

	264 responses received, 78% said 'no change' required		
No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
1	Biodiversity should be more highly weighted in assessment criteria	Noted. All the sites had low biodiversity value so this did not affect the score.	None
2	My only concern is with parking, particularly Winchester St. which has become a real problem verging on dangerous.	Overton Hill car park remains underused. Street parking and restrictions are the responsibility of the Borough Council. However development that impacts on parking IS a planning matter. The Parish Council has done a parking survey and is pursuing this matter. Parking will be a project funded by developer contributions	Policy T2 revised
3	We are very strongly opposed to additional housing both E of Court Drove and NW of the primary school because (1) additional congestion caused by building works of very heavy and noisy vehicles around the school. (2) Lordsfield Gdns and Court drove are already excessively utilised for car parking and vehicle waits at pick-up and drop-off times. More houses in this area of the village is only going to add to this. (3) Safety concerns with yet more vehicles travelling around the school area. We would prefer to see these 19 houses added to the two larger sites.	Noted. If houses are built near the school, the children of these households will walk to school. If the houses are built on the other side of the village they are more likely to come by car. We agree that parking at the school is a problem which needs a solution. OPC is pursuing it.	Policy T2 revised
4a	I do not agree with any new homes anywhere around the school. The traffic and footfall during the time the children are going to and leaving the school is far more than Court Drove can cope with now!	See 3 above.	None
4b	My preference is for Sites J, K, AW, WW and M. No homes should be built on the hills surrounding the village. There would be less impact if they are built on my suggested sites.	We agree about the hills around the village and visual impact. Sites A and B have very little visual impact. Site M has been withdrawn from the allocation.	Policy SS1 revised
4c	However, any of the proposed sites will be preferable to houses built on the North Field.	Noted	None
5	One glaring omission: no mention of the Great North Field. I assume that if this were to happen it would deliver the 150 in one go and negate the NP?	This is our assumption too. However, nothing is certain until the Local Plan is approved.	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
6a	The chairman's foreword refers to how the plan will achieve what Overton wants and needs in the next 15yrs. It sets out a number of hopes and aspirations but there is little on how the plan will achieve them. For most of the important things which will be affected by substantial growth in population we are in the hands of others to decide how and when they will be tackled if at all.	We agree about the chairman's foreword, but the Plan clearly sets out achievable objectives with policies to support them. A made NP carries legal weight.	None
6b	Everybody is aware that the owner of the GNF wants to build 275 houses and is pressing on with a determined effort to obtain planning approval. It is extraordinary that there is no mention of it in the plan and no hint of a 'Plan B' in case they reach their objective. It is a classic 'elephant in the room' which nobody knows how to deal with and hope it will just go away.	Many sites were rejected in the process of shortlisting and an outline of the reasons was given, including GNF.	None
		It is for OPC to respond to speculative developers, not the NP Group.	
6c	In a report of 12 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2015 to BDBC, Cllr Jayawardena...referred to the Overton Riverside walk project and 300+ houses to go on Overton Hill.....	We are unable to find this report. If he did say that he was mistaken. The number is 120.	None
6d	If the GNF is built on in addition to the 270 in the plan it would make 545.....	See 5 above.	None
6e	A second objective for 'Getting Around' is to improve car parking in the village...but no obvious way it could be achieved. This really is a 'tick box' answer.....	We agree that no suitable sites are available now but the policy is there for the duration of the plan and sites may be proposed. See also No2 above.	Policy T2 revised
6f	The increase in population will probably include a number of toddlers coming up to school age or youngsters already in yr1 or yr2. ...I understand that HCC has decided to expand Whitchurch junior school at the expense of Overton meaning that even the youngest children might have to commute to school. If this is correct it should be clearly stated. ....	It is correct that these decisions are in the hands of HCC. This is not a BDBC planning matter. OPC is pursuing it with Hampshire Education Authority. The Plan will allocate developer contributions for the expansion of Overton Primary School if that is what HEA decides.	Policy L2 revised.
6g	Policy E2 is deficient in suggesting that OPC has the power to permit developments in the River test SSSI. It does not. Nor does it have the power to permit or undertake any activity in the SSSI which might disturb the biodiversity or disturb any protected species.	It is correct that OPC cannot permit anything. The policies will be for development control officers at BDBC to operate when the plan is approved. This policy spells out which designated areas and buildings are protected by Local Plan Policies anyway. Policy wording revised.	Policy E2 revised

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
6h	Policy E4 is also deficient. It is not sufficient for developers to be 'guided' by the bodies referred to. They should be required to comply with the law and if OPC has evidence that a developer has failed to do so then OPC should report it to the appropriate authorities.	Compliance would be made a 'planning obligation' on the developer when permission is granted. In theory, BDBC could compel the developer to rectify any deficiencies but it is correct that in practice it is difficult. Policy now refers to a project	Policy now E3 revised
6i	Overton should be proud that it has some of the few remaining habitats of water voles in England. They are becoming increasingly rare and we have a duty to play our part in protecting them.....	Overton Biodiversity Society agrees that none of the sites allocated in the Plan has any potential to disturb the water vole habitats.	None
6j	It was only a few months ago that the River test was nearly flooded and sand bags were issued. This was most unusual but likely to become more frequent...With the increasing number of houses being built large areas which were formally green fields and absorb rain will in future channel water directly into the river....Developers should be required to take the necessary steps to eliminate the risk of flooding resulting from their developments.	We agree	Policy revised. Now H4(2)
7a	Many sites seem to be unfinished before another one is started, i.e. Overton Hill.	By phasing developments we hope to avoid this though it cannot be guaranteed.	None
7b	Small bungalows near the village centre for elderly if possible. The younger people could live up to the top of Sapley Lane as they can climb the hill.	We agree about homes for the elderly near the centre, partly because 'downsizers' free up larger homes for families and makes better use of the existing housing stock. No such sites are currently available and the plan cannot specify particular types of home in advance.	Supporting text revised to include 'downsizers'.
7c	Do we have to do this survey every year? Pick sites and stick with them. Waste of public money could be better spent.	If this plan is approved it will last 15years so no more surveys for a while! We do not agree that public consultation on so important a matter is a waste of money. The cost has been low because most of the work has been done by volunteers.	None
8a	The way the summary has been presented is unclear, confusing and misleading. Coloured boxes all over the place and the word 'key' seems to crop up all over the place. Key to whom?	The subject matter is complicated but many others have complimented us on the clarity of the Plan. The 'key' issues were those raised by residents in the consultations in May, the questionnaire in July and events in November and January.	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
8b	In the introduction you stated that in this plan the vision and objectives and the policies derived from them 'we have allocated the 150 dwellings required'. Surely under this proposal the 120 dwellings on Overton Hill should be part of this allocation leaving the remainder, i.e. 30/34 homes to be placed on small sites around the village. Small sites preferred by the village as per the last survey. Where has the extra 120 houses come from., which is obviously over-allocation for the village.... I assume that the pre-submission Local Plan with Map 1d showing site SS3.5 with the proposed change to the settlement boundary is not part of your neighbourhood plan.	The pre-submission Local Plan. Section 4.25 reads ' <i>a Greenfield allocation (set out in Policy SS3.5) is made to deliver approximately 120 new homes. A further allocation of 150 homes has been made to meet the longer term needs of the village through Policy SS5. These homes will be delivered through mechanisms such as Neighbourhood Planning.</i> ' Map 1d shows that the greenfield site is Overton Hill. The foreword to the summary NP says, 'The Plan will deliver the 150 homes required by the emerging Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan. There will also be 120 more homes on Overton Hill.'	None
8c	All sites on the NP are greenfield/agricultural land, not preferred by the government.	There are no brownfield sites being offered for sale for housing in the parish.	None
8d	The sites shown are all outside the settlement boundary therefore increasing the size of the village. If these proposals are agreed undoubtedly turn the VILLAGE into a town!.....	Settlement boundaries are determined by Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council every 15 years when plans are reviewed. There are no sites within the current settlement boundary to accommodate 120+150 homes. The number of homes to be built is decided by the Borough Council and our parish council has no legal power to change that. Many people will agree with you that the numbers are too large but that is the situation.	None
8e	Building on the scale you envisage would have environmental impact –should any new build be [placed on rural land? One issue would be pollution from building works, another would be obstruction of pleasant rural views. Another profound impact would be the added volume of vehicles....Any new build (medium or large scale) would impact on wildlife.	We agree that building houses inevitably has an environmental impact. Overton has no brownfield sites. We have gone to great lengths to ensure that it is kept to a minimum as we are required to do. An independent Sustainability Assessment of the Plan has been done and is available on the village website.	None
8f	Having researched the site showing the responses regarding the effect on the sewage system for the village, it seems that your proposals at the utmost would require improvements to the sewage system and costs to be mainly borne by the developers. This shows that the management of the village sewage system to date is adequate but any new medium/large scale developments would need the system to meet the added requirements. ....	Southern Water agrees that the system is already 'at capacity'.	Policy revised. Now H4(1) and H4(3)

