

6. The Regulation 14 Consultation

6a. Preparation for the Consultation

The public consultation on the Pirton Neighbourhood Development Plan was carried out in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (S1 no.637) Part 5.

This states that:

Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority a Qualifying Body must-

- a) Publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on a business in the neighbourhood area and provide –
 - (i) Details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan.
 - (ii) Details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected, or acquire hard copies of all the documents.
 - (iii) Details of how to make representations; and
 - (iv) The date by which those representations must be received not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised.
- b) Consult with any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a Neighbourhood Development Plan: and
- c) Send a copy of proposals for a Neighbourhood Development Plan to the local Planning Authority.

The Pirton Neighbourhood Plan was published for formal consultation for 6 weeks from Monday 4th April 2016 to Monday May 16th 2016.

Below are the details of the consultation process.

6b. The Consultation Process.

Date	Event
<i>April & May 2016</i>	The following took place :
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment had been under consideration since September 2015 <p>A Pirton Neighbourhood Plan Screening Determination was carried out by NHDC in April 2016. (Appendix 18)</p> <p>It was identified that the scope of Pirton’s strategy would not give rise to any significant effects and therefore a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was not required.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter was sent to all Statutory and other Consultees by the Chair of the Steering Group – the consultee list was provided by North Herts District Council (Appendix 14)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of the Regulation 14 Consultation was delivered to each household in the parish (including landowners and local businesses resident in the parish). (Appendix 11)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation posters were displayed around the village including the Village Shop, the Chapel, the Church, the Village Hall and the pubs. Consultation information was provided on all village communication channels (For example of communication - see Appendix 9).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Regulation 14 Guidance Leaflet was delivered to each household (including landowners and local businesses resident in the parish), giving comprehensive information on the process, and how respondents could access all of the documentation involved via various websites and links, by email, by Facebook, or for those without internet connection, by telephone or in writing. (see Appendix 11)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A hard copy of the Response Form was delivered to each house (including landowners and local businesses resident in the parish), giving guidance on its completion, and how it could be returned or collected. (see Appendix 13)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification of a public meeting to encourage parishioners to participate in the process, to ask questions and receive answers, make a comment, or express an opinion, was delivered to each household (including landowners and local businesses resident in the parish) and advertised through all the village channels. (Appendix 12)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public meeting took place in the village hall on the evening of 19th April 2016, attended by over 90 parishioners (including some landowners and business owners resident in the parish). The comments, opinions and questions raised and the responses/answers given were recorded and formed part of the analysis of the Regulation 14 Consultation outcome. (See Appendix 12 insert)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice that a further opportunity to discuss the draft Plan at the monthly Steering Group meeting on 3rd May 2016, was delivered to each house in the parish.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Group meeting on 3rd May 2016. A number of parishioners (including some landowners) attended and various topics were discussed and questions appeared to be answered to the satisfaction of those attending.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As completed Response Forms were received, these were recorded on a spreadsheet provided by Urban Vision Enterprises (UVE), and this and the Response Forms were passed to UVE to provide both a professional analysis of the content of the responses, and a report on the outcome of the Regulation 14 Consultation process.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A further leaflet drop to each household together with reminders on all village communication channels regarding the end date for the consultation and a reminder to return the Response Forms.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day by day countdown reminders on Facebook as to how many days until the end of the consultation and reminders to return the Response Forms (Appendix 12).

6c. Who was Consulted?

- All the residents of Pirton Parish including landowners and businesses.
- Statutory and other consultees, a list of whom was provided by NHDC and may be found in Appendix 15

6d. Main Points Made by Consultees

- A Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons and entities consulted and how these have been addressed by the Steering Group can be found in Appendix 16.

6e. Table showing the residents overall response rate to the Plan and the response rates to the different Policies.

Responses Received - 130	Agree	%	Disagree	%	Made no selection	%
In General Agreement with the Plan	126	97%	2	2%	2	2%
PNP 1 - Meeting Local Need.	114	88%	11	8%	5	4%
PNP 2 - Design and Character	120	92%	4	3%	6	5%
PNP 3 - Residential Extensions	122	94%	2	2%	6	5%
PNP 4 - Infill Housing Development	118	91%	6	5%	6	5%
PNP 5 - Hedgerows and Trees	123	95%	1	1%	6	5%
PNP 6 - Local Green Spaces and Open Spaces	122	94%	3	2%	5	4%
PNP 7 - Wildlife	124	95%	0	0%	6	5%
PNP 8 - Heritage Assets and Archaeological Heritage	120	92%	5	4%	5	4%
PNP 9 - Key Views and Vistas	115	88%	7	5%	8	6%
PNP 10 - Community Facilities	119	92%	7	5%	4	3%
PNP 11 - Support for Local Business	116	89%	7	5%	7	5%
PNP 12 - Safety of Pedestrians and Motorists	117	90%	5	4%	8	6%
PNP 13 - Connectivity	120	92%	4	3%	6	5%
PNP 14 - Car Parking	121	93%	3	2%	6	5%

