

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE **PLANNING COMMITTEE OF EVERSLEY PARISH COUNCIL** HELD ON **TUESDAY 5<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2016** IN EVERSLEY VILLAGE HALL AT 7.30PM.

PRESENT: Cllr P Todd Chairman  
Cllr S Miller  
Cllr C Young

ALSO PRESENT: Cllr S Dickens, Cllr C Hetherington, Cllr A McNeil, Dr A Crampton (HDCllr), Terry Radford, David White, Leone Brown, 8 other residents and Mrs J Routley (Clerk).

119 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr K Neville, Cllr G Macdonald, D Simpson (HCCllr), Cllr T Southern and A Renshaw (HDCllr),

120 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

121 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

(i) The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on **TUESDAY 1<sup>st</sup> DECEMBER 2015** had been previously circulated to all Councillors.

(ii) No errors were reported.

It was **resolved** that the Minutes be approved and signed by the Chairman.

PT

(iii) Matters arising from the Minutes

None.

122 DIARY MATTERS

None.

PT

123 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(i) The Chairman acknowledged that many residents had attended the meeting for the discussion of item 7, The Appeal for Land adjacent to Marsh Lane KECR/15/01295/FUL, and item 8, HDC Draft Local Plan Consultation, and therefore agreed to take public comments when these items were discussed.

There were no public comments on any other matter.

The Council **resolved** to change the order of the meeting and to take item 7, Appeals, and item 8, HDC Draft Local Plan Consultation, next and then return to item 6, Planning Applications.

124 APPEALS,

KECR/15/01295/FUL Land Adjacent to Marsh Lane

Erection of 121 dwellings with associated access and highway works, open space, hard and soft landscaping and Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).

(i) The Chairman confirmed that the date for responses was indeed the 27<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and not 21<sup>st</sup> January which had been mentioned on some documents. This appeal is to be decided by a hearing.

The Chairman emphasised that this was an opportunity for residents to withdraw, amend or reinforce their previous comments or indeed to comment for the first time on the application. Comments must be received by 27<sup>th</sup> January.

Flooding Cllr A McNeil asked if the recent flooding could have an impact. The Chairman stated that flooding had already been raised as an issue and that the water run off could be raised as a concern. It was noted that HCC had commented that the height of the attenuation ponds would not be sufficient and that now the appellants have added 1.5ft to all the ponds and will presumably provide evidence as to how this will work. This was also an issue which the Environment Agency raised.

SHLAA Sites Cllr C Young noted that in HDC's draft Local Plan the site had been included as a SHLAA site. Dr A Crampton (HDCllr) responded that the SHLAA sites are not the sites that are considered developable but just a list of the sites that are available. Terry Radford noted that it was therefore important that residents also responded to the draft Local Plan consultation.

New Documents A resident commented that it did not appear right that the applicant could submit new documents as part of the Appeal. The Chairman suggested that EPC could comment that it is not fair for the Inspector to make comments on documents which had not been available to the public for the full consultation and had not been available to HDC at the time of their decision.

(ii) It was **resolved** that EPC will:

- Respond asking that the objection EPC previously submitted (see Appendix A) is confirmed in total along with a copy of the report of what EPC said at HDC's Planning Committee (see Appendix B).
- Comment that supplementary information and changes to documents which have not had formal public consultation should not form part of the Appeal documents.
- Ask that the impact of the Arborfield development with the subsequent decision of WBC to grant permission for a further 1500 houses at Hogwood Farm and the traffic impact on the road network through Eversley needs to be born in mind.
- Confirm that EPC does wish to be present at the hearing and take full part in the hearing and answer any further questions and information required by the inspector.
- Ask that the inspector holds an evening session to allow members of the public to put their case to the Inspector.

**Clerk**

Leone Brown asked if residents could do anything further. The Chairman suggested that residents could write and comment that they had assumed that the planning system worked in a way that plans are made public and were considered by the Parish Council. That HDC had looked at the application and made a decision and that an Appeal at this stage, with so many reasons for refusal on this unsuitable site, is running against the idea of democracy and input into the planning system and is undermining the planning system. To reverse the decision does nothing for the public perception of the planning system.

(iii) Any other actions

- EPC is to ask its MP for his feedback regarding the planning application.