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
8g	Planning states that new build must conform to parking-in other words houses should provide parking off road in relation to the number of bedrooms per house. Parking is a major issue in the village and many existing houses cannot part other than in the road.	New developments must conform to BDBC parking standards for off-road parking in relation to the number of bedrooms.	None
8h	The B3400 is notoriously busy and more housing will create an even busier stretch of road particularly at peak times.	We agree, and the new housing in Whitchurch will add to that as well. There is nothing that a Neighbourhood Plan can realistically do about it except to say that the problem may be eased by using multiple sites rather than one big one.	None
8i	The village has a doctor surgery that is full to capacity and the school is full to capacity-how do you think the development of 270 houses will impact on the already overstretched school and doctors?	We have consulted with both. The Overton/ Oakley practice are confident that they have the space and will have the staff to accommodate the increase. At our many consultations, very few people have told us the surgery is 'overstretched'. Capacity at the school is a matter for OPC and the Hampshire education Authority. See 6f above	None
8j	The Co-op is the only supermarket in the village – we have no other supermarket and should the village be snowed in- it often does- the only supermarket to serve the village plus 540 extra people.	Additional shops are a matter for the market and the NP has policies (S1 & S2) to support village shops.	None
	The summary says that...'When new housing is built, developers are required to pay for the infrastructure to support it.' But developers will not pay for a new school or a new health centre.....	Developer contributions can pay for new schools and health centres when required. Policy L2 and Objective C1 now reflects this	Objective C1 and Policy L2 revised.
8k	The summary NP should have been presented in a clear concise manner and not so confusing. Villagers have a right to see a document which is well presented and also with facts and figures and substantial information backing up the impact large scale build would have on the village..... The Overton Plan contradicts itself more than once and totally ignores the wishes of the villagers.	78% % of the responses we have had say ' <i>there is nothing I want you to change</i> '. The Plan is derived from the questionnaire and public consultations	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
9	We are pleased that Overton Hill Car Park is on the back burner. Not a case of NIMBY but all along we have wanted to protect views and the first of many have of Overton is the one from Overton Hill/London Road to the church. Also, don't brick in the children in the playground.	Noted.	None
10	Can we ask that developers consider eco-homes. There are a number of features that should be included in any new homes. Much more sustainable.	We agree and this will be reflected in the revised plan.	Policy revised. Now H3(1)
11	I would like to have the employment site at Quidhampton removed. The current site already causes noise, traffic problems with HGV's driving down a 3 metre wide road damaging trees and verges. The current site provides no local employment –hence the need for a 25 space car park on the site. At present this is open land with views of the countryside and totally inappropriate for this type of development. The original planning for the units which was conversion of agricultural buildings was also strongly opposed at the time by Cllr Tilbury for the reasons that currently exist.	Noted. The policy allocates the land for employment. It would not be suitable for housing. Any planning application would be subject to all the usual controls.	Access changed and site redefined
12	Some concern about how robust the landscaping obligations are.	Noted.	Policy LB1 strengthened
13	Please include an explanation of the expression 'Secured by Design'	A reference to the website is given.	Supporting text revised.
14	Ditto	Ditto	
15	Make affordable housing criteria only available to local people not just an initial period of time.	We wanted to but it is not in conformity with BDBC allocations policy. The policy wording has been strengthened	Policy H1(4) revised

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
16a	As the NP is promoting a bias towards smaller developments and infill with phasing then developments of all sizes should contribute towards infrastructure improvements. One of the consequences arising from a multitude of small developments is that the aggregate demand on infrastructure, community services, flood risk etc. is just as great as a single large development. There is no logic to exempting small developments from making financial contributions or complying with policies applied to larger sites.... Larger developments have the ability to contribute more to the community and the impact is less than piecemeal development.	They will. If only one house is built, developer contributions are required. With the exception of multi-use footpaths (Policy T1, the policies apply to all development. Phasing helps to give a steady supply of affording homes. In the consultations, residents strongly preferred small sites phased over the period of the plan so they thought it would have less impact than one large suite.	None
16b	There is inadequate information in the emerging Local Plan to be assured that their policies will cover all the issues not addressed in the NP. Until there is a comprehensive Local Plan, or near final draft, then all issues must be covered by the NP. Where the NP relies on LP policies for each specific objective then finally, or at least as an interim, the objectives should be stated in the NP with a cross reference to the specific LP policy.	In the absence of an up to date local plan, the 'saved' policies of the Adopted Local Plan Apply. If there are no up to date policies, an NP does not have to comply with them. However, reference is also made to emerging plan policies.	None
16c	There is no mention of SUDS in the NP or in the Emerging Local Plan Documents.		
	In 2007 the Pitt Report made exceptionally strong recommendations that all new developments should minimise runoff by utilising SuDS. Also where possible existing developments should be retrofitted with SuDS. The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (F&WMA) embodied the requirement for SuDS. Although Schedule 3 of the F&WMA has yet to be implemented it is still a National Planning Requirement for all developments to incorporate SuDS.		
	The National Guidance has a hierarchy of preferred solutions for reducing the rate and volume of runoff with infiltration techniques given a high priority.		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	Many areas of Overton are underlain with “clay with flints” over “chalk”. Thus there is great potential to implement infiltration SuDS, providing the chalk is near the surface and adequately jointed or of a permeable texture. However in many areas of Overton, due to the thickness of the clay the chalk is relatively deep and developers frequently and erroneously construct soakaway type systems within the clay. That approach is incorrect and needs to be addressed in the NP or LP. During periods of high rainfall any SuDS relying on infiltration but erroneously located in soils with inadequate permeable fail and overland flooding arises. As a consequence, many existing properties that experience localised flooding are illegally connected directly or indirectly to the foul sewerage network with consequential impact on the load at the Sewage Treatment works.	We agree	Policy revised. Now H4(1)
16d	Contradictory policies on movement - Parking – NP Page 4 - S1 “Key Issues for shopping and services”, - L1 “Key issues for getting around” - T2 Parking at Overton Station. Most National and Local Planning Policies set out a requirement for accessibility by specifying minimum distances for new developments from schools, bus services, rail stations, doctor’s surgeries, shops etc. This policy encourages residents to walk, cycle or use public transport. The proposed NP policies to introduce additional parking encourages more car usage which is contrary to National Policy. The proposed development sites should be as close as possible to the public transport, school, doctor’s surgery and shops. The sites to the south and west of Overton do not meet the accessibility requirements. Public transport / bus services to the railway station should be provided as a priority objective. CIL topics must include improvements to the road leading to the station. A bus service particularly during peak periods would reduce car traffic and reduce parking demand at the station. The bus service through Whitchurch is diverted to the railway station. Similar provision should be a priority for Overton.	<p>We agree and the conflict is acknowledged. On balance we think the sustainability issues are in favour of providing more parking.</p> <p>We agree about buses to the station but it is not a planning issue for BDBC. However, it can be taken up by OPC with providers.</p>	<p>Supporting text to T2 inserted.</p>



No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
16e	Have discussions been held with the riparian owners along the River Test with an aim to provide public access? Has contact been made with the riparian owner along the north bank of the test through the Recreation Centre? If direct access is not possible can the hedge be removed to allow visibility of the watercourse? Although most of the local land owners do not prevent the public using many paths across their land, there is a distinct lack of public footpaths particularly in a west east orientation especially south of the village. Efforts should be made to change the status of the permissive paths and informal routes to Public Footpaths to establish a network of protected circular routes. Some of these land owners will benefit from their sites being allocated in the NP, thus there is an opportunity to enhance the public footpath network across their land away from the village.	Yes, there have been discussions. We note your comments about footpaths in general.	Policy E4 revised
16f	<p>– Policies for Landscape etc. – Policy LB1 item 2</p> <p>The existing wording , engage from the pre-app stage, is not strong enough. “From” can be interpreted as after and should be replaced by “during”.</p> <p>Developers frequently advance their master plans etc. prior to an application with limited consultation with stakeholders. Only holistic consultations over transport, drainage, land use etc. throughout the pre-application stage deliver a satisfactory solution. Without pre-app consultations stakeholders, developers are reluctant to modify the details in their full applications and compromise retrofitting requirements are second best solutions.</p>	We agree	Policy LB1 revised.
16g	<p>Policies for Landscape etc. – Policy LB1 item 4</p> <p>Minimising visual impact is a relatively weak statement</p>	We agree	Policy revised LB1(4)
16h	– Policy H1 item 1 provision / contribution of affordable homes		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	Small developments must contribute to the stock of smaller affordable homes in the same way as larger developments. The NP is aimed at maximising small developments and small phases thus fewer affordable homes will be delivered. The figure of 10 is arbitrary. The accumulated effect and impact of small developments means fewer affordable homes. The sites in the NP are relatively large in area compared to the number of dwellings being promoted on them and that will lead only to low density developments with large gardens and large houses.	Sites AW & WW have been withdrawn from the allocation. The figure for Site A is now 11 and it will deliver affordable homes. The figure of 10 is not arbitrary. It comes from an amendment to Planning Guidance. (The figure has now been amended to 11) The revised site allocations will deliver 40% affordable homes. On the larger sites, the developers' indicative plans include green space. The housing density in the built areas is similar to neighbouring developments. BDBC policy is to mix affordable homes with market housing. NP policy is to phase developments in order to ensure a steady supply of affordable homes.	None
	Small site developers could cooperate with each other and arrange for their combined quota of small affordable homes to be provided on only one of their sites. They can cooperate with each other and come to an amicable financial arrangement between themselves. This shared provision arrangement is currently used for SuDS where a single site wide solution such as a large balancing pond serves multiple developers.		
16i	Policy H3 item 1	We agree	
	In my extensive experience throughout the UK, I frequently encounter competing aspirations for water infrastructure and biodiversity. Meandering watercourses, swales, balancing ponds, reed beds etc. are excellent SuDS solutions and provide excellent biodiversity opportunities. However these drainage solutions require regular maintenance comprising dredging, silt removal, vegetation control etc. The features must not be deliberately enhanced to, or allowed to develop into habitats for protected species. As functional drainage is the original and primary objective, its maintenance must take priority over the flora /fauna		Policy revised. Now H4(2)

