



## The SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Review R2

### Introduction.

This document records the Housing Need Review process completed by the SSJ NP team; starting with the baseline situation, progressing through the Housing Needs Survey, 'Call for Sites' procedures and SSJ NP Questionnaire and Consultation Events, and shows how the final housing number and choice of the preferred site(s) has been achieved.

New housing is the most contentious item within the Neighbourhood Plan process; deciding on the number of new houses results from the consideration of a number of different factors. These factors do not always point to the same conclusion. This section is designed to record (step by step) how the figure of 10-20 new houses was chosen, and the process of defining their preferred location.

### 1. Objective.

The objective of the Review Process is to establish the actual requirement for new housing in Sherborne St John (if any) and reach a consensus as to where any housing should be located.

### 2. Background.

**2.1 Conservation Area.** Much of the Village of Sherborne St John is designated a Conservation Area; any development should not only not detract from the existing settlement but should positively enhance it. This applies to

- a. The built environment
- b. The rural setting of SSJ Village and the surrounding countryside.

Areas of specific social and environmental value in the Parish include:

- c. The Village Green and Watercress Meadows
- d. The Village Pond
- e. St Andrews Church (11<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> C)
- f. The SSJ Wetlands (associated with the Chalk spring line)
- g. The Chute Playing Fields
- h. Views across open fields to the North (the Weybrook and Morgaston Woods), East (partly compromised by intervisibility with Marnel Park II), South and West of the Village

**2.2 Population.** The Parish of Sherborne St John comprises just under 1200 persons living in approximately 500 houses – the vast majority of which are located in the Village of Sherborne St John.

Recent population trends in the Parish are relatively difficult to follow due to the building works and parish boundary changes that have occurred over the last ten years. In particular, housing developments at Marnel Park and Merton Rise have been constructed (in part at least) between the 2001 and 2011 National Censuses. As a result, the 2013 Action with Communities in Rural England (ACRE) Rural Evidence Project Review was found to be of limited use.

Population studies by HCC (Hampshire County Environment Department's 2013 Small Area Population Forecasts (<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/factsandfigures/population-statistics/pop->

[estimates/small-area-pop-stats.htm](#)) indicate a NIL population growth for Sherborne St John Parish (excluding the new development at Marnel Park Phase II). This trend is supported by BDBC figures for Borough Ward of Sherborne St John, which indicate a reduction in population of 2.6% (-ve) over the period to 2029.

**2.3 Infrastructure.** The road system, water supply and sewerage system is largely the one that has served the Parish for the last 100 years – since the advent of the motor car.

Traffic on the A340 has increased very considerably over the last 25 years, and this had had a ‘knock-on’ effect on other roads through SSJ as a result. The detrimental impact on Village life was recognised by the installation of Traffic Calming measures in 2008 as well as Speed Indicator Devices - to deter speeding through the Village. These measures are now deemed to be insufficient and are again under review. Increased pressure on roads are anticipated as a result of current house building at Merton Rise and Marnel Park Phase II, and the effect this will have on the flow of traffic on the A340.

Water supply and sewerage management is a BDBC-wide issue. Abstraction from the Basingstoke aquifer is typically running at 97%; the SSJ water treatment works operate at near capacity and there is a general issue with effluent quality in the Loddon Catchment (of which Sherborne St John forms a part).

**Current Infrastructure doesn’t support further development.**

**2.4 Marnel Park Phase II (BDBC Local Plan Policy SS3.4).** Construction of a further 450 houses on agricultural land also known as ‘Land North of Popley Fields’ commenced in early 2015. The site is wholly within the Parish boundary of Sherborne St John.

### **3. BDBC Local Plan**

The emerging BDBC Local Plan is under severe pressure from Central Government to deliver a very significant quantities of new housing in the period 2015-2029. Indeed the Inquiry has been further delayed as a result of the Inspector’s insistence that BDBC should increase the original figure of 748 houses per annum - to 850 per annum.

