

SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL



NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMITTEE

Minutes of Neighbourhood Plan meeting held on 20th March 2014

Present - John Darker (Chairman), Alan Ball, Ivan Gosden, Sandy Johnston, Bruce Batting, Rhydian Vaughan, Natalie Larnar, Kym Greener, Bryan Jenkins, Steve Levin, Ian Wilson, Oliver Bartrum, Mary O'Connor, Adrian Burt, Eleanor Burt, Kathleen Gaiger, V Rowland, P Rymer, J Attwood, V Attwood, N Smith, M Smith, A Gosden, M Smith, C Smith, N Robinson, R Waters (?) and Peter Hayes (Minutes).

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Howard Perkins, Peter Lansley and Peta Alvares.

2. Minutes of last meeting (20/02/14)

The Minutes were accepted as an accurate record; there were no matters arising from them not on the agenda. Due to increasing numbers of people attending the meetings, it was agreed that new members, and those recently joined, would access future Minutes via the website; anyone who was not online and wished to see the Minutes should contact PH.

3. Progress update on the Sherfield Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire

B Jen led on this item, using a powerpoint presentation. He said that he was giving a snapshot of progress as of 17th March. A total of 183 questionnaires – 7.2% of the total population over the age of 20 - had been submitted. There were 110 on paper and 73 online. His current analysis was based on the 73 responses from Sherfield village:

- Q1: Essential characteristics of SoL now: open/green spaces & separation from other villages were highest on 'very important'; when all the 'important' criteria were aggregated the conservation area also rated highly;
- Q2a: Characteristics of additional houses: brown field sites were strongly supported as were small developments and two storey housing;
- Q2b: Housing priorities: families and the elderly were the categories most supported; for second choice preferences 'singles' was a popular choice;
- Q4: Existing facilities: footpaths, the Ponds, local shops and the village green were strongly supported;
- Q5: Potential new facilities: more recycling, a surgery and a pharmacy were popular choices. Takeaways and a youth centre received only limited support. B Jen commented that certain new facilities cannot be forced eg a shop, and the NHS would decide on the need for a surgery. Some aspects may need to be followed up by the Parish Council;
- Q6: Transport issues: top of the priorities for change included: last bus (later); HGV traffic; road maintenance (potholes). Road humps are not liked, but traffic calming is.



SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL

For the age and gender breakdown, B Jen said that 92% of the batch analysed were aged 50+ and 67% were female. The population for those aged 20+ in Sherfield parish is 2,550 (2013).

For future consideration, SL asked for the percentages of the population for the different age groups used in the questionnaire.

Discussion followed on the timescale for the submission of responses, initiated by VR. She felt that one month allowed insufficient time for everyone to get an opportunity to respond. She also thought that some issues that affect the future of the village were missing from the February Open Days.

B Jen said that he would look at responses received after 1st April. NL thought that awareness could be raised through people putting posters on garden fences and their front gates (this approach was organised after the meeting). VR said that more people should be engaged with the future of the village; JD believed that numbers interested would increase as the process continues.

4. Meeting with BDBC (13/3/14)

Six members of the Committee had met with Ed Rehill and Emma Clarke from the Planning Team. A draft note of the meeting (pending a response from BDBC) was projected, and summarised by JD, who said that the final version would be published on the website.

a) BDBC had suggested that the deadlines on the gantt chart (Project Plan) needed to be extended: the aim would be to complete the Plan by April 2015. He queried how easily new houses could be assimilated and said there was evidence that developers were active in the area.

b) For selection of sites the 5-page BDBC matrix would be used. Although no houses had been allocated to the parish in the Pre-Submission Plan (2013), Sherfield was one of 10 villages in the borough across which 150 houses were needed. BB updated on a recent housing association proposal to have 28 houses built on 'The Triangle' even though they don't own the land yet: this would be an 'exception site' His view was that they would be out of keeping with houses on Old Reading Road. The Committee was informed that 'things have gone quiet' with the Sherfield School development; also that Redlands would only be developed if integral to the East of Basingstoke site.

c) The Governance Review was now agreed and the PC would be looking at the position of Taylor's Farm. If TF was taken out of Sherfield parish the Plan would need to be re-designated. There would be 3 options for TF: i) stay as things are ii) go in with Chineham iii) become a separate entity – with the ability to set up its own PC.

VR asked how the PC was going to support the strategic gap. JD responded that a NP could nominate areas in the strategic gap if deemed suitable. BB said that for sites generally planning approval would be granted if the development was 'in the interests of the community'. AB pointed out that for BDBC strategic gaps ran out in 2011 and needed to be renewed through the upcoming Local Plan.

OB asked what was meant by affordable housing being 'outside normal market housing'.

BB explained that for any development over 5 houses, 40% has to be affordable housing (ie managed by a housing association.)



SHERFIELD ON LODDON PARISH COUNCIL

5. **Successful grant bid and consultant**

JD reported that the NP had been successful in its bid to Locality for £4,640 – this brought the total grant received to the maximum of £7,000. This second grant would be used to pay for the services of two consultants.

6. **Planning for Annual Parish Meeting (9th May)**

JD said that the NP would present detailed findings from the questionnaire. It was agreed that the displays put up for the Open Days would be put up again and updated where necessary. In response to a question, JD added that consultation with landowners would probably take place in June.

7. **Next steps**

JD summarised achievements of the NP Committee to date. He said there was now a need for a smaller group to take the work forward and a Steering Group was being looked at by the PC. Progress updates would be taken to the current (larger) group.

In response to the question 'What happens if the Plan is rejected?' the answer was: 'you start again'. NL commented that if we do it well enough the community will have what it wants. B Jen added a cautionary note that it was difficult to devise a process which will have sufficient visibility and be fully understood by everyone.

Date of next meeting: This will not be before the APM (9th May).