

## Crookham Village Submission Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2032



### Summary of representations received.

There were two consultation periods on the submission neighbourhood plan, the first in September 2019 and the second in November 2019, with a specific focus on additional evidence to support Policy NE01 'Preserving the Gap between Settlements'.

A copy of the full representations can be viewed at <https://www.hart.gov.uk/crookham-village>

### Summary of comments, September 2019

Summary of representations received by Hart District Council (HDC) as part of Regulation 16 Submission Plan consultation and submitted to the independent Examiner. A copy of all representations was provided to the Examiner in electronic and paper formats.

Consultation period: 10am on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2019 – 4pm on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2019.

Ref No	Representor	Summary of Comments
001	Waverley Borough Council	No comments to make.
002	SGN	Confirm that network pressure in the area is extremely robust and do not expect any reinforcement to arise from information held within the plan.
003	Brian Whyatt	Support
004	Church Crookham Parish Council	Commend the plan.
005	Odiham Parish Council	No comments to make.
006	Janice Stenning	Support

007	David Stenning	Support
008	Crookham Care Village Ltd.	<p>Oppose the whole document. Seek clarification on a range of heritage issues and clarification on “important views”.</p> <p><b>Policies BE02 (General Design Principles) &amp; BE03 (Design Principles for Crookham Village)</b> and the criteria which refers to ‘views’ are unjustified and should be removed or amended. As drafted, the Plan is restrictive, seeks to limit development in the area, and unnecessarily repeats national and local policies. It should provide and plan for the future housing provision for older people to assist in addressing the Council’s ambition as set out in the emerging Local Plan. The Plan should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allocate Cross Farm for housing to meet the needs of older people;</li> <li>2. Amend the settlement boundary to include the area where built form is proposed at Cross Farm; and</li> <li>3. Amend the area designated as a “Gap” to exclude the area where built form is proposed at Cross Farm.</li> </ol>
009	Thames Water	<p>Raise a number of comments and make suggested changes to text:</p> <p><b>Policy BE01 (Sustainable Development Principles)</b> requires more detail relating to wastewater/sewerage infrastructure and recommends the following text: <b><u>“Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.”</u></b> <b><u>“The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</u></b></p>

		<p><b>Policy BE06 (Prevention of Flooding)</b> requests the following text be included with regard to surface water drainage:  <u><b>“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”</b></u></p>
010	Gladman	<p>Concerned that the Neighbourhood Plan does not meet basic condition (a), as the plan conflicts with national policy and guidance, specifically:</p> <p><b>Policy SB01 (Settlement Boundaries)</b> - Object to the use of settlement boundaries, in circumstances such as this where they would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Policy should be worded more flexibly supporting development proposals adjacent to Fleet.</p> <p><b>Policy BE02 (Sustainable Development Principles)</b> - Support</p> <p><b>Policy BE06 (Prevention of Flooding)</b> - The approach to flood risk does not accord with national policy in the NPPF (2019). Bullet point (2) should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Policy NE01 (Preserving the Gap between Settlements)</b> - Object to the use of Local Gaps if they would only serve to act as an arbitrary tool to prevent sustainable development. The emerging Local Plan deals with this issue sufficiently.</p> <p><b>Policy NE02 (Preserving Key Views)</b> - It is not clear how the strict requirements of the policy might be interpreted by a decision maker.</p>
011	Hart District Council	<p>Throughout the Plan, there are a number of references to the 2012 NPPF, such as ‘core planning principles’, which should be removed or updated to NPPF 2019.</p> <p><b>Page 9</b> - Recommend the following amendments:  ... As required by paragraph <b>16</b> of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the policies are an aspirational but realistic attempt to reflect the unique characteristics and context of the Neighbourhood Plan Area and its diverse needs which arise from the different settlement types in the Plan area.....</p> <p><b>Page 11</b> - Once this Plan is adopted it might be confusing to</p>