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
16j	<p>Policy W1 item 2</p> <p>Despite the results of the survey of HGVs on the C29 between Micheldever and Overton indicating the majority of HGVs are accessing properties along the road, the amount of HGV traffic is unsuitable for the road. They definitely cause a nuisance to both residents of the road and the car drivers using the road. During most of the day and especially during peak periods there is a queue of cars behind each HGV driving north on the C29. The rail bridge is too narrow and has inadequate forward visibility.</p>	<p>These are not planning issues for BDBC. They should be addressed by the transport member of OPC and Hampshire County Council.</p>	
	<p>The rural road is too narrow and most Overton residents are aware of accidents caused by large vehicles on that road.</p>		
	<p>Sat Navs appear to direct large HGVs along the road. The New Coop depot at Andover appears to have generated an increase of articulated Coop lorries along the road.</p>		None
	<p>HGVs accessing properties along the road are accepted. However the use of the C29 as a short cut to the A303 or north of Overton should be restricted. The C29 should be signed "Access Only – not suitable for large vehicles – ignore your Sat Nav". These type of signs are being used in such situations in various Counties. Frustrated car drivers accelerate along Winchester Street.</p>		
	<p>Is it possible to introduce traffic calming features such as chicanes on the southern section of Winchester Street between Highfields and the bend in the vicinity 121 Winchester Street. A suitable location for a chicane could be between numbers 101 and 115? HGV loading bays need to be provided to the shops in Winchester Street to prevent double parking.</p>		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
16k	Policies for shops and Services etc. – Policy S1 It is alleged that there are two parties who own several retail units in the village centre and they allegedly refuse to let vacant premises to persons who may provide competition to their main activities. This monopolistic situation (if true!) needs to be removed so that greater competition and variety is provided.	Neither the Parish Council nor the Borough Council has any legal power to alter the situation. It is not a matter for the NP.	None
16l	Policies for Shops etc. – Policy S3 This policy of increasing parking provision contradicts other policies that discourage the use of cars.	In the full version of the plan, a justification is given that if it means people travel fewer miles than they would to reach a main shopping centre then it means fewer car miles.	Supporting text added to Policy T2
16m	Parking can be made available by better policing of parking restrictions to increase turnover of vehicles.	OPC are working with BDBC on possible strengthening of existing restrictions and introducing new ones.	None
16n	Many more disabled spaces should be provided for those who are unable to walk or cycle.	A question for people with restricted mobility was asked in the questionnaire asking what would make life easier for them. More 'blue badge' parking was not mentioned. More cycle stands is now included as a project in policy T2.	Added to policy T2.
16o	Cycle stands should be provided.	See 16n	See 16n
16p	Policies for Getting around – Policy T1 Provision of multi-use paths where feasible, or contributions towards acquisition of rights or construction of multi-use paths should be made by developers of sites of all sizes and phases not only from developers of 10 plus sites. Inconsistency with policies – some are 10 or more and others are more than 10. I also recommend that all developments contribute.	Probably not realistic for small sites but developer contributions are required from all sites.  Thank you	Wording of Policy T1 corrected
16q	Policies for Getting around – Policy T2 Again increased parking is contrary to national policy. The CIL should not be used for parking.	See response to 16d	Policy T2 revised.
16r	Policies for Community Services – Policy CS1 The CIL should be used for community services – If Developers are required to contribute as well as pay the CIL it will be an unfair duplication of contribution.	Supporting text to Objective CS amended	Policy deleted
16s	– Policy E4 See comment point five , objective E4.		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	The Overton Biodiversity Society and Hampshire IoW Wildlife Trust are not statutory bodies and although they should be consulted as stakeholders they can only guide. However Natural England can be made a mandatory party acting for B&DBC Planners.	Noted	Policy now E3 revised
16t	Policies for Allocated Sites Policy SS1	We agree.	
	Policy H2 page 5 sets out the phasing but is not cross referenced to policy SS1 for phasing despite the objectives of scenario A page 9.		Supporting text amended
	Can Policy H2 and SS1 be integrated to ensure that irrespective of which site is being developed, the phasing is met?		
16v	The North Field located between the School and Kingsclere Road, north of the Church and south of Hill Meadow must be reconsidered.		
	1 Landscape; It is in the hollow and not visible from outside the built area.	1 We disagree. It is highly visible from many viewpoints.	No change
	2 There is space for housing and public open space. It would prevent expansion of the village perimeter.	2 Noted. All proposed developments sites would be an expansion of the village perimeter.	No change
	3 Accessibility: Its location near the school, nearer the station and within a reasonable walking distance of the shops and doctors surgery make it ideally located. It is better located than all the other sites	3 Noted. Accessibility is not the only consideration.	No change
	4 Phasing: It could easily be phased, using exactly the same housing number conditions as the multitude of sites.	4,5,6,7 The developer has ruled out any phasing.	No change
	5 The maximum number of combined occupations or housing completions in the period up to 2018 shall not exceed 120.		No change
	6 The maximum number of combined occupations or housing completions in the period from 2018 to 2024 shall not exceed 80 or a total of 200 between the period 2015 to 2024.		No change

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	7 The maximum number of combined occupations or housing completions in the period from 2024 to 2029 shall not exceed 70 or a total of 270 between the period 2015 to 2029. REASON this allows for phased development but not at a pace exceeding current aspirations nor being tied to a specific site coming forward as expected.		No change
	8 Highway Access; The main access and a secondary access could be off Kingsclere Road and minimise impact on other more minor	8 The developer has indicated a single exit/entry junction with 88% of the traffic going southbound to the traffic lights.	No change
	9 There is also a fantastic opportunity to provide an access off Kingsclere Road linking to Court Drove (? The road leading to the school and the Harrow Way). This would provide a through route to the school and overcome the current congestion and significant accident risk outside the school due to the cul-de-sac nature of the access to the school.	9 The developer has indicated a single exit/entry junction with 88% of the traffic going southbound to the traffic lights.	No change
	10 Parking: Additional parking for the school could be provided within the North Field adjacent to the school. If appropriate, parking off Kingsclere Road could serve the station as it is within walking distance.	10 Noted. These advantages are outweighed by the disadvantages of an extra 275 houses all built at once.	No change
	11 CIL etc.; The North Field, being in one ownership / development (albeit phased) would be easier to manage in planning terms and secure CIL or other contributions. It could provide funds to improve highway access to the station and a footway link. Either along the road parallel to the railway and/or Station Road.	11 Developer contributions will apply for all site sizes.	None
17	Under developer contributions, the ref to infrastructure should include parking. There is plenty of evidence of other locations where no provision has been made for parking and new roads have ????? dangerous bottle necks due to bumper-to-bumper parking. If providing parking means a few houses less, so be it. Improved parking should also be included under the 'vision' bullets (p3)	Parking is referred to in Policy T2. New developments must include BDBC parking standards dependent on the number of bedrooms. The NP must deliver at least 150 dwellings, come what may.	Policy T2 revised.