Conclusion

The Consultation Statement has been produced by the Pirton Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group to document the consultation and engagement process undertaken. It is considered to comply with Part 5, section 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The publicity, engagement and consultation completed throughout the production of the Plan has been effective, open and of high quality with many and varied opportunities provided for those who live and work in the Parish (including landowners) to feed into the process, make comments and raise issues and concerns.

All statutory requirements have been met and there has been a significant level of additional consultation and research completed throughout the process.

The monitoring of the Plan will be the responsibility of the Pirton Parish Council.

Appendix 16.

Summary of the main points and actions taken from the Regulation 14 Consultation.

Housing and Development

PNP1 Meeting Local and Wider Need

Main points	Action taken
<p>PNP1. Meeting Local and Wider need</p>	
<p><i>30 House cap.</i></p> <p>1) Consider deleting the 30 house limit.</p> <p>2) 30 dwellings restriction unjustified</p> <p>3) Disagreement with 30 house limit -should be lower – as at odds with community feedback Rationale needs further clarification .</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further Discussion with NHDC in meeting 28th July 2016 • Further discussion with Independent planning Consultant on 15th September 2016 • 30 unit cap on new development sites retained with additional detail and clarification. The intent is to ensure that the scale of new development within Pirton is commensurate with its village character. There is the possibility of two further large sites (outside the village envelope) coming forward before the Local plan is in place. The 30 limit figure has been identified taking into account a combination of public consultation, discussions with the NHDC and an assessment of the fabric of the village within the supporting Character Assessment. It seeks to balance the wishes of the residents(who were in favour of an upper limit of 10 houses per site.) the character analysis of the village which identifies approximately 35 units as the upper limit of new homes built at any one time during the last 90 years and the ability of new developments to subsidise supporting infrastructure. NHDC advised the maximum limit be raised to 30 houses per site. • New objective added in 4.2 to Maintain rural character and prevent sprawl and urbanisation
<p>4) <i>The village development boundary</i></p> <p>Clarify the 2014 NHDC preferred options boundary change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion with NHDC who reconfirmed the development boundary • Section 1.3.7 re written and additional map included of the new development

<p>Village development boundary arbitrarily extended by NHDC.</p> <p>Restrictive village development boundary.</p> <p>No key to Appendix 6 and not clear where boundary is.</p>	<p>boundary in the October 2016 Emerging local plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification added in PNP1 Justification and Evidence, Compliance with Strategic and Local policies section that the designated village development boundary will accommodate windfall development that complies with the policies of the current and emerging Local Plan. • All Appendices have been moved into the main document. Map key added.
<p>5) <i>'Meeting Local Need'</i> – consistency required. Definition need and consistency throughout the document</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy PNP1 modified to include Local and Wider need. Also wider need included throughout the document. Definition given of the meaning of wider need in PNP1. • Clarification of growth strategy in Strategic Context section 1.4 (1.4.5)
<p>6) <i>Growth strategy</i> for Pirton needs to be clearer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth strategy for Pirton re confirmed in discussion with NHDC and clarified in Strategic Context section 1.4 • There are currently no strategic requirements for Pirton in the adopted Local plan other than to accommodate suitably scaled development within the settlement boundary. • A meeting with NHDC on 28th July 2016 confirmed that this position is maintained in the Emerging Local plan. Following the grant of outline planning permission on the SHLAA site 214 (PT1 in the emerging Local Plan) as of September 2016, Pirton has not been assigned a housing target nor is it to be the subject of any future allocations .All that is required of Pirton is to accommodate windfall development that complies with the general policies of the development plan.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National affordability ratio comparison added to Housing Stock section under Justification and evidence for PNP1. • Table of Pirton Housing stock by Council tax band compared to Hertfordshire and