**BDBC has provided an indication in Policy SS5 of the number of houses that Sherborne St John should be provided through the Neighbourhood Plan process:**

#### *Policy SS5 – Neighbourhood Planning*

*The council will support parish/town council and other representatives from local communities in non-parished areas, through the Neighbourhood Planning process. In the settlements listed below, it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to meet the following levels of development, generally in and around defined Settlement Policy Boundaries:*

- a) Bramley – approximately 200 homes*
- b) Kingsclere – approximately 50 homes*
- c) Oakley – approximately 150 homes*
- d) Overton – approximately 150 homes*
- e) Whitchurch – approximately 200 homes*

***A further 150 homes will need to be identified through neighbourhood plans/ neighbourhood development orders in areas outside of those listed above. The council will support the relevant parish/town council and other representatives from local communities to identify the most appropriate means of meeting this requirement, through Neighbourhood Planning, rural exceptions schemes, or a review of Settlement Policy Boundaries.***

*The delivery of housing will be monitored annually by the council to ensure the housing requirement is met. If no opportunities have been identified by 2017 the council reserves the right to identify opportunities to address any shortfall through the DPD process.*

**The draft Local Plan (policy SS5) allocates a total of 150 new houses to be built in the period 2015-2029 in (circa) 10 Villages otherwise not identified for development – of which Sherborne St John is one. The current, major, development at Marnel Park (Phase II) of 450 houses - itself within the SSJ Parish Boundary – is not taken into consideration within this framework.**

**In agreeing to the production of a Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan, BDBC indicated that the Parish of Sherborne St John would be expected to deliver a proportion of these 150 houses. The actual number was not specified, but 10-20 might be considered appropriate.**

**Further guidance is provided by Policy SS6 with respect to ‘New Housing in the Countryside’:**

*Policy SS6 – New Housing in the Countryside*

*Development proposals for new housing outside of Settlement Policy Boundaries will only be permitted where they are:*

*a) On ‘previously developed land’, provided that:*

*i) They do not result in an isolated form of development;*

*ii) The site is not of high environmental value; and*

*iii) The proposed use and scale of development is appropriate to the site’s context; or*

*b) For a rural exception site for affordable housing; or*

*c) For the re-use of a redundant or disused permanent building provided that the proposal:*

*iv) Does not require substantial rebuilding, extension or alteration;*

*v) Does not result in the requirement for another building to fulfil the function of the building being converted; and*

*vi) Leads to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or*

*d) For a replacement dwelling that is not temporary in nature, or an extension to an existing dwelling provided that:*

*vii) The size of the proposal would be appropriate to the plot; and*

*viii) It would not be significantly visually intrusive in the landscape; or*

*e) Residential proposals that have the support of the local parish council/town councils/parish meetings, provided that:*

*ix) They do not result in an isolated form of development;*

*x) The scale is appropriate to the site and location;*

*xi) The development will respect the local environment and amenities of neighbouring properties; and*

*xii) The development is well related to the existing settlement; ... ..*

**Review of the previous Local Plan period (~15 years) shows a significant number of housing completions during the period; one approach might be to propose that no specific measures are required now to ensure further housing in the next 14 years. However, this flies in the face of two considerations – one technical, the other regulatory:**

**a. Only developments of 5 houses or more can be considered in achieving the N Plan development target.**

**b. Affordable (Social) and possibly smaller (Open Market) housing is unlikely to be provided by so-called ‘windfall’ sites.**

#### **4. NPPF**

The National Policy Planning Framework is a central Government document defining that any development must meet specified Sustainability criteria. Sustainability assessment requires consideration under three headings:

##### **a. Social.**

- BDBC has advised that some level of development is essential regardless of other factors.
- Housing numbers are relatively small and will allow assimilation into the Community without undermining current strengths
- Suitable measures must be included to avoid adverse impact on existing properties
- Any development must not undermine Sherborne St John as an independent community providing a discrete identity for its residents
- The Housing Needs Survey and Questionnaire has defined a specific requirement for Affordable (Social) and/or Smaller/Low Cost housing which can sensibly be delivered by the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Limited, targeted development is considered to provide a positive advantage for the future sustainability of Sherborne St John.

##### **b. Environmental**

Much of Sherborne St John is designated a Conservation Area – any development should not only not detract from the existing settlement but should enhance it.

This applies to

- The built environment
- The rural setting of SSJ Village and the surrounding countryside.

##### **c. Economic.**

No economic issues within Sherborne St John have been identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process.