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
18	Try to emphasise opportunities for improving sustainability aspects of any developments, e.g. water recycling, insulation, etc.	We agree	Policy revised. Now H3(1)
19	I don't want any more houses. The school can't cope, nor the doctors nor the sewage. Nor do I agree with this plan. I don't agree with any more housing. We don't need it.	The Parish Council does not have the power make these decisions. Financial support to the school is covered by Policy L2 and the surgery by objective CS	None
20	Site K to be given priority. Access to site H (?site J) will be into the most dangerous stretch in Overton (C29). Site J to be omitted. Site G unsuitable.	Concern about Site J noted. It will be for the developer to design a safe access as a condition of approval. Site allocation have been influenced by residents' responses to consultations.	None
21a	Large estates do not belong in a village setting. Overton Hill always looked very out of place and 'plonked on the land. Smaller developments of max 30 houses should be considered. 70 houses behind 2 gate Lane is still too big	We have to work with what is available and negotiate with landowners. If we place a limit of 30 dwellings there are not enough sites to add up to 150 homes.	None
21b	Flooding. Any developments should be designed with plenty of grass in front and back gardens. Space around houses and landscaping all help to prevent flooding risks in the village.	We agree about water run-off. Policy including SUDS has been inserted	Policy revised. Now H3(1)
21c	The vision to enhance services is now in question following the Gazette (article) suggesting that any money from all this is going to Whitchurch. Also suggesting to off-load the additional kids at Overton school. The last year will be packed off to Whitchurch. This is appalling and ludicrous and should not happen. We will not stand for it. Make Overton school bigger and expand Whitchurch primary to take more children in all years.	OPC is pursuing this with Hampshire Education Authority. It is not a planning matter for BDBC. If a decision is reached to expand Overton school, Policy L2 will provide the money	Policy L2 revised.
22a	The plan and objectives are good but I worry about the possibility of an extra 260 houses on GNF giving Overton an extra 535 houses.	We believe that if the GNF development goes ahead then the NP will not allocate housing sites but this is not certain. This is why the NP is so important.	None
22b	No room at the school-children to be passed to Whitchurch.	See 6f above.	Policy L2 revised.
22c	We need more parking in the village and at the station but how is this achievable?	No suitable sites available now but the plan runs for 15 years. Policy T2 will allocate developer contributions if a site is offered.	None
22d	The shops will suffer. Everyone will drive out of the village for work shopping. How do we protect the global environment if this happens?	The plan supports more shops. A greater population makes our shops more viable, not less.	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
22e	Small sites. Will they have affordable housing?	Sites AW & WW have been withdrawn from the allocation. The figure for Site A is now 11 and it will deliver 40%affordable homes. See 16L	None
22f	I think all 150 houses should be at two Gate Lane, less visible, near the B3400.	The allocations reflect the results of public consultations.	None
23a	V2, line4. Insert 'engage in sport, recreation and exercise'	We believe that sport and recreation can both imply exercise	None
23b	H1. After 'needs of local residents, insert 'including affordability'.	We think 40% affordable housing adequately covers this point	None
23c	Key issues for enjoyment/recreation. The first bullet pt does not acknowledge the need for improvements to modernise and enhance facilities. e.g. upgrade of Town Meadow.	We agree	Policy revised. Now E1
23d	First bullet pt to read, 'To support and enhance social, sporting and recreational facilities.	As above	Policy revised. Now E1
23e	Assessment criteria. The criteria don't seem to give weight to the factor that central development, as opposed to the edge of the village can add to congestion. Development of 2 Gate Lane site should mean that traffic goes away from the village to the employment centre of Basingstoke.	We disagree. Development closer to amenities means less travel by car. A study of traffic leaving Overton Hill shows that it goes both ways almost equally	None
24	Don't think any development should be anywhere near the junior school. It will increase the congestion at peak times.	Noted. If houses are built near the school, the children of these households will walk to school. If the houses are built on the other side of the village they are more likely to come by car. We agree that parking at the school is a problem which needs a solution. OPC is pursuing it.	None
25a	Should have an up to date aerial photo on the front cover. If we are trying to emphasise that we want staged growth we must ensure that those studying the document are clear about how big we are already.	Agreed.	Front cover revised.
25b	Does L2 need to be reviewed in view of what we have learned about having to bus children to Whitchurch?	Agreed.	Policy L2 revised.



No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
25c	In view of letter to N&V April edition, you may need to clarify the wording on P2,4 <sup>th</sup> para of the summary. I can see where the confusion lies as it's not clear that the 120 are predetermined by BDBC.	Noted.	More explanation provided in full text of plan
26	The obvious place to build 150 plus houses is the GNF. Pond Close, Sapley Playing Field and Vinn's Lane are much too far out of the village and over-developed already. The infrastructure for these is wholly inadequate for any more houses. Two Gate Lane is a possible alternative but not in preference to GNF.	GNF is not on offer for 150 dwellings. Sapley Lane Playing Field is not being proposed. Vinn's Lane has been withdrawn from the allocation. Comment on Pond Close (Site K) noted. Policy H4 has been strengthened to address infrastructure issues.	Policy H4 revised
27a	I would like to see the levels of sustainability of all new developments to be at the maximum that can realistically be afforded, not just the minimum required. I suggest adding to policy LB1 specifying a higher than minimum energy efficiency and water use stated unless the developer can demonstrate that this would make building unviable.	We agree	Policy revised. Now H3(1)
27b	Include plan for SUDS at pre-application stage as part of community engagement.	We agree	Policy revised. Now H4(2)
27c	Building must be sensitive to Overton Conservation Area appraisal.	We agree	Policy revised. Now LB1(1)
28	We have been advised to write to you by Rosemary Sullivan and Ian Tilbury because we have serious concerns about one of the reserve housing development sites - the field opposite Vinns Lane.	Noted.	Vinn's Lane (Site M) has been withdrawn.
	I have attended two village meetings and have written down my concerns in the feedback forms and chosen from options as requested. It seems that the field remains an option.		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	Having read the Summary Version of the Overton Neighbourhood Plan dated February 2015, I can see that North Field is no longer included in the scenarios. While I absolutely agree that it is incredibly special and should be protected I feel that our field and the surrounding area of countryside should also be protected and I don't understand why North Field is no longer included in the options as it was on it and the focus has now been aimed at our side of the village which is also a natural edging to the village and hosts a great deal of wildlife.		
	<b>Our concerns are for:</b>		
	1. The protection of the natural habitat that this field and the fields beside it provide. Kites fly above and nest in the trees beside the field. We are surely hoping on a national scale hoping to preserve their numbers. Also deer roam and I spotted 3 today who would be further pushed into limited countryside and strange habitats. If they crossed the road, the increased traffic would pose a great danger.		
	2. We are bordering the Test river and near its source and surely more residents would increase traffic and pollution potential from rubbish and traffic fumes in the cut through road, Silk Mill Lane, where ducks cross daily and a wide range of birds nest on the river. Also, the ancient banks would be further cut up by traffic, as there would be many residents who would be using this road to cut through to the train station to commute or to schools in the area.		
	3. There is a history of flash flooding in the area which came up in our surveys when we moved in to our house 9 months ago (New House, Vinns Lane). This is because of the steep angle of the field. Any tarmac laying or building work would exasperate the problem. Apparently Parsonage Farmhouse had to raise the entrance of its doorway to prevent a repeat but the bungalows which house a number of elderly residents would be prone to this flooding.		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	4. There are several listed buildings in the surrounding area including Parsonage Farmhouse, Tithe Cottage and Rosemary Sullivan's House on the corner. To preserve the visual approach of the village, surely their visual presence should be protected from obstructing developments.		
	5. We live in New House in Vinns Lane which at the moment has a view overlooking this field. I realise that we have a personal interest in preserving it but it is why we chose this house - to look out on the beauty of the area and to help preserve it in any way we can.		
	We look forward to hearing from you with regards to how my comments will be logged and will Basingstoke Council see them.	Your comments will be seen by BDBC	
29a	Tom Ridler states 'this is the first time we have had the opportunity to shape our own future' which is not true as the last time there was any so called consultation on housing volunteers produced the 'Village Design Statement', hailed as the shining example of how rural planning should be done at the time, and then IGNORED.	The VDS provides supplementary planning guidance and carries legal weight, as does a NP.	None
	Sorry to be cynical but why will this time be any different?		
29a1	Whilst I agree it is preferable for the local community to plan its own future there is the obvious point that BDBC may not accept this Neighbourhood Plan. Smaller phased development should be the way to go for all rural communities - but look what happened with Overton Hill. That started out to be 60 houses, to conform to 'the ancient street pattern of Overton'. Clearly that's not what we got!	The NP team is working closely with BDBC and the feedback is constructive.	None
29b	It seems nobody questions the number of houses to be built - you just deliver the 150 'required' by the BDBC local plan. Furthermore, the local authority rejected the plan for a further 120 houses on Overton Hill, only to roll over on appeal. Well that's likely to be 740 more cars trundling through the village for a start off.	OPC has no legal power to determine the number of houses.	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
29c	As to all this nonsense about 'discouraging short car journeys' - well discourage all you like. You can do nothing whatsoever to prevent people making them!	We do not agree. Attitudes and the decisions people make do change over time.	None
29d	I am amused at the very idea that you can 'improve parking facilities'. What are you going to do, knock down buildings in the village centre to accommodate more vehicles? Use cloud storage?	We agree that no sites are available now but could become available in the future	Policy T2 revised
29e	I hear from a reliable source that Overton Primary School - L2- could not accommodate pupils in line with all this development and children would be 'bussed to Whitchurch'. That represents a split community which is unacceptable and proves that villages cannot sustain this scale of expansion.	This is not a planning matter for BDBC. OPC is pursuing it with Hampshire Education Authority	Policy L2 revised.
29f	What is all this utter rubbish - policy T1- about 'provision of multi-use paths and cycle tracks'? Reminiscent of the bus lanes on the motorways - a waste of public money with no guarantee that anyone will use them	We agree there is no guarantee but we believe people will use them.	None
29g	It also reminds me of the stupid argument put forward to support the Overton Hill development, that Overton has a station so people will commute via train. The reality is that the vast majority of rail users drive here from elsewhere to park for free.	We agree.	Supporting text to Policy T2 amended.
29h	The village has very good sporting and recreational facilities- rendering policy E1 pointless- unless we are just supposed to be grateful that the planners don't decide to build all over the football pitches.	We have re-worded the policy to allow for upgrading of existing facilities	Policy revised. E1.
29i	Policy E2 does not seem to have helped much to date - nobody seems to have cared too much about the natural environment when agreeing to the next phase of Overton Hill despite it's proximity to the river. Worse E4 talks about improving access to the riverside - wildlife does not stand a chance! There really are places people do not need to go. We don't want artificial green space- E3- we want to preserve the countryside we have.	The policy wording makes public access conditional on low biodiversity impact	Policy E4 revised