		<p>include maps that mention 'existing' boundaries and refer to documents elsewhere to proposed (and what would then be adopted) boundaries. It is suggested that this map be updated to include the revised Settlement boundary.</p> <p><b>Page 12</b> – Recommend the following amendment: The Submission version of the CVNP <b>was</b> submitted in June 2019 and so the final Basic Conditions Statement has been referenced to the policies set out in the NPPF 2019.</p> <p><b>Page 19</b> - Recommend updating Figure 4 with a map that clearly identifies the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) &amp; Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs).</p> <p><b>Page 23</b> - Recommend updating footnotes to correspond with the 2019 NPPF.</p> <p><b>Page 26</b> - Recommend the following amendments: The wording for each <b>policy</b> is highlighted in green and is supported by the rationale for with the supporting evidence.</p> <p><b>Policy BE03 (Design Principles for Crookham Village)</b> - Recommend the following amendments: (first bullet point)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they comply with Policies PA01 – PA03 and <b><u>the guidance within the</u></b> Conservation Area Appraisal for each conservation area and its setting in which they are sited or lie adjacent to;</li> </ul> <p>(final bullet point)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>are designed not to increase the level of light pollution within any of the three conservation areas within/and/or adjacent to Crookham Village Parish. Proposals for any necessary street lighting or external lighting should be fully justified through an assessment demonstrating the need for the lighting and the measures taken to minimise any impact.</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b>Figure 4 &amp; 7</b> - Recommend updating Figure 4 with a map that clearly identifies the Conservation Area boundary. It would be useful to include the Conservation Area boundary within Figure 7.</p> <p><b>Policy BE05 (Design Principles for Netherhouse Moor)</b> -</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Recommend the following amendment: (third bullet point)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not infringe on the footpaths and accessibility for <b><u>Netherhouse Moor</u></b> (NHM) and Lea Green park, which are used as a key access point to Calthorpe Park and All Saints schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy BE06 (Prevention of Flooding) -</b> Recommend the following amendment: (third bullet point)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that includes Sustainable Drainage Systems will <b><u>be supported</u></b> if it adheres to the principles above and will only discharge surface water either at, or less than, greenfield runoff rates (where technically viable), will leave green corridors along watercourses and/or will reduce flood risk.</li> </ul> <p><b>Page 52</b> –Recommend the following amendments: This supports the NPPF’s requirement to establish a “strong sense of place” and to be <b><u>“sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)”</u></b>.</p> <p><b>Policy PA01 (Crookham Village Conservation Area)</b> Recommend the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development shall respect the linear <b><u>pattern of development in</u></b> the Conservation Area, following <b><u>adherence to recognised good examples of traditional building forms and the prevailing grain of development within the area. Where appropriate,</u></b> it shall reflect the mix of single and two storey traditional buildings in order to introduce interest and variety into the development in order to reinforce the character and distinctiveness of an area.</li> <li>• Development shall respect the significance of heritage assets in the Conservation Area street scene. Particular consideration shall be given to <b><u>retaining the contribution of buildings and sites to the significance of the conservation area where these frame, punctuate or terminate views though, out and into the village.</u></b></li> <li>• The <b><u>positive contribution that</u></b> the properties on the southern side of The Street and eastern side of Crondall Road provide to the <b><u>setting of the</u></b> Conservation Area and the key views that they</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>afford from the village to the countryside, shall be respected and protected from unsympathetic development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that affects locally significant buildings (as identified on Figure 17 below) must not undermine the significance of that contribution</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy PA02 (Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area)</b> Recommend the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development shall have regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The contribution of the canal side cottages to the significance of the canal setting;</li> <li>○ The contribution of the historic bridge crossings to the historic significance of the canal; and</li> <li>○ The contribution of the landscape including ancient woodland alongside the water's edge:</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development shall use a common palette of locally distinctive vernacular building forms and materials, commonly red brick, painted brick, rendered or timber framed;</li> <li>• Proposals to demolish buildings which are identified as being non designated heritage assets and are buildings of local importance or significance (as identified on Figure 17) will be resisted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy PA03 (Dogmersfield Conservation Area)</b> (second bullet point) '...so as to sustain significant open spaces and key views from the <b>highway and other public rights of way</b> that contribute...'</p> <p><b>Page 63</b> Remove the whole of the third paragraph since it refers to the wrong Conservation Area.</p> <p><b>Policy PA04 (Protection of Historic Assets)</b> Second para: Development proposals which <b>conserve</b> or enhance a heritage asset will be supported <b>in cases</b> where clear and convincing <b>justification for the heritage benefits to be derived from the scheme can be</b> demonstrated by way of an assessment of the development's <b>impact</b> on <b>either</b> the <b>heritage</b> asset or its setting. Third para: '... Within the conservation areas, the built form and linear nature of the built environment will be conserved or enhanced <b>or</b> there should be no net loss and preferably a net gain of native trees or hedges. ...'</p>
--	--	--

