

Neighbourhood Plan News for November 2014.

Recent Forum Meeting.

The Forum held on 16th October had an unusually low attendance. However, Bryan Jenkins provided his personal vision for Sherfield in 2029. This provoked an interesting discussion and highlighted a tension between establishing a more modern environment in the village, through use of technology, provision of modern facilities, traffic management and better upkeep of green areas, and the desire to keep the village very much as it is now, through careful maintenance and avoidance of change. It was suggested that the somewhat chaotic and unformulated nature of the village should be valued above modernisation. We look forward to hearing more comment on this issue as we develop the plan process.

One of our consultants recently told us that the idea of holding a regular public forum to keep parishioners involved is a unique idea and should be valued. However, we are looking at other ways to keep residents involved, such as this news letter, outreach to local village hall user groups (in the New Year) another Open Morning and future Forum meetings.

Meetings,

There are two to report –

The first with ACTION HANTS in Winchester was about investigating whether Action Hants would carry out a survey of Housing Need in the village.

Action Hants is a rural housing enabler, funded by the Hampshire alliance for rural affordable housing –HARAH and partnered with Hyde housing association.

Action Hants is currently engaged in a survey in Sherborne St John with a view to setting up an affordable housing scheme through their Neighbourhood Plan. Such a scheme would be allocated to local people.

In order for AH. to carry out a survey – paid for by Hampshire CC - it needs to know that the Parish will support and find land for a rural housing project; (there is little profit in such a scheme for a land-owner or developer .)

NB. It was agreed that SOL does not at present meet this criteria, and that a housing survey is not for the moment cost effective.

Currently, AH believe that there are 56 people on the hosing register for a property in SOL, but AH have no knowledge of how firm this list is in reality.

We asked AH. if they had any knowledge of a scheme proposed by Sentinel for the ‘Triangle’ because under the rules AH should be involved in a rural affordable housing scheme in a rural parish.

AH had no knowledge of such a scheme and do not use Sentinel as its development partner in any case.

It was suggested that SOL PSCNP will need to set up a meeting with Sentinel to ascertain their intentions.

The Second Meeting took place with BDBC Planner..

NB. Through out this meeting there was a slight air of concern from BDBC about the consequences, which might flow from the Inspector’s initial response to the local Plan. Bruce and I were struck that he was hinting that Sherfield’s Neighbourhood Plan might prove to be more important than we perhaps have thought.

1) BDBC began by outlining the issues raised by the inspector, viz –concern re. no of houses to be built per year; concern re sites east of Basingstoke; concern re A33; concern re water quality in the Loddon.

This has led to the request from BDBC to the parishes to firm up on their contribution to the 150 number for windfall housing

2) The Triangle and Sentinel.

BDBC have had no meaningful approach from Sentinel. The reaction from Action Hants was discussed as was a possible 'Mitchell Scheme'. It was agreed that BDBC will talk to Development Control and SoL will talk to Sentinel.

3) Building outside the Settlement Boundary .

If the Triangle does not work or is used differently, SoL has no meaningful areas for development (have we forgotten the other Triangle by the telephone exchange.?) SoL 'could' be required to find sites outside the settlement boundary. Given that the strategic gap is not sacrosanct a small scale exclusion site might be acceptable. SOL NP would need to address this in a development policy eg " consideration will be given... provided that will only be permitted." There was some discussion whether any land might be available outside the strategic gap and outside the settlement boundary.

There is a possibility that the Inspector may suggest removing the Strategic Gap as it could be deemed to duplicate the landscape Policy.

4) Additional points from the revised local plan .

The Bramley Developments are identified sites and may not count towards the 150 parish Figure.

The figure of 10 houses being needed to count towards the 150 has been reduced to 5.

BDBC plans to carry out a Settlement Boundary Policy Review after the Local Plan has been accepted.

5) Policy Areas for the NP.

BDBC suggested that the NP includes policies on 'Protection for areas outside the settlement boundary'; Protection of Local Green space/landscape ; Avoidance of coalescence of communities; Heritage/ rural diversity; biodiversity -river Loddon.

6) It was agreed to meet again and to keep in touch as the situation develops.

Our next steps.

Finalise a vision and plan principles.

Arrange to use up as much of the second tranche of grant as possible

Finalise a Project Plan and a policy Framework.

Write a regular newsletter..

Arrange interactive sessions with VH User Groups and Hard to reach groups.

Arrange to meet with local landowners and businesses.

Arrange the next Forum (January) and or an Open Morning.

John Darker 10/11/14