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
29j	Funny that one site put forward is 'East of Overton Hill car park' - the site of the village hall that nobody wanted! It would have made far more sense to fill that area in than go close to the river - and I can't believe only 10 houses could or would be put there.	The site has a restrictive covenant on it which could be difficult to remove. It is no longer allocated.	None
29k	Face it - you are dealing with a mobile population, very few of whom live and work in the village. There is no realistic way in which the village can support employment for all - and even if you did provide it there would be nothing to stop people from outside the village taking up said jobs. Unless of course you are planning some kind of commune .....	Noted	None
30a	My reason for writing is to highlight what could, potentially, be a weakness within the document. This is the selection of Site M, W of Vinn's Lane. There are many contradictions within the document both using its' criteria and intent with the selection of Site M as reserve. My main concern is were Site M to be used, it could result in lengthy reviews concerning impact statements and FOI requests focusing on the decision making process. This would put unnecessary strain on the need to move the generally robust Overton Neighbourhood Development Plan forward.		
	I have outlined the problem areas below:		
	Page 3 "V1 Above all, we want Overton to remain a village, set in its open landscape."		
	The development on Site M would begin a gradual creep of development, blurring the end of the village and reducing its distinctiveness.		
	Page 3, Our Vision for Overton.		
	"To conserve and enhance the things people value most about living in Overton"		
	Page 3, Objectives for landscape, the built environment and local distinctiveness.		
	"Key issues for landscape and the built environment.		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	1 -In the questionnaire, over 90% valued Overton as a compact settlement connected to the surrounding countryside.	Noted. Site M has been withdrawn from the allocation	
	2 -To conserve existing views within, to and from the village.		
	3 -To respect the settings of listed buildings, especially the four grade II* buildings.		
	4 -New developments must respond to the local context and distinctiveness in terms of design and location.		
	5 -To conserve the green open areas within the village."		
	Unfortunately, there appears to be many discrepancies with these key issues and the decision to use Site M as a reserve.		
	1. The decision would be counter to the 90% who valued a compact settlement.		
	2. The site would change the views within, to and from the village, particularly on entry and exit to the village.		
	3. There are a higher proportion of listed buildings within Southington and this location would not respect them.		
	4. The design of the new builds would be a complex affair to respond to the local context and distinctiveness. The location would not fulfil these requirements.		Site allocation amended
	5. This location would not impact on any of the green open areas within the village.		
	Page 4, Objectives for getting around.		
	"Key Issues for getting around		
	-Capacity of the roads to accommodate more traffic		
	-The number of HGV's.		
	-Road safety.		
	-The need to discourage short car journeys."		
	These objectives do not appear to have been met regarding Site M and its' location.		
	Page 4 Objectives for enjoyment and recreation		
	"Footpaths within and beyond the village are highly valued but can be improved."		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	Potential impact on footpaths with the area of Site M. E2, not fulfilled without further research.		
	Page 5, Policies for landscape, the built environment and local distinctiveness. Policy LB1. Point 1, not fulfilled. Point 4, not fulfilled.		
	Page 5, Policies for housing, Policy H3. A detailed report of the site has not been made, this means the use of the site may not fulfil this requirement or become cost prohibited to comply with this. (There have been several studies carried out within Southington on biodiversity etc.)		
	Page 6, Policies for shops and services, Policy S3. Due to the location this is not achieved, it could be argued the location of site M will increase traffic to the village centre adding to parking problems.		
	Page 7, Policies for enjoyment and recreation, Policy E2. This policy is still in development / emerging and therefore has not been adequately addressed.		
	Page 7, Policies for enjoyment and recreation, Policy E3 and E4 would require research to confirm the site is compliant with these policies, as yet this has not been done.		
	Page 7, Selecting Sites for New Housing, Assessment Criteria, 1,2,4,5, 7,8. It would appear, at first look that these criteria are not meet for the site.		
31	I would like to raise my concerns about the field at Southington being on the reserve list for house building. My thoughts are as follows: It is the gateway to the village of Overton from the west - even with the houses at the top of the field the entry roads will be visually intrusive.	Noted. Site M has been withdrawn from the allocation	Site allocation amended
	Several listed buildings within a few hundred metres		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	Flooding - there have been two flash floods that affected Parsonage Farmhouse as a result of the steep angle of this field. Tarmac / building speeds run off and exacerbates the problem. Previous owners of Parsonage Farmhouse raised the height of their entrance way to prevent a repeat but the bungalows at Southington Close remain vulnerable.		
	Southington has a distinct village character separate from Overton which will be spoiled by such a large quantity of houses - There are probably about 50 houses including the bungalows in Southington Close (my rough count up) so this will just about double the size of Southington - completely out of scale.		
	Placing more family homes at the far end of the village will add to village traffic - three quarters of a mile each way is too far for most people to walk exacerbating parking problems for the village centre with people accessing shops / playgroup		
	The ancient banks of Silk Mill Lane already largely destroyed by traffic in particular school run traffic - family homes in this location could add many more daily journeys causing further damage.		
32	We seem to have been ignored. We really need another road on to Overton Hill. I think there will be an accident.	We suggest you contact Overton Parish Council. Overton Hill is not within the NP	None
33	Concerns regarding traffic flow and congestion in Winchester St. My preference is for 125 dwellings on site F keeping the majority of development on the east side of the village. Scrap site J.	There is nothing a NP can realistically do about traffic congestion. A study of Overton Hill showed that the traffic goes almost equally in both directions. The site allocation was influenced by public consultations.	None
34	As the Parish Councillor for Deane I am concerned that your plan includes a small development at Ashe Warren. In spite of government promises any development in the countryside inevitably leads to large estates. I am of the opinion that any development outside of existing parish boundaries should be connected to the parish.	Site AW has been removed from the allocation.	Policy SS1 revised.