	England added to Housing Stock section under Justification and evidence for PNP1.
7) <i>Housing mix.</i> More information needed on current mix. Consider Self build plots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 Census details re Pirton Housing Stock added to Housing stock section of Justification and Evidence for PNP1 • Self-Build Plots added to the mix of homes in Policy PNP1. • Tables showing National and Local comparison of Types of Housing and Housing Tenure added to Housing stock section of Justification and evidence for PNP1.
8) <i>Landowners</i> More formal engagement with landowners needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting arranged for Landowners on 19th July 2016 to ensure complete transparency and robustness in a Plan that does not allocate sites for development. Should the date be difficult for attendees, the letter offered the recipients the opportunity of conveying their comments and opinions in writing to the Chair of the Steering group.
9) <i>Basic Conditions</i> Plan does not meet basic conditions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are ensuring this through ongoing discussion with NHDC and independent Consultant advice.
10) <i>Infrastructure 4.1.4</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsidered in the Text and amended to a more relevant section Community Facilities (in PNP9 (9.2)
11) <i>The whole of site 64 (PT1) should be allocated for development.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have already discussed this in a meeting with NHDC. • SHLAA site 64 S (PT1S) has now been designated a scheduled National Monument. • The Northern part of the site was not put forward for site allocation in the latest NHDC call for sites. When it was considered by NHDC in the past their own conservation officer advised against it as did English Heritage on the basis that it would adversely affect the setting of the scheduled monument and historic buildings it adjoins in the conservation area. There is now a scheduled site immediately bordering this part of the site.
12) <i>The term Social Housing should be replaced by Affordable Housing with Additional explanatory text</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed ; retained wording as social is a subset of affordable housing.

<p>13) <i>Neighbourhood Plan Objectives</i> (Para 3.2) Suggest changing Protection and enhancement of Pirton's rich heritage to Conservation and enhancement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changed as suggested
---	--

PNP2 Design and Character

Main points made by consultees	Action taken
<p>PNP2 Design and Character</p> <p>Visual Character Areas and Transition</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Concern that the proposed Visual Character Areas almost completely surround the village - in the past these areas have been more specific rather than ring fenced. 2) Appendix 7 (map of Visual Character Areas) is unclear and a key would be helpful 	<p>Visual Character Areas reviewed.</p> <p>Key added.</p>
<p>Types of plots, Design Innovation and Architecture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) No mention of energy efficiency of new builds. I believe this should be made a priority. 4) Some plots should be available for individuals to build for example eco-friendly one off designs. 5) Important to retain possibility for design innovation within historic contexts. 6) A good opportunity for modern architecture and renewable energy sources rather than further ugly developments 7) Innovative solutions to the visual intrusiveness of car parking would be welcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy added in PNP 2 that new developments must be in accordance with the Build for Life Principles. • Text reviewed to ensure support for creative and innovative design solutions and innovative design in accordance with Build for Life principles. • Self-build plots dealt with in PNP1. • Discussed with NHDC at meeting July 28th Vehicle parking at new development standards. • New section 2.8 added to PNP2 re storage for cycles and Children's buggies. • Provision for the disabled checked

	<p>throughout the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for cyclists checked in the Design Policies and throughout the document. • NHDC Parking Standards in 2016 Emerging Local Plan checked.
<p>Height of buildings</p> <p>8) The Plan needs to define the maximum permitted height of buildings, rather than just the number of storeys.</p>	<p>PNP 2 (2.1) amended to include height in relation to the existing distinct local and rural character of the village.</p>
<p>Density</p> <p>9) Density - Stronger statement needed - too weak (expected) Density should not be greater than the density of adjoining developments especially on the edge of the village. PNP 2.6</p>	<p>Policy reviewed. PNP2 (2.5) amended to address this comment.</p>
<p>Policy Wording</p> <p>10) Check that it is all in the right place and firm enough</p> <p>11) The terms 'unit' and 'home' need to be defined. Are these the same or different</p> <p>12) PNP 2 (3) Wording difficult to understand and suggest the policy needs to take account of the NPPF policy. (Historic England)</p> <p>13) PNP2 (7) Recommends closer adherence to the wording of the special duties under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p>	<p>Design approach strengthened, more detail given and repetition checked and mainly removed.</p> <p>All policies and text reviewed consistency and where appropriate modified to remove repetition.</p> <p>All policies reviewed for consistency – the term dwelling is being used.</p>

	<p>PNP2 Policy and text reviewed and rewritten.</p>
<p>PNP3 Residential Extensions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Extensions to be forbidden on new affordable housing 2) This should not mean anything outside these guidelines is automatically rejected , should be considered on merit 3) Could change ‘fit’ to ‘respect’ as this is more open to good Design qualities. 4) ‘Sensitive and Complementary, to’ may work for some historic buildings but seems rather over prescriptive generally , could change to demonstrably derived from the local context’ which would support good new design (what is ‘sensitive’ seems to be hostage to fortune.) 5) Additional parking space for larger households 	<p>Discussed with NHDC at meeting on July 28th. No evidence for such a restriction</p> <p>Policy Reviewed and some of the detail removed put into the Character Assessment</p> <p>Wording reviewed and amended.</p> <p>Overall review of depth of detail which should be included within then Neighbourhood Plan v. the Character Assessment. No change.</p> <p>Discussed at meeting with NHDC on July 28th their policy re parking for extensions. Policy reviewed adopting NHDC standards save for larger properties where additional space to be provided (the roads are narrow in the village and any on street parking is a problem)</p>
<p>PNP4 Infill Housing Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I do not see how any infill can enhance local Character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy was removed as the growth strategy for Pirton is through development of windfall