#### **5. Housing Needs Survey – Action Hampshire**

The Sherborne St John housing need survey was carried out by Action Hampshire; it was conducted in July 2014 (ie prior to the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire). 523 surveys were sent out to all households in the Parish; of these 523 surveys distributed, 220 were returned, a 42% response rate. This is a good response rate. The results are summarised below (with further comment) – the results were accepted by the Neighbourhood Plan, but with some interpretation and qualification.

##### **5.1 Support for an Affordable (Social) housing scheme:**

74% of survey respondents would support a small affordable housing scheme for local people in the parish, should one be needed. 26% would not support a scheme.

##### **5.2 Local Housing Need Survey Results**

- The overall findings of the survey showed that whilst 22 households completed Part 2 of the survey stating they were in need of affordable housing only 17 households were interested in either an affordable rented home or shared ownership home within the parish. The remaining 5 were only interested in owner occupation.
- The majority of households in need stated a local connection to the parish of more than 10 years.
- Housing need may arise for a number of reasons, but in the majority of cases within the parish, it is because individuals cannot afford the high cost of mortgage and rent levels locally. Other respondents stated they wished family members to return to the

parish for support or be supported by families currently living in the parish. Setting up a first home and divorce and separation were also given as reasons.

- Almost half of all those giving income details earn below the national average. For those on lower incomes the opportunities to stay in the parish will be limited by the types of tenures they can afford.
- Only 2 households in the survey mentioned that they were currently registered on the local housing registers maintained by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's 'Homebid' for affordable rented housing or 'Help to Buy South' shared ownership register. The 'Homebid' register has currently 24 households stating a connection to the parish and 5 households are registered with 'Help to Buy South'.
- This means that the Housing Need Survey has uncovered a (possible) further 15 households who have expressed a need for affordable rented housing or shared ownership and are not currently listed on either Housing Register.

### 5.3 Future housing requirements for the Parish.

- Survey respondents identified affordable housing for local people, housing for older people to downsize and homes for first time buyers as priority housing groups for the parish.
- More than 80% of survey respondents currently own their own home and most live in 3 and 4 bedroom houses or bungalows, with much fewer 1 and 2 bedroom homes available in the parish. With the demographic trend moving towards smaller households, this lack of 1 and 2 bedroom homes will make it difficult for many groups, such as single people and couples, first time buyers and those on low income to enter the local housing market. (One bedroom houses are insufficiently versatile, smaller 2 or 3 bedroom units are more appropriate)

### 5.4 Adequacy of existing homes

- 16 survey respondents stated their current homes were not adequate for their future needs. The majority of these residents were over the age of 65 and owned larger homes. Most wanted smaller housing for older people to downsize within the parish where support networks such as family and friends could be maintained.

### 5.5 Survey Recommendations

- The survey has indicated that a mix of new homes is needed by local residents of the parish. This is evidenced in the results of the survey and by those currently registered for affordable rented and shared ownership housing.
- Further investigation with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council is recommended to confirm whether this identified need can be met through the new homes currently being planned and developed within or close to the parish boundary. (Marnell Park Phase II is wholly located within the Parish of Sherborne St John). These new developments will provide a mix of market and affordable housing for the Borough. A rural exception scheme for the Parish should only be considered if local housing need is not being given some priority.
- A Rural Exception Affordable Housing Scheme for local people should only be considered for the parish if the housing need identified cannot be met through the new planned housing developments being built close to or within the parish boundary. (Marnell Park Phase II is wholly located within the Parish of Sherborne St John).

## 6. Other Local Factors

There are a number of factors arguing against any significant increase in housing in Sherborne St John:

- 6.1 Marnel Park Phase II.** As already noted, a development of 450 houses is currently in construction within the Parish of Sherborne St John; 40% of the housing will be Affordable (Social) Housing. This clearly can accommodate all and any requirements for Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan – there is no actual need for further housing in Sherborne St John. 1. HCC research projects a fall in SSJ population – so there is no need for more. In any case a period of ‘recovery’ should be observed after completion of the development.
- 6.2 Parish Facilities.** The existing Parish facilities – St Andrews Church, the Village Hall and the Chute Pavilion are heavily supported and Village Events are commonly sold out. The SSJ Football Club operates at full capacity and there is a problem with pitch availability and car parking on busy weekends.
- 6.3 Lack of Parish Facilities.** The range of Parish facilities are modest – there is no GP Practice or Doctor’s surgery, no NHS Dentist practice.
- 6.4 Schools.** The SSJ Primary School is full – although only ~ 50% of the children are resident in SSJ Parish. There is very limited scope for expansion.
- 6.5 The Business survey failed to identify a lack of suitable workforce in SSJ.**

## **7. Neighbourhood Plan Process – ‘Call for Sites’ – Long List**

The Neighbourhood Plan has a duty to review the availability of potential development sites; the process was completed concurrently with the NP Questionnaire and NP Feedback Consultation.

It is essential to provide complete transparency in reviewing all possible sites in the Parish – local landowners and developers were invited to submit potential locations for development sites within the Parish Boundaries. The Neighbourhood Plan:

- Contacted all identified landowners / potential developers by email / letter
- Advertised the process in ‘The Villager’
- Advertised the process on the SSJ Parish Council website.

A number of responses were received; these were listed and this ‘long-list’ was included in the Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire sent to every house in SSJ Parish in late September 2014. A map identified the location of each site. At this stage, respondents were not asked to vote for specific schemes, only to indicate preferred locations / house numbers / house types.

The long-list was reduced to 11 sites in September 2014 by agreement, on the basis of further correspondence with landowners and developers.

## **8. NP Questionnaire Feedback**

As already stated, the NP Questionnaire (held over the period late September / early October 2014) progressed in tandem with the Call for Sites process.

The first section of the Questionnaire considered possible development in SSJ. In summary, the responses showed:

- 78% responded that they were in favour of modest new housing (between 0-10 and 10-20 houses) as long as it would not compromise the village or rural nature of Sherborne St John.
- A large majority thought that the new housing was most important for local young people or old people “downsizing”. A proportion of the housing should be Affordable (social).
- The results indicated that the housing should be of mixed style and size, with 1-3 bedrooms.
- 93% of respondents want any houses to be situated on Brownfield or Derelict sites

- 94% of respondents do not want development of Greenfield sites
- 95% did not want any housing to be situated in the Strategic Gap
- Respondents felt strongly that housing should not be located in the Conservation Area.

The Questionnaire responses gave the Neighbourhood Plan a strong mandate to deliver a limited number of houses (between 0-10 and 10-20 houses) – very much in line with the initial ‘steer’ (10 to 15 houses) from BDBC. Furthermore, the Questionnaire returns were absolutely unequivocal in showing their preference in avoiding houses both on ‘Greenfield’ sites and also in the Basingstoke / Sherborne St John Strategic Gap. Smaller sites were called for, but this cannot be considered as part of the Neighbourhood Plan (Hampshire CC regulations).

The Questionnaire revealed a requirement for smaller units – for younger purchasers and for older residents. The logic for this latter being the ability to allow long-term residents to down-size, thereby releasing (existing) larger houses in the Parish.

Key Criteria.

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

#### 9. SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Development Strategy

Taking all the above information into consideration, the SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group resolved to include a single 10-20 house development in the Plan, which would permit a proportion of the houses to be Affordable (Social). The proportion of smaller houses (2-3 bedroom) should be as large as possible to meet identified demand, and release existing larger (4-5 bedroom) houses for resale.

#### 10. Neighbourhood Plan Process – ‘Call for Sites’ – Short List

Following analysis of the results of the Housing Needs Survey and Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire, and taking into account the requirements of the NPPF, HCC and BDBC policies (in particular the HCC minimum requirement for 5Nō. houses for any development to be considered under the Neighbourhood Plan) the ‘Long List was reduced to a short-list of 6Nō. potential sites (see Appendix B below). Inclusion on the short-list did not imply approval by the Neighbourhood Plan. The 5Nō. unsuccessful site owners / developers were advised by letter / email.