No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	I am also puzzled as I read both the Overton plan and the Oakley plan is that Southern Water state that the sewage works are at full capacity. At times of high rainfall the sewage plant at Ivy Lane floods and flows to Deane and then on to Overton. We are both in a flood plain and this should be sufficient concern to limit any development West of the Ivy Lane works.	We agree about sewage and have reworded our policies to reduce inflow of rainwater into the sewers arising from new developments.	Policy revised. Now H4(1) and H4(3)
35	I have read through the Overton plan as you requested with an eye towards the needs of older people. My initial thoughts are that it seems very comprehensive and there has been good involvement. I only have the following points	Thank you. Noted. Phasing the development would not remove the obligation. The parameters for CIL have not been decided yet. Policies concerning developer contributions have been revised. We note your comments concerning people living with dementia	
	On page 26 CS1 – what parameters are these needs based on. What sort of contribution will be expected from developers?		Policies T2, L2, E1, E4 revised
	Page 25 T1 - Housing developments over 10 dwellings are expected to make a contribution towards multi-use paths which would be good from an access point of view and a reduction in the likelihood of falls. Will this obligation be in place even if the developer provides the houses in stages of 10 or less?		
	It is recognised that health needs may increase as the population ages. It would be good to use the principles of dementia friendly communities and get input from dementia advisers when planning community facilities (these principles such as clear signage can benefit the wider community too).		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
36	We object most strongly to the selection of WW owing to the complete disregard to the issues of Access. The farm track off the B3051 is a footpath and single track lane. There are considerable issues at present for residents and locals concerning safe use of the track to support existing dwellings and traffic movement, without the potential to exacerbate the problem further. There is insufficient space for passing without encroaching onto neighbouring property. The path is regularly used by cyclists, ramblers, joggers, dog walkers, horse riders and children. There are various blind spots and no passing places.	Site WW has now been removed from the allocation	
	Access from the B3051 relies on no traffic exiting the narrow single track lane, and when this is impeded, vehicles are left stationary on the B3051 and it is not known locally as the 'mad mile' without reason! Departing from the track onto the B3051 to turn right towards Overton is hazardous in itself, as traffic flowing south approaches over the brow of hill, with no line of sight.		
	In addition to the above, we would have to challenge the alleged score of 68 under your assessment criteria. The score for the first three criteria cannot have been more than 5? The site is not close to the village centre. The proposed dwelling next to Longbarrow House would have a massive impact on the landscape. Ease of connection to an adequate road, score 1. I would also query any score for		Policy SS1 revised
	Item 6, the Lack of Legal or Physical Constraints in particular relation to track access and ownership.		
	The proposed development does not fulfil the Objectives for Housing and in particular contradicts H3 relating to Efficiently conserve natural resources, reduce pollution and promote biodiversity. The development also contradicts in entirety, the Objectives for Getting Around – it will actively encourage use of vehicles for short journeys and previous experience has proven the potential for a bus route to be uneconomic.		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	We also have to point out the inability of local councillors to support outlying properties which was highlighted recently by the bridge closure and total lack of consultation and once again highlighted by the production of this document without the knowledge of any affected resident.		
37	<p>My concern is the Willesley Warren Farm site. I object to the development of this site on the grounds of unsafe access. It is approached by a track which already has traffic problems. My specific issues are:</p> <p>1. When we moved to the area the track had very little traffic and as a consequence there are properties with very poor visibility when joining the track. It was a farm track and good visibility was not an important concern. A few years ago 3 houses were built at Willesley Warren and since then traffic on the track has increased tremendously. Frequent vehicles driving at high speed make it very dangerous for myself and my neighbours to pull out of our drives onto the track. We are unable to increase visibility because the hedges do not belong to us. 5 extra properties at Willesley Warren will really increase the amount of traffic and increase the likelihood of a serious accident.</p> <p>2. On the attached plan I have shaded blue the section of the track that is a concern. Since traffic on the track has increased this section is a problem because there are no passing places. Vehicles have to pull into private driveways to pass. Of particular concern is the junction of the track with the B3051. Vehicles frequently have to wait at this point for the track to be clear to drive on, but they have to wait on the driveway of April Cottage. This is not public land and the owner of this property has no requirement to allow this. If access to this land is denied then vehicles will have to wait on the B3051 for the track to be clear. This is unsafe because of the fast speed of traffic on the B3051 and the lack of visibility caused by the brow of the hill. More traffic on the track will worsen the issues with passing.</p>	<p>Site WW has now been removed from the allocation</p>	<p>Policy SS1 revised</p>

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	<p>3. The neighbours in the area currently fix potholes in the track, cut hedges to maintain visibility splays and cut verges to improve visibility. This is carried out on land that does not belong to us. If there is housing development at Willesley Warren then I have concerns about who is responsible for visibility and safety on the track and at the junction with the B3051. You seem to have not considered that this was a farm track, but developing a community at Willesley Warren will require it to be converted into a maintained and safe road</p> <p>4. Our enjoyment of the area will be further reduced. The track was a place where the residents of the area could walk and cycle - it is a public footpath. Children like to be able to walk between the houses. When 3 houses were built at Willesley Warren it became more dangerous to use because of the lack of visibility accessing the track and blind bends on the track. Allowing children on the track is a constant concern. With more houses I think the track will be too unsafe to allow children to use. It appears the Parish Council has made the decision to support the development of this site but without looking for input from local residents. The consultation exercise that was undertaken for the village sites has not been carried out for the Willesley Warren site and so the local issues have not been considered. I think the Development Plan should be amended to say that the Willesley Warren site has access problems that would need to be resolved before it could become a possible development site.</p>		
38	<p>We would like to raise our concerns in response to the initial suggestion of extending the Ouidhampton Business Units onto adjoining agricultural land as per the Overton Neighbourhood Plan Summary dated February 2015, page 12.</p> <p>We feel this expansion would be gravely inappropriate due to the following reasons:-</p>		<p>Access changed and site redefined</p>

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development will be over-bearing and out of character, detracting from the sustainability of the area rather than adding to it.</li> </ul>	Noted. All development must conform to planning regulations including appearance, traffic.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will not generate local employment; many individuals already working in the existing business units travel from outside of Overton.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are already empty units on the existing site and by the railway station; these have now been vacant for at least 3 months.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic generation and congestion; primarily from heavy goods vehicles and delivery vans servicing the business units from outside Overton. It is our experience and observation as residents that deliveries to the existing business units continue to increase in frequency as do the sizes of vehicles making the deliveries.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased carbon dioxide emission; again, from heavy goods vehicles and delivery vans servicing business units from outside Overton. From our experience and observations as residents, the number of daily deliveries vastly outnumbers the number of personnel working at the units. Even if all such employees were local, any reduction of carbon emissions is greatly out-weighed by vastly increased emissions from deliveries.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor site access from existing roads increasing risk of accidents and congestion.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road safety; both Station Road and more importantly Polhampton Farm Road are highly popular walking routes in and out of the village used by local residents.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and disturbance resulting from use of the field as an industrial estate.</li> </ul>		Access changed and site redefined
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual impact of the development, particularly to the open and rural aspect of the neighbourhood.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact to the overlooking properties (Osier Cottage and Vyne House) and loss of privacy.</li> </ul>		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacting effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood;</li> </ul>		
	<p>Quidhampton has a long and rich history as a rural community. It is very popular rural landscape used by dog walkers, hikers, bird watchers, runners and cyclists. Osier Cottage, previously known as Vine Kennels, which is nearly 200 years old was home to the local Huntsman John West (1881 British Census), his family and lodgers; Kennel man Waiter Vosper and Whipper-In Joseph Pick. These men looked after hunting dogs for local gentry. Royal hunts also took place in the area. This heritage should be protected for the benefit of all Overton residents.</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of light / overshadowing of the development to existing adjoining properties are a concern.</li> </ul>		
	<p>Page 1 Increased risk of water run-off and resultant flooding; as a rural area, there is no drainage in the vicinity and considering the slope of the landscape, the existing field provides drainage for Osier Cottage. We already witness regular flooding further along Polhampton Farm Road in times of heavy rain.</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse effect of the development and increased traffic on the character, appearance and sustainability of the conservation area opposite the proposed site which is home to many types of land and water birds as well as other animals.</li> </ul>		
	<p>Based on these numerous reasons, we would like to express our strong objection to the suggested extension of the Quidhampton Business Units. We do not believe they are in the best interest of the local and broader Overton community.</p>		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
39	<p>We have concerns over the plan for five dwellings at Willesley Warren as this would involve more traffic using the track leading on to the B3051. The track is directly in front of our property and that of our neighbours and is in effect a footpath and single track lane. We already have an issue with traffic travelling down this track at speed and worry at the prospect of more doing the same if nothing is done to control the situation. We do not object in principle to 5 properties being built at Willesley Warren, it is a wonderful place to live but would need assurances that a structure was put in place to make the track safe in all aspects including the junction on to the B3051 from the track. This does not appear to have been considered as yet nor had we been informed or aware of the prospect of five properties considered for the Willesley Warren area .</p>	<p>Site WW has now been removed from the allocation.</p>	
	<p>We have lived at April Cottage, which is right next to the junction for the B3051, for nearly forty years and have seen the B3051 become a very busy road and the speed of traffic much greater. There have already been accidents at the junction onto the B3051 from the track; one involving a tractor turning right onto the B3051 and one involving our daughter on her moped turning right onto the track from the B3051. In both accidents the vehicles were hit from behind by speeding traffic coming over the brow of the hill from the direction of Kingsclere. In both cases lives were not lost but the potential for it is there. We have serious concerns that more traffic emerging onto B3051 could result in more serious accidents. The Objective for Getting Around section of the plan is not being fulfilled in this respect and needs much more thought into the dangerous situation that could occur unless speeding traffic is controlled. We will be visiting the community centre on one of the dates indicated in the plan to discuss these issues with the Overton Neighbourhood Plan Group but felt the need to point out these issues to the Parish Council too.</p>		<p>Policy SS1 revised</p>