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Windows should not intrude on the privacy of adjoining neighbours. 3) Need to mention policies on density and issues of privacy, 4) Is the sale of gardens infill? 5) Why have no infill sites been identified with current land owners. There might be opportunity to meet housing needs with areas landowners will want to. 	<p>sites within the village development boundary repetition of what already contained in the other design policies. The relevant policies are found in PNP2.</p>
---	--

Environment, Wildlife and Heritage

PNP 5 Hedgerows and Trees

Main points	Action taken
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Use of the word encourage not strong enough Make the wording stronger and more binding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy modified to contain stronger more binding wording.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Should there be mention of hedgerows and important shrubs in the third bullet point? 	<p>Hedgerows included. No definition or evidence for 'important shrubs' so no amendment.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) More explanatory text needed. 	<p>More explanatory text included in the Justification and Evidence section for PNP4 and 5.</p>

PNP 6 Green Spaces

Main points	Action taken
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Check for accuracy and clarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text checked for accuracy and clarity. • Map and list reviewed.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) The Pirton Vicarage Nature Reserve should be protected as a community asset. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added to List of Local Green Spaces in PNP6. • It may be registered as a community asset in due course but this is being pursued outside the Neighbourhood Plan.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Make the wording stronger and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy modified to include stronger wording,

more binding	a map and table of green spaces which meet the NPPF criteria.
4) Existing farmlands and open spaces should be protected so that the character of the countryside around Pirton is maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New objective added in 4.2 to prevent sprawl an urbanisation and maintain Pirton as a distinctive and separate place from the surrounding villages or town of Hitchin. Development boundary for Pirton maintains protection for countryside.
5) No mention of Heritage Road verges.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Road verge included in Policy PNP 4,(4.5)
6) Not made clear that the 3 tests for local Green Spaces have been met for all those identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New table of Local Green Spaces (with description) included and a high resolution map of the LGS's showing accurate boundaries. Also justification that they meet the NPPF para. 77 criteria included in the text.

PNP 7 Wildlife

Main points	Actions
1) Accuracy of wildlife list	Wildlife list updated - in Character Assessment only.
2) Encourage wildlife friendly measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed - Wildlife friendly measures included In PNP 5
3) Protection of wildlife, hedgerows and trees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife friendly measures included In PNP 5 Protection of trees and hedgerows dealt with in PNP 4.
4) Update approach to Bio diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed both Policy and NPPF which is strong in the area of wildlife and biodiversity. Discussed with NHDC Amended Policy PNP4 and 5 accordingly.

PNP 8 Heritage Assets

Main points	Action
1) Clarity and strength of wording.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewritten in light of Local Plan and Historic England policies and also with regard to clarity and strength of wording.

PNP 9 Key Views and Vistas

Main points	
1) Should we be more discerning which views and vistas are most important?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of views and vistas reduced to the particularly important ones which could be affected by new development. Other favoured and iconic views remain in the Character assessment
2) Importance of maintaining open spaces surrounding Pirton to maintain the superb views and vistas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional objective added re preventing sprawl and urbanisation and maintaining Pirton as a distinct and separate place from the surrounding villages and Hitchin.
3) Maps unclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New clearer maps inserted.

4) Importance and relevance of the Visual Character areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed. NHDC no comment to make. VCA's do not prevent development but protect the extent of development on sensitive boundaries. No change.
5)) Policy PNP 9 is restrictive due to the number of views identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above in (1)

Amenities and Facilities

PNP 10 Community Facilities

Main Points	Actions
1) Adequacy of infrastructure should be considered (impact on primary school provision and public transport to 2ndry school mentioned)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional policy re infrastructure PNP9 (9.2)
2) Why the word 'unnecessary' in (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Word deleted.
3) Consider effects on the e economy and need to ensure fast broadband spec.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy re improved broadband added to PNP10 (10.2)
4) The policy does not address the enabling of new community facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PNP9 (9.2) revised to address this point
5) The policy does not refer to the needs of young people.	Additional objective added re the improvement of facilities for young people and 'facilities for the benefit of all residents' added to PNP9 (9.1)

PNP 11 Support for Local Business

Main Points	
1) Development of farm buildings – restriction to family members and rental market. Wording not clear. 2) Enforceability of PNP 11.2. 3) Wording of criterion 2 not clear. Section 106 would not be used for affordable housing for settlements of less than 3000 people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy reviewed after discussion with NHDC and attention to existing legislation. Policy amended in the light of this.

