

SHERBORNE ST JOHN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE WORKSHOP

Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 30th April 2015 at the Old Post Office, Kiln Lane at 6.30pm

Present:

Julian Crawley	Chairman	Richard Morgan	Natasha Rougier
Jayne Tomlinson			Penny Mayo Administrator

17.15. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Linda Agnew & Mike Harrison.

18.15. Minutes of meeting 4th March 2015

The Minutes of the meeting on 4th March 2015 were agreed and signed as accurate by the Chairman, Julian Crawley.

19.15. Matters arising

There were no matters raised.

20.15. Call for Sites - Draft Proposal post Consultation Event dated 14.3.15

The Committee reviewed the document and agreed that the Plan must reflect the residents' views as expressed on the Consultation day and earlier in the Questionnaire.

Call for Sites. Consultation Ballot Results:

SSJ Neighbourhood Plan - Consultation Event 14.03.15

Call for Sites - Ballot Results

Option	Total Votes	%	No. 1 st Choice	%
Site 2 Bob's Farm	622	38	79	61
Site 3 Aldermaston Rd	359	22	26	20
Site 4 Hilltop	198	12	4	3
Site 5 HCC Kiln Rd	166	10	8	6
Site 6 Aubrey Place	158	10	1	1
Site 1 Cranesfield	151	9	11	9
	1654		129	

Bobs Farm was the preferred site with 15 houses, of which 6 are Affordable. The Chairman will contact Pro-Vision to discuss removal of the 3 large houses (which residents did not want) and instead include 3 pairs of smaller semi-detached homes. BDBC has been asked whether a development increase in actual housing units (to say 18) could be exempt from a need to increase the provision re affordable homes. This could be considered in light of the provision already made in the Marnel Park Phase II Development. Aldermaston Road was the 2nd site choice.

Attendees at the Consultation Event were strongly against any building in the Strategic Gap or on Greenfield sites.

The attached 'Call for Sites - Agreed Steering Group Position (post Consultation Event 14.03.15)' was adopted.

In general terms –

It is still unsure whether SEA assessments will be needed in view of the small number of houses proposed.

It was noted that:

- a. the criteria used in choosing sites must be included in the Plan
- b. they must comply with BDBC planning guidelines
- c. they must demonstrate sustainability

21.15 Actions:

Alex Munro / Sue Jobbins will be contacted (Conference Call with JDC, RM) about writing the first draft plan (and will again be asked if an SEA report is required). **RM**

The Chairman, Julian Crawley, will update / extend his draft report Revision 6 (8.3.2015) to form a Draft Plan Scoping Document as a discussion paper for the Conference Call **JC**

The Administrator is in the process of applying to Locality for further grant aid. **PM**

Julian Crawley, Chairman, will summarise the presentation given at the Consultation day to include ballot results. **JC**

Jayne Tomlinson will summarise the results from the Questionnaire in October to extract the key points made. Administrator will re-send information. **JT**

NP DOC REF 33.02.18



The SSJ Neighbourhood Plan

Call for Sites -

Agreed Steering Group Position (post Consultation Event 14.03.15)

1. Background.

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

2. Key Criteria

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

3. Draft Proposal.

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