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
40a	My concern is in keeping with the suggestions I opted for scenario D at the public exhibition on 24 <sup>th</sup> Jan. my main area of concern is that the 'voting' was an ambiguous process, particularly as most of the space was devoted to pitches by selected developers. I was assured by a member of the NP Group that this was a consultation, but the summary treats the results as a majority verdict.. In any event the summary does not provide us with the opportunity to make our own evaluation of the results. Consequently, I feel that NPG has not done enough to justify transparently its selection of sites in scenario A.	The voting results are posted on the OPC website. The process was explained on the ONP boards. There was a clear majority in favour of Scenario A. The voting results are in full version Pre-submission Plan which is on the OPC website.	None
40b	While I share the village's great unease about the number of houses imposed upon us, compounded by the threat of the GNF, I do not question the desirability of some development. However, given the imposed constraints, I support the view that the NP should attempt to secure housing to meet the needs of local people, the highest number of affordable homes to meet local need, the maximum contributions from developers for infrastructure and community benefit and carefully planned phasing over the life of the Plan. Unfortunately, I think the sites proposed are unlikely to meet the above criteria or, indeed, the Plan's own housing objectives. The NP Group's proposal to spread the development over a number of sites is likely to reduce the affordable housing allocation and be neither viable nor sustainable in terms of infrastructure, particularly roads. Indeed, this 'pepper-pot' approach is likely to exacerbate the negative consequences of development.	The NP Group have responded to the very strong public preference for small sites. The plan as a whole will aim to deliver a minimum of 40% affordable homes. All developments will make contributions. We have no reason from the landowners/developers to suppose that the smaller sites will not be viable or sustainable.	Policies T2, L2, E1, E4 revised as concerns developer contributions
40c	The proposed Sapley Lane development will increase the volume of traffic criss-crossing the centre of the village.	By dividing housing across many sites we aim to minimise the impact of traffic. Some traffic from this site will go south to the A303	None
40d	The proposal to include simultaneously two relatively large allocations at Two Gate Lane and Sapley Lane is likely to make unrealistic demands for improved infrastructure at and for both sites	The aim is to phase development so they will not be built simultaneously. The policy concerning infrastructure has been revised following discussions with Southern Water	Policy H2 and H4 revised



No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
40e	I am also concerned that the inclusion of so many sites, particularly the four small sites, will make it very difficult for villagers to express a clear view when it comes to referendum. Once they have voted, it will not be clear from the result if they have voted for or against the whole proposal or just part of it. Moreover, given such confusion before the question is put, many may decide not to vote at all.	At the referendum, voters can accept or reject the whole plan, not just parts of it. The submission Plan will explain how the conclusions have been arrived at.	None
41	Policy S1 (additional local shops). Phrase to encourage additional grocery store to provide competition to and lower prices than Co-op.	OPC has no power to decide for what purpose a shop will be used.	None
42a 42b	P3, V2. Insert 'wildlife' after landscape and before heritage. Additional bullet point to vision about village life.	We consider 'wildlife' to be part of the enjoyment of rural landscape. Wildlife corridors are included in Policy H4 and habitats in policy E4.	None
42c	Add biodiversity to key issues about housing.	We agree.	Addition made to supporting text Policy H3.
42d	3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point currently reads as though young people should look elsewhere. Change to 'are having to look'	We think the wording is clear	None
42e	H3. Promote biodiversity 'is not very meaningful. Suggest 'conserve and enhance'.	The comment refers to Objective H3. Policies H3 clarifies how it will be achieved.	Policy H3 revised
42f	P4. Key issues for learning/skills. Would like a mention of traditional land management skills. There is an increasing disconnect between general population and those involved in activities such as farming, woodland management that maintain our landscape and wildlife. Should seek opportunities for children to engage with those skills.	We think this is a valid point but the NP has no power to influence school curricula	None
42g	E2. Include non-statutory bodies like Hampshire and IOW Wildlife Trust.	We have added 'partner organisation' to the policy wording	Objective E2 revised.
42h	E2. Would prefer a more positive approach. Rather than simply preventing harm or loss, there should be an emphasis on enhancing or restoring important habitats and associated biodiversity.	The NP and Borough Council Planning department are concerned with development and planning permission. Consents for development within/near a designated area may well involve enhancing and restoring but the first priority is to protect by not allowing development in those areas.	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
43	It would be foolish to expect the village to remain unchanged but any change should be appropriate and managed. The proposal for the GNF is neither of these. Their proposals are speculative and take no cognisance of the needs and wishes of the locals. They talk of affordable homes but affordable to whom? They talk of accessibility to the station which would suit incomers but would only put a strain on the infrastructure of Overton. Such a large development is unsustainable and would change the character of Overton for good and once lost it will never come back.	Noted. The GNF is not an allocated site.	None
44	I do not believe that a number of small developments will deliver the affordable housing that a large development will. I think Site F would be better than J being nearer to the village centre. I am worried that the NPG have missed the point of affordable housing for the young people of Overton who want to stay in the village.	The plan as a whole aims for a minimum 40% and is achievable. Phasing will help to give a steady supply of affordable homes	Supporting text to Policy H2 revised.
45	Only houses for local people. We have been let down by the Parish Council, Basingstoke and Hampshire. We have been too quick to give in to government demands for housing.	The law does not allow an NP to make this stipulation but Policy H1(4) has been revised to read 'exclusive' access.	Policy H1(4) revised
46a	Define what is an 'affordable home'. Do you mean subsidised, if so by whom? And publish data supporting the scale suggested. E.g. is the demand from folk who work in Overton?	There is a definition in the glossary of the full plan. Housing need is referenced No55 in the full plan.	None
46b	Provide evidence that more riverside access/footpaths are required. I see very little use being made of the extensive access and footpaths networks already in and around the village.	The proposal was supported by 78% of those who responded to the questionnaire.	None
46c	Plenty of info on plots and house numbers. No mention of the size and quantity of the housing proposed-bedrooms/plot sizes.	Housing mix is now defined in terms of the number of bedrooms in supporting text to policy H1(2). Housing density is not mentioned but is governed by BDBC policies to conform with the surrounding area.	Policy H1(2) revised
46d	Tell us how much housing needs building in the area to make it affordable. Demand vs supply=build more.	The NP is required to deliver 150 homes.	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
47	Landowner BLUE admitted site F will have a landscape impact which by your own assessment criteria (30) is the most important factor. It also breaches policy LB1 as this site is the highest in the village and will be seen from many footpaths. This was admitted by the landowner at the open day in January. Site F is not well screened so your statement is incorrect and a dangerous precedent in AONB.	The site is assessed as having 'high capacity' for development primarily because the visual impact is low. This site is not within or within the setting of the AONB.	None
48	Southington is a conservation area of beauty. It still has the character of a Hamlet which it originally was.	We think these comments relate to Site M which has been withdrawn as an allocated site.	None
	The increased influx of traffic without a doubt will filter directly into Southington Lane and along Silk Mill lane and not through the village of Overton. This is already a bottleneck at peak times.		
	This traffic increase would not only erode the pathways and verges as mentioned but increases the possibility of a serious accidents as children walk to school. It would no longer be a "lane".		
	The more cars in rush hour and throughout the day eventually causes the destruction of an "Area of outstanding Beauty" which the Hamlet of Southington has been designated as.		
	Gateway to the village of Overton from the west - even with the houses at the top of the field the entry roads will be visually intrusive		
	Several listed buildings within a few hundred metres (Parsonage Farmhouse, Tithe Cottage and Rosemary and Paul and Jan and Pat Fox's houses I believe - oh and the red phone box :)		Policy SS1 revised.
	Flooding - there have been two flash floods that affected Parsonage Farmhouse as a result of the steep angle of this field. Tarmac / building speeds run off and exacerbates the problem. Previous owners of Parsonage Farmhouse raised the height of their entrance way to prevent a repeat but the bungalows at Southington Close remain vulnerable		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	Southington has a distinct village / hamlet character separate from Overton which will be spoiled by such a large quantity of houses - There are probably about 50 houses including the bungalows in Southington Close (my rough count up) so this will just about double the size of Southington		
	Placing more family homes at the far end of the village will add to village traffic - three quarters of a mile each way is too far for most people to walk exacerbating parking problems for the village centre with people accessing shops / playgroup		
	The ancient banks of Silk Mill Lane already largely destroyed by traffic in particular school run traffic - family homes in this location could add many more daily journeys causing further damage.		
49	<p>Whilst we do not believe that the village amenities Rail\Parking\Doctors etc. can sustain the great influx of people that the proposed developments will cause, we do accept that some building will have to take place and are generally in agreement with the majority of the proposed plans. However we would like to register our objection to the proposal of Site M in Southington as a Reserve Site and thus removed from the plan.</p> <p>Our objections are based on the following concerns;</p> <p>1. An increased volume of Traffic through Overton High Street, through the recently introduced pinch point near Red Lion Lane, this is already causing delays in the village and will only increase.</p> <p>2. Directly linked to point 1, is an increased volume of Traffic down Southington Lane\Silk Mill Lane, we have already seen an increase of traffic using the route as a Rat Run to the School and the Station as it circumvents the traffic lights, we expect the pinch point will encourage more and more traffic to take a "short cut". An additional development will only add to this load.</p>	Thank you. Site M has now been withdrawn as an allocated site.	Policy SS1 revised

