to provide suitable ducting rather than just for employment development?</p> <p>With regards to the second paragraph of the policy, it is recommended that careful consideration is given as to whether it accords with the NPPF (section 5 - Supporting high quality communications infrastructure: paragraphs 42 to 46) and also the provisions of Part 16 (Communications) of the General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015. In light of this national policy/legislation consider if this paragraph is to introduce any conflicts, if it will add anything to existing guidance and indeed if it is required.</p>	<p>High speed internet connectivity is now an important service that is demanded by all home owners as well as rural businesses. It is considered appropriate and reasonable that developers should be asked to take the provision of such services into consideration.</p> <p>The Parish is badly served by the mobile phone network providers and there is no cable service to provide an alternative phone service. Thus, improvements in mobile phone services would be very welcome although any masts would require careful siting.</p>	<p>The supporting text for Policy C1 has been amended to widen the connectivity need to include new houses in addition to businesses.</p> <p>The supporting text for Policy C1 has been amended to highlight the present unacceptable situation, but also tries to safeguard the impact on the visual environment.</p>
Paragraphs 6.8.3 – 6.85	See the LPA's comments on the second paragraph of policy C1. If amendments are made to the paragraph in the policy or it is deleted, paragraphs 6.8.3-6.8.5 will subsequently need to be amended/ deleted.	These paragraphs have been amended.	These paragraphs have been amended as described in the two Policy C1 comments above.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	Project 4 is noted. Could there be consideration to seeking a shared pedestrian/ cycle route along the A33 between the main village settlement and the allocated Local Plan housing sites (Redlands and East of Basingstoke)?		
References	In light of the comments on policy D2 criterion b) delete the entry “technical Housing Standards – nationally described standard”. If the final two entries in the table remain, it would be helpful to clarify the source and date of these references. Ensure that all evidence/ supporting documents referenced in the Plan are included in the table.	D2 reflects the proposed Housing White Paper: Fixing our broken housing market which is due to be published in November 2017.	Details added to References.
Annex D – Para 1.2	Further clarify the location of 1,100 quantum of housing development. This should include explanation that it is not just located in and around Bramley village but the wider parish.	Noted.	Wording added to provide clarification
Annex D – para 4.1.1 (5)	It is recommended that reference to a footbridge over the A33 is deleted. It is considered that a crossing point is a more realistic option.	A refuge in the road, footbridge or a pelican crossing are all options for the safety of pedestrians.	The wording amended to include the different options.
Annex D – para 4.2.4	Consider if ‘digital speed display devices’ should be added to the ‘Village facilities project list for Sherfield on Loddon’ in appendix A of the SOL NP.	Noted	Digital speed display devices added to the project list in Appendix A.
Annex D – section 4.3 and other sections	There are concerns that section 4.3 and other sections in Annex D are very aspirational and therefore the LPA questions whether they are appropriate/ achievable.	The section makes a valid point about bus services and reflects the views of residents who are dependent on public transport (para 6.5.8)	No action
Annex D	The LPA recommends that the SOL NPG consider the recommendation in paragraph 141 of the Bramley Neighbourhood Plan Examiners Report (October 2016). This is equally applicable to Annex D of the SOL NP. Paragraph 141 states: “I note that Hampshire County Council, as Highway Authority, does	The traffic issues, concerns and hazards are expressed in Annex D which has been reviewed by HCC.	The detailed comments by HCC have been included in an amended Annex D at Section 5.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ANNEX I – TABLE OF REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND RESPONSES MADE

Section/Policy	Issue	Comment	Action
	<p>not fully support the measures proposed to mitigate identified traffic hazards in Appendix G. To provide a practical framework for decision making, I recommend modification to Appendix G. Preferably the solutions to the traffic hazards should be modified to those that have the support of the Highway Authority, or at least Appendix G should be modified to make it clear where the Highway Authority does not support the solution.”</p> <p>Following the publication of the Examiners Report, Bramley NPG liaised with HCC (as Highway Authority) and made amendments to Appendix G in line with the Examiner’s recommendations. It is recommended that appropriate amendments to Annex D are made to ensure potential similar concerns are overcome prior to Submission of the SOL NP.</p>		
Annex E	The protected species listing states Long-eared and Brown-eared bats. There is no such animal as a Brown-eared bat, this should be amended to “Brown long-eared bat”.	Agreed	Wording changed as recommended.