		<p><b>Page 68 (table title)</b> Recommend the following amendments: Crookham Village Parish Heritage Assets – <b><u>22 Statutory Listed Buildings within the Parish</u></b></p> <p><b>Page 79</b> Under “Evidence”, remove reference to and quotes from the NPPF since they come from an earlier, now substituted version.</p> <p><b>Page 90</b> Remove final sentence in first para under “Rationale” since allotments on Hitches Lane are not listed as Local Green Space.</p> <p><b>Page 107</b> Remove second para, since it refers to the previous version of the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Page 116</b> First sentence to be replaced with: Traffic and Management Policies are <b><u>enforced by</u></b> Hart District Council and Hampshire County Council.</p> <p><b>TM01 (Parking Standards)</b> Recommend the following amended paragraph: • proposals for new, or extensions to existing, commercial premises or community facilities, which require planning permission, also demonstrate the adequacy of off street car parking spaces by compliance with HDC standards for commercial properties.</p> <p><b>Glossary</b> Recommend updating the glossary to correspond with the 2019 NPPF.</p> <p><b>Appendices</b> Appendices should be limited to those necessary to interpret the Plan.</p>
012	Berkeley Homes (Southern) Limited	<p>Consider the draft Neighbourhood Plan should be paused until the new Hart Local Plan is adopted.</p> <p>Believe the draft does not meet all the basic conditions require from a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Policy SB01 (Settlement Boundaries)</b> Support settlement boundary amendments to incorporate those proposals granted planning permission, and</p>

		<p>suggest the Definite Maps Supplement should include the location of land.</p> <p><b>Policy BE01 (Sustainable Development Principles)</b> No need for policy as it repeats NPPF and parts of new Hart Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Policy BE02 (General Design Principles)</b> Amend policy to make clear that on consented sites, if the principle is established, then it should prevail. Delete “<i>Where appropriate, development shall be designed to incorporate appropriate energy saving measures</i>” since this is covered under other legislation.</p> <p><b>Policy BE06 (Prevention of Flooding)</b> No need for policy as it repeats national/local policy.</p> <p><b>Policy NE01 (Preserving the Gap between Settlements)</b> Policy should be deleted. The matter should be determined at Local Plan level, and is currently subject to amendments through the Modifications stage.</p> <p><b>Policy NE02 (Preserving Key Views)</b> Policy should be deleted since, as a principle, there is no right to a view.</p> <p><b>Policy TM01 (Parking Standards)</b> Policy should be deleted. This is a matter for the District and County Council’s, and should not be stated as policy since it is aspirational. Concerned that draft NP is seeking to impose higher car parking standards than required by the highway authority without justification or evidence, and is not sustainable.</p>
013	Natural England	No comments, other than to forward a generic list of opportunities for Neighbourhood planning.
014	Hampshire County Council (HCC)	<p><b>Policy BE07 (Development of Footpaths and Cycleway Networks)</b> HCC is unable to support the general reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>developing traffic-segregated pedestrian and cycle routes between schools and residential areas, and.....</i></li> </ul> <p>since this will be constrained by adequate highway space or third-party land. HCC encourages the Group to engage with them on routes to school, and extending the public rights of way network.</p>



		<p><b>Policy PA02 (Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area) and Policy NE05 (Protecting Biodiversity)</b> HCC request reference in both policies to it being designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) with a Conservation Management Plan.</p> <p><b>Figure 28</b> Fails to show that Zebon Copse is a designated Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). HCC recommends amendment.</p> <p><b>Aspiration TM02</b> HCC supports the first two aspirations.</p> <p><b>Flood and Water Management</b> HCC (as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)) is pleased to note the comprehensive understanding of flood risk in the area, but suggest better links to online documents or confirm where offline copies can be found.</p>
015	Historic England	Supports the positive strategy it presents for the conservation of heritage assets.

### Summary of further comments, November 2019

Summary of representations received by Hart District Council (HDC) as part of the additional evidence concerning Policy NE01 'Preserving the Gap between Settlements'. A copy of all representations was provided to the Examiner in electronic format.

Consultation period: 10am on 9<sup>th</sup> October July 2019 – 4pm on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2019.

Ref No	Representor	Summary of Comments
001	A McCallum	Support protecting the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
002	D McCallum	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan as the gaps are decreasing and need to retain the clear distinction between Fleet and Crookham Village.
003	S and B Whyatt	Local gaps need to be maintained
004	J Holmes	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
005	D Prieto	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement

006	J & T Farmer	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
007	A Kirk	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
008	J Stenning	Support the gaps between settlement
009	C Leversha	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
010	P Kenaghan	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps
011	S Kenaghan	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
012	M Kenaghan	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
013	J Kenaghan	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
014	P & J Rutherford	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to protect these as biodiversity corridors
015	Church Crookham PC	Support the Neighbourhood Plan
016	M & J Thomas	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
017	K Axtell	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
018	N Wilson	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
019	E Shaw	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
020	A Hillyer and S Callaghan	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
021	J & J Hillyer	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
022	J Thomas	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
023	J Clark	Support to preserve the gap around Crookham Village
024	J R Behmber	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
025	G Brandon	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
026	M Marett	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan

027	S Tilley	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
028	J Abel	Support the Neighbourhood Plan to protect the gap
029	D Stenning	Support to preserve the gap
030	S Thorns	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
031	J McNamara	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
032	J Noble	Support protection of the gaps
033	A Noble	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
034	C Boddy	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
035	M Parr	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
036	S Whyatts	Protect the identity of the village and preserve the local gaps
037	T Collins	Gaps are important part of the local landscape
038	A Sully	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
039	D Frankland	Support the gap to preserve the identity of Crookham Village
040	B Marett	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
041	R Farmiloe	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
042	A Evans	Support retaining local gaps
043	K Braddon	Retain separate identify of Crookham Village
044	C McCulloch	Support the preservation of the gaps
045	D Wears	Support the to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
046	A Delaney	Support retaining local gaps
047	K van den Heever	Support retaining local gaps
048	D H Lawrence	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
049	R Gwynne	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
050	J Johnson	Support retaining local gaps
051	C Eastwood	Support the preservation of gaps between settlements
052	V Woodford	Support retaining local gaps
053	M Mabin	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan to retain the character of each settlement
054	M Penton	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan

055	D & J Robson	Support the preservation of the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
056	D & M McIndoe	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
057	S Valu	Support the plan
058	K Davies	Support the evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
059	M Abel	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
060	B Boddy	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
061	E Baker	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
062	J Dyer	Support retaining local gaps
063	C Bletsis	Support retaining local gaps
064	P & S du Gay	Support the concept of strategic gaps around Church Crookham
065	H Geoghegan	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
066	P Brown	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
067	A Goddard	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
068	M King	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
069	J king	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
070	A Allen	Support retaining local gaps
071	M King	Support retaining local gaps
072	Natural England	No specific comments to make
073	A Ramage	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
074	M Allen	Support retaining local gaps
075	S Kinnell	Support retaining local gaps
076	R Kinnell	Support retaining local gaps
077	M R Behmber	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
078	T & A Stephens	Support retaining local gaps
079	S Emery	Support retaining local gaps
080	J Evans	Support retaining local gaps
081	B Frankland	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
082	C Frankland	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
083	I Frankland	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
084	Historic England	Do not wish to comment on the proposed modifications
085	V Hall	Support retaining local gaps
086	C Hall	Support retaining local gaps
086	Zebon Copse Residents Association	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
087	G Sheppard	Support retaining local gaps
088	R Goddard	Support Gap policy and evidence
089	F Bailey	Support retaining local gaps
090	J Ambler	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan

091	L Abel	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
092	V Kettley	Support the preservation of the gaps
093	L Plummer	Support the local gaps policy
094	W Herbert	Support retaining local gaps
095	K Herbert	Support retaining local gaps
096	N Herbert	Support retaining local gaps
097	N Laws	Support retaining local gaps
098	L Norris	Support the preservation of the gaps
099	O Robinson	Support the preservation of the gaps to maintain the identity of Crookham Village
100	S Gray	Support the preservation of the gaps
101	R Herbert	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
103	G Whiteside	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
104	L Bell	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
105	C Riley	Support the policy to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
106	S Tolley	Support the preservation of the gaps
107	P Bell	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
108	K Tolley	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
109	B Miller	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
110	I Johnson	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
111	K Abel	Support the neighbourhood plan
112	S Baker	Support maintaining the gaps around the village
113	Crookham Care Village	<p>Raise concerns regarding the evidence to justify the designation and extent of the local gap. The revised evidence relies heavily on the historic designation and Policy CON21 of the Local Plan which has been deemed out of date in recent appeals. The emerging local plan included indicative gaps however these have since been deleted.</p> <p>Appendix 3 provides no evidence as to why policies NBE01 and NBE03 of the emerging local plan are not sufficient to control development outside of defined settlement boundaries. The evidence in Appendix 3 is descriptive and reliant on out of date historic policies, there is no new evidence/assessment or robust methodology to justify the gap. A detailed review should be undertaken to justify the designation which Appendix 3 fails to do.</p> <p>Request the local gap policy is deleted and designations removed.</p>
114	M Teale	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan

115	J Clark	Support the evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
116	C Killen	Support the gaps policy in the Neighbourhood Plan
117	A Killen	Support the evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
118	M Lloyd	Support the gaps policy in the Neighbourhood Plan
119	G Boucher	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
120	S Ambler	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
121	S Istead	Support protecting the gaps around the village
122	J Halton	Support Policy NE01
123	E Acheson	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
124	J Kwok	Support the gaps policy in the Neighbourhood Plan
125	N Burton	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
126	L Morris	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
127	R Morris	Support to preserve the gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan
128	A Needham	Support Policy NE01
129	B Needham	Support Policy NE01
130	K Hicks	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps
131	C Johnson	Support the preservation of the gaps
132	W Richmond	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps
133	S Byrne	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps
134	K Byrne	Support the new evidence to preserve the gaps