All sites were available – although

- there was a lack of clarity regarding 06.Aubrey Place which was subject to probate.
- One site, 05.Kiln Rd, had a potential problem with flooding due to the high water table / spring line which runs east-west immediately to the South of Kiln Rd.
- Not all sites abutted the Village

#### 11. Site Sustainability Appraisals

Meetings were held with land owners / developers and the short-listed sites were visited (in the presence of the land owners / developers where possible) and Site Assessments were completed for each site (see Appendix X). The key findings are tabulated here:

## Key Findings:

Site	Sustainability Reds	Sustainability Oranges	Sustainability Greens	Comments
01 Cranesfield	Greenfield Site Impacts Strategic Gap	Too many houses	Central location Option 1 = 6 affordable	
02 Bob's Farm		Edge of SSJ Village	Derelict (brownfield) Site Will improve visual aspect of SSJ 6 affordable	No Reds
03 Aldermaston Rd	Middle of Strategic Gap	Out of SSJ Village Full services not available	Derelict (brownfield) Site Affordable tbc Good bus connections	
04 Hilltop	Middle of Strategic Gap Greenfield Site	Out of SSJ Village Full services not available		
05 Kiln Rd	Middle of Strategic Gap Greenfield Site Groundwater flooding	Affordable housing only	Central location	
06 Aubrey Place		Edge of Strategic Gap(?)	Will improve visual aspect of SSJ Good bus connections	Availability not yet understood

It was realised that not all the sites on the short-list met the National and Local acceptance criteria; however, it was felt that local residents should be allowed to make their own judgement – at the Consultation and Feedback Event on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2015.

## 12. NP Consultation Feedback (14.03.15)

The Short List of potential sites was presented at the NP Consultation Feedback Event held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2015. As part of this event, attendees were invited to vote for their preferred development option:

Figure 'B'. *'The short-listed sites have now been identified as part of the Neighbourhood Plan Consultation and Feedback Event – none fully complies with the preferences indicated by*

***the Questionnaire. Residents are invited to comment and vote on specific sites – explaining the reason for their preference(s)***

Name / Ref	Availability	Relationship with Village	Protects Strategic Gap?	Access	Utilities	No. of Houses	Mix of Houses	Affordable (Social) Houses	Community Benefit	Comments
Rydon - Cranesfield & Cranes Rd / 01	Yes	Good but abuts Village Pond and affects view for existing Residents	No	Good	All	Package 1 = 35, Package 2= 30	1-5 bedroom	Package (option) 1 = 14** Package (option) 2 = 0	Yes Village Shop  Possible provision of a landscaped country park' to the North of Site A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Twice</b> the number of houses indicated by the Questionnaire responses.</li> <li>• <b>Greenfield site</b></li> <li>• <b>Partly located in Strategic Gap</b></li> <li>• Housing Mix (1-5 bedrooms) incorrect</li> <li>• ** Affordable housing could be replaced by Sheltered housing</li> <li>• Relatively big impact on other residents.</li> <li>• Possible useful site for replacement Village Shop/ PO.</li> <li>• Size of 'Country Park not defined.</li> </ul>
Horton – Bob's Farm/ 02	Yes	Good	Yes	Good	All (tbc)	15	2-5 bedroom	6	Removes existing eyesore  Permissive footpath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semi-derelict site</li> <li>• Housing Mix (2-5) incorrect</li> <li>• Would greatly improve the look of the Village.</li> <li>• Positive impact for residents</li> <li>• Permissive footpath will allow foot access across site</li> </ul>
Hatt – 'Tin Sheds' behind 14 Aldermaston Rd/ 03	Yes	Poor	No	Good	No Mains Gas or Sewers?	15	SK01=2-5 bedroom SK02=1-4 bedroom	tbc		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replaces existing sheds</li> <li>• <b>In the middle of the Strategic Gap.</b></li> <li>• Housing Mix (1-5) incorrect</li> <li>• Out of sight except to 15&amp;16 Aldermaston Rd.</li> <li>• Not attached to the Village.</li> </ul>
Hilltop – Lewis/04	Yes	Poor	No	Good	No Mains Gas or Sewers?	10-20	1-3	8-10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Greenfield Site</b></li> <li>• <b>Does not protect Strategic Gap</b></li> <li>• Not attached to Village</li> <li>• Housing Mix (1-3 beds) correct.</li> <li>• No detailed drawings available</li> </ul>
Kiln Rd / 05	Yes	Good	No	OK	All (tbc)	10-12	2-3	10-12	Provides 10-12 Affordable (Social) Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Greenfield site</b></li> <li>• <b>Does not protect Strategic Gap</b></li> <li>• Housing Mix (1-3 beds) correct</li> <li>• <b>Affordable (Social) housing only ie no market housing</b></li> <li>• Impact on residents in Kiln Rd</li> </ul>
Aubrey Place/06	No	Good	Yes	Poor	Good	?10	?	?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May become available for development in next 6 months – no guarantee it will suit N Plan.</li> </ul>