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	3. Silk Mill Lane as you will know is a single track lane with one or two passing points, however it would appear that some people are taking it on themselves to 'create' new passing points eroding the ancient banks of Silk Mill Lane and our driveway, as a resident of Silk Mill Lane it is a daily occurrence to see someone attempt to access our drive to allow a vehicle to pass but in doing so ending up wedged onto the bank, damaging it in the process. There has also been a number of occasions where there have been near misses as we try to leave our drive and people blindly reverse up it, we can only anticipate that this will get worse.		
50	Firstly I would like to thank the team who have put The Overton Neighbourhood Plan together and run the community awareness campaign. Clearly much thought and time has gone into the initiative and I am sure that it has engaged more of the community as a result.	Site M has now been withdrawn as an allocated site.	
	I am writing to express my concern about the choice of site <b>M: West of Vinn's Lane</b> being used for the development of 30 houses. My concerns are that		
	It does not fit with V1 or LB1 - to remain a village, conserve views and have an open landscape. This site, being on the Western edge of the village and on a slope would impact on the views of those approaching from the West and the countless walkers who walk behind this site.		
	This field has twice caused the flooding of properties opposite;		Policy SS1 revised
	Additional family housing at site M will mean more traffic using Silk Mill Lane to get to the school. Having walked up this lane for the last 10 years it is shocking to see how it has deteriorated as more and more vehicles have used it as a rat run to the school and the station. This has been to the detriment of the environment as well as reducing the safety of cyclists and walkers.		

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	<p>The site has a proposal for 30 houses. There are around 50 dwellings in total in Southington with the only group of dwellings being in Southington Close. Neither a cul de sac nor the quantity of houses suit the character of Southington which would then be 60% bigger.</p> <p>The site is a good half mile from the shops and the reality is that <u>people will drive to local facilities.</u></p> <p>I appreciate that housing development is never going to please everyone but the development of this site alters the balance of the village, the feel of Southington and will add traffic to the key routes to the school, the station and the village centre.</p>		
51	<p>I'm writing to raise my concerns about the plan of having the site across from Parsonage Farm &amp; Southington Close in Overton on the reserve list for the building of new homes. My husband &amp; I have been living in Southington (2 Silk Mill Lane) for the past 7 years, and moved to Overton &amp; particularly Silk Mill Lane, for it's unique village feel, beautiful surroundings and quiet location.</p> <p>This has been increasingly disrupted over the past few years due to increased traffic along Silk Mill Lane. This is a beautiful, quiet country lane, which many residents use to walk along to experience the beautiful surroundings and walk towards the river on The Lynch. In recent times, the traffic down Silk Mill Lane has increased to the extent where the verges of the lane have been eroded away in several areas, where traffic has increasingly been using them as passing points. Cars speed down this lane, especially during rush hour &amp; school times, and the lane is continuing to get wider and wider, which is destroying the hedge and tree line. Having more houses in Southington would increase this already over-used lane, with further detrimental and permanent damaging effects.</p> <p>We moved to Southington for it's very distinct village character and sense of community. This will be destroyed by the addition of more than double its current number of houses.</p>	Site M has now been withdrawn as an allocated site.	<p>Policy SS1 revised</p>

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
	Placing more family homes at the far end of the village will add to village traffic and cause further problems for parking and people's <u>access to the shops &amp; local amenities.</u> I appreciate that there is a need for more housing in the area, but they should be located where there would be limited disruption to the already over-extended resources in the local area.		
52a	There are a number of points we don't feel achieve the overall objective of being sustainable. Spreading the pain is understandable, however the challenges around infrastructure, upgrading paths and cycle ways, encouraging people to walk or ride instead of making short journeys by car will not be achieved by the sites selected.	We think this is a comment about the use of small sites. See 52b	
52b	Also, by having a number of smaller sites, affordable numbers, quoted at 40% on developments of more than 10 dwellings will not be achieved.	The Plan as a whole will deliver a minimum of 40% affordable homes	None
52c	Equally, the costs and challenges of providing infrastructure to multiple sites, including power, drainage, services will increase the costs of the houses to levels beyond most 'villages'.	Noted. There was almost universal public support for smaller sites phased over the plan period.	None
52d	For the village to gain the most, a single large site with 1 or 2 developers will minimise the impact and maximise revenue for community projects.	Noted. There was almost universal public support for smaller sites phased over the plan period. Developer contributions are required regardless of the number of dwellings.	None
53a	After the second phase of Overton Hill, the only other development should be of small builds within the village.	There were not enough small sites available to add up to 150 homes	None
53b	The public outcry over GNF has meant that Two Gate lane is now a consideration. When Pond Close was developed along with Lordsfield Gdns it was felt that these sites might be extended. No mention of this now.	Noted. No land adjacent to Lordsfield Gardens is on offer. Sites J and K are extensions of the Pond Close development.	None
53c	If Overton Hill is completed and GNF is approved that will be enough!	If the GNF does get approval it is our current understanding that the NP will not allocate any more housing but this is not yet certain.	None

No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
54	Would prefer 150 houses on Two Gate Lane and none on Site J which is too far from village amenities.	Noted. However, the consultation on 24th Jan confirmed a preference for Scenario A	None
55a	This plan needs to re-focus on building houses on the GNF and thus alleviate the need to build on as many of the 'allocated' sites. It is logical to build north of the village because of the proximity of the train station and school. Building on the west or south will encourage more traffic to pass through the centre. Please think again!	Noted. The GNF was not on offer for 150 homes. The consultation on 24th Jan confirmed a preference for Scenario A	None
55b	All the maps are too small. Enlarge them to A4.	Noted. They will be improved.	Site plans revised
56a	Concerns about more business development at Quidhampton as HGV's are already causing problems on Kingsclere Rd.	Noted. Any planning application would be subject to a traffic assessment.	None
56b	Concerns about any houses being built E of Court Drove, close to the GNF as it will lead to future developments there.	Noted. The characteristics of the site are different from GNF.	None
56d	Our wish is that Overton remains a village, keeps its attractive views and friendly atmosphere.	Agreed. This is what the vision and objectives try to achieve.	None
57a	Prefer houses mostly on Two Gate Lane and NOT Court Drove, nor Ashe warren, nor Willesley Warren.	Noted. Sites AW & WW have been withdrawn from the allocation	Policy SS1 revised
57b	No NOT expand Quidhampton business units. Encroachment on prime agricultural land increase in articulated lorries and traffic on narrow roads.	Overton has no brownfield sites so all development will be on good agricultural land. This site is not suitable for housing. Any planning application will be conditional on a traffic assessment.	None
58	We would appreciate that a small plot of land was made available in the plan for local retired people to purchase for a small number of dedicated housing (i.e. small 2-bedroom with garage and small patio garden easy to maintain. This would make sense to free up larger properties in the village. Suggest E of Overton hill Car park.	We agree, but Site E has restrictive covenants on it which would be difficult to remove. It has been withdrawn as an reserve site.	Policy SS1 revised
59	Add to Policy L2, 'and that these contributions are dedicated to accommodation of pupils within the physical location of Overton Primary School.	This is a matter for OPC and the Hampshire Education Authority. It is not a planning matter for BDBC.	Policy L2 revised



No	Comment	NP Group Response	Proposed change to NP
60	The number of houses as there are no plans for infrastructures, amenities, parking, sewerage, schools before the houses are built.	There are policies covering infrastructure (H4) parking (T2) sewerage (H4) and the school (L2) which have been revised.	Policy H4, T2, L2 revised
61a	E2 should refer to conservation and enhancement of general biodiversity and not just designated sites.	Developments are required to produce a net gain in biodiversity (if possible) wherever they are.	Policy H3 revised
61b	E4 wording very woolly. What does 'guided by' mean? What are 'important habitats'?	Thank you.	Policy now E3 significantly revised
61c	Does site E not form part of the green open space for the existing Overton Hill development and therefore alternative green space should be provided?	Site E has been withdrawn as a reserved site because of restrictive covenants.	None
61d	P15/16. 'Promote biodiversity'. Does this mean 'conserve and enhance'?	Yes	None
61e	P9 refers to SINC as 'sites of interest'. Should be 'site of importance'	Thank you.	Wording changed
61f	P12. Clarification required whether 'local environment' refers to the natural environment or built environment or both?	Local' means all aspects of the environment.	None
	Updated 20th July 2015		