**Clerk**

## 125 HDC DRAFT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION,

(i) EPC considered the draft local plan which is HDC's vision of where it will be in 2032 with regards to planning.

Residents made the comment that it was a badly constructed consultation. The Chairman felt that even if the option was for a new settlement then the other options would also still be required in order to meet the demand.

The 'New Homes Sites' document details where houses could be built and asks respondents to put them in order of acceptability.

It was noted that since this is an informal consultation not a statutory one, HDC do not have to take the comments into account.

The Clerk had placed details of how to respond on EPC's website and on the notice board. The Clerk is also to email EPC's email database of residents giving these details.

**Clerk**

The Chairman explained that EPC has been asked to comment on the sites on the list and on the 3 sites that HDC believes to be unsuitable.

EPC's wish for the allocations would be for 50 units of old people's accommodation and 9 units of affordable housing. The affordable housing could possibly be an exception site.

EPC has previously disagreed with the settlement hierarchy of HDC and does not feel that Eversley Centre and Eversley Cross are any more sustainable than any other part of Eversley.

EPC would urge as many residents as possible to respond to the consultation.

(ii) It was **resolved** to establish a working group and to delegate the working group authority to make a response to the consultation on behalf of EPC. The working group is to include all councillors who will seek the views of residents and will circulate a response to all councillors and to residents by 13<sup>th</sup> January 2016.

ALL

Terry Radford asked if a Neighbourhood Plan would have done the work of this working group. The Chairman agreed and commented that at the last Annual Meeting of the Parish Council EPC had noted the need to find a Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator but had so far been unsuccessful.

At 9.15pm the 11 residents left the meeting.

#### 126 PLANNING APPLICATIONS,

(i) The Chairman gave a presentation of the details of the following applications to the Committee and after full discussion it was **resolved** to forward the comments, listed below to HDC,

(a) 15/03000/HOU

10 Kingsley Road

Single storey extension

EPC Consultee Comment: Eversley Parish Council raises no objections.

Clerk

(b) 15/02979/HOU

Collingwood House Reading Road

Erection of a single storey rear extension.

EPC Consultee Comment: Eversley Parish Council has no objections but would ask for a condition that the extension is always used as an integral part of the existing property rather than a separate residence.

Clerk

#### 127 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

(i) Existing cases

Laser Tag This case is not closed and is still ongoing.

Land at Warren Heath and south of Church Road The Chairman is to look into the usage of the site.

PT

Yalden's Farm Councillors are to verify whether the floodlights are still an issue.

ALL

The Kingsley

Issues had been raised regarding the new sign at The Kingsley B&B. Queries were: whether the tree was protected and being damaged, the very bright flood light shining into a neighbour's property. The sign suggests a change of use to a hotel with wine bar. The Enforcement Officer and Environmental Health are investigating these issues. The Enforcement Officer has confirmed that an application has been requested for the sign that is located in the tree which should be submitted by Monday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016. The 'A' bard on the Highway verge is temporary as it is not fixed to the ground and therefore no action can be taken.

(ii) New Cases

Dorney's There are now 5 advertising signs by this property. The signs are technically temporary but are there all the time and block drivers' views when turning right. The signs are on Highways land and Highways ought to take action if the line of sight is affected.

EPC is to write to Highways and copy D Simpson (HCCllr).

Clerk

#### 128 REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

(i) This item was deferred.

19.1.16

## 129 FINANCIAL REPORT,

(i) The Responsible Financial Officer's reconciliation for **December 2015** had been previously circulated.

**Reconciliation****Balance expected at End of Dec 2015 (Pl. Min 117/15-16)****31,773.94**

|                   |             |                                      |        |               |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------|---------------|
| <b>Lodgements</b> | Chequers    | lights                               | 50.00  |               |
|                   | Chequers    | basketball                           | 130.00 |               |
|                   | inscription | Violet Gwynn                         | 35.00  |               |
|                   | Ashes       | Gwynn                                | 95.00  |               |
|                   | St Marys    | donation due to admin error on above | 53.00  |               |
|                   | Natwest     | refund bank error                    | 10.00  |               |
|                   | Chequers    | replacing incorrect currency