Transport and Connectivity

PNP 12 Safety of Pedestrians and Motorists

Main points	Actions
1) Add safety of cyclists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title amended.
2) Safe all weather cycle/pedestrian track to Hitchin.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed and concluded not feasible for inclusion in this NDP.
3) Don't forget cyclists. And mobility scooters – ramps, kerbs and general areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies reviewed to ensure that needs of cyclists and those with visual and mobility disabilities are included. Cycle storage included in PNP 2.(2.8)
4) Lower Speed limit to 20mph.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not within the NP remit. PPC to take forward elsewhere
5) General pedestrian safety (specific reference to cars parking on pavements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed. Added to PNP2.
6) Include reference to the Chilterns cycleway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referenced in PNP 12.
7) Importance of safe access to infill development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy re safe access added to PNP11 (11.1).

PNP 13 Connectivity

Main points	Actions taken
1) No mention of public transport	Limitations of public transport already described in the text for PNP 12.

PNP 14 Car Parking

Main points	Suggested Actions
1) Provision of visitor parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PNP 13 revised in accordance with NHDC residential Parking standards in the Emerging Local Plan 2016.
2) The requirement for 3 parking spaces could be questioned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PNP 13(1) amended and rationale for 3 car parking space strengthened.
3) Clarification of requirements for business parking and consideration of highways safety,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed requirements for business and conclude insufficient business premises to require new policy Highways safety now in PNP11.

Additional General Comments

Main points	Actions taken
1) Checking and monitoring of the Plan once adopted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed with PPC and NHDC and revised.
2) What is this Plan about 3) Plan needs to define what a Neighbourhood Development Plan means .Explanatory text needed. 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 1.1 and 1.2 revised and reordered for clarity and including further explanation.
5) The Plan needs to make clearer how landowners have been involved. 6) Landowners should have been consulted more and plots of land identified for potential development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details included in the Community Consultation statement . Pirton’s Strategy for growth clarified in 1.4.and the text of PNP1.
<i>Some Examples of Appreciation of the Plan.</i> 7) A lot of hard work has gone into this and Steering Group commended for their commitment. 8) Excellent Plan Well presented. 9) An incredible piece of work – well done. 10) A chance for the community to achieve something that works for them 11) Fantastic Work. 12) Very thorough. 13) A superb achievement	The analysis of the regulation 14 consultation responses showed that 97% of residents who responded were in general agreement with the Plan.

Appendix 17.

Letter Offering Follow Up Meeting for Landowners to explain the process and next steps .

Pirton Neighbourhood Development Plan

10 Cromwell Way

Pirton SG5 3RD

29 June 2016

Dear

One of the outcomes of our recent Regulation 14 (pre submission) consultation on our draft Neighbourhood Plan is to tell us that a few landowners within the Parish would like a further opportunity to discuss the draft Plan and its policies with us.

Although the number of persons making this comment is small, we are happy to respond positively to their point and organise a meeting specifically for interested landowners.

The Neighbourhood Plan's strategy for growth is to deliver housing within a newly defined development boundary. To this end, we have adopted the NHDC's proposed strategic housing development boundary for Pirton as set out in their "Preferred Options" draft local plan consultation, which took place at the end of 2014. We are informed that this boundary is unlikely to change very much if at all in the forthcoming consultation on the latest draft Local Plan.

To decide on this boundary, the NHDC has conducted a number of "calls for development sites". It has assessed each piece of land put forward to ensure that it is "deliverable, achievable and sustainable". We assume that those landowners who wished to have land allocated for housing in the new Local Plan responded to the NHDC's search for sites. We therefore have not sought to replicate this work, the latest search concluding only in March of this year.

However, there may be issues that you might like to discuss with us, so the opportunity is offered on 19th day of July at the Pirton Village Hall at 8 o'clock.

If you cannot make this meeting, please feel comfortable in letting us have your comments in any event. For those who do not wish to discuss any matter with us, thank you for taking the time to read this, and thank you if you have already responded to our Reg. 14 consultation.

It would help greatly if you could let Diane Burleigh know at Dianeburleigh@aol.com if you intend to attend the meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Diane Bailey, Chair Pirton Parish Council

Diane Burleigh OBE Chair Pirton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group