Following the Event, voting was extended for a period of three weeks via the SSJ NP website. A total of 129 attendees voted – either for their preferred sites or for all sites in order of preference (or a mixture of both), as summarised below:

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

Site 1 Cranesfield	151	9%	11	9%
--------------------	-----	----	----	----

The results of the ballot were publicised in the Village Magazine, on the SSJ NP Website and by letter / email to all 6Nō site owners / developers.

### 13. SSJ NP Resolution.

The information gathered was considered in the round and the key factors identified:

- No population growth has been identified for the period to 2020
- No specific need for additional population was established
- BDBC have provided a 'steer' for 10-15 houses
- The Housing Needs Survey has identified a requirement for some Affordable (Social) housing – although this could be satisfied by the Marnel Park Phase II development.
- SSJ Residents indicated a preference for a development of 10 -15 houses including some Affordable (Social) housing – to be located at Bob's Farm.

Based on the Background data, BDBC Policies SS5 and SS6, the Action Hampshire Housing Needs Survey, and the feedback from the NP Questionnaire and NP Consultation & Feedback Event, the SSJ NP Steering Group decided to promote a development of ~ 15 Houses in SSJ Village.

The following resolution was agreed by the SSJ NP Steering Group at the Meeting 30<sup>th</sup> April 2015:

#### *'Call for Sites'*

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

### 13. '2nd Consultation Event'

Subsequent to the decision process outlined above, Bob's Farm was withdrawn from the Neighbourhood Plan process by the developer, and the Steering Group were unable to persuade the Developer to reverse this decision. The site was therefore 'unavailable'.

A '2nd Consultation' was process was therefore required. This proved problematic, since 3 of the original sites had been discounted (making a total of 4 of the original sites ineligible) and one – Aubrey Place – was still unavailable.

The developer for 'Site 1 – Cranesfield' submitted a revised scheme using only one of the two sites previously identified. A340/Cranes Rd was presented as an 18 dwelling scheme incorporating 6 Affordable (social) houses and an option for a 1230sq ft Post Office / Shop (to be gifted to the SSJ Parish Council free of charge, if desired. Note – the existing Post Office is 'for sale' as a private dwelling).

This presented the Steering Group with a problem – the 'new' site was both a greenfield site (albeit abutting the village and not in open countryside), and located in the Strategic Gap (albeit at its very northern extent). Compromise would be necessary to accept this site; it was decided to offer a further (2<sup>nd</sup>) Consultation Event for Residents to decide for themselves. Further consultation was, in any case, essential since this option had not been previously offered in this format.

Voting was carried out via a placing (insert) in the SSJ copies of the October 2015 Villager Magazine. Residents received their copies no later than 1<sup>st</sup> October, voting was by paper voting slip deposited in ballot boxes located at 4 locations in SSJ Village, close time for returns was 6pm on 12<sup>th</sup> October.

Residents decided the site was suitable and voted in favour of adoption of the A340/Cranes Rd site as the (only) preferred development site for the SSJ Neighbourhood Plan:

<b>Votes Received</b>	<b>199</b>	
<b>In Favour</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>Of which -</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90 were in favour irrespective of whether the scheme provides a shop or not.</li> <li>• 40 were in favour only if the shop is provided</li> <li>• 4 undefined</li> </ul>
<b>Against</b>	<b>65</b>	

The SSJ Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group resolved at its Meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2015 to support a development of 18 Houses at A340/Cranes Rd., working in co-operation with the developer.

In summary, it is concluded that the site at A340/Cranes Rd can be considered as available, deliverable and sustainable, as well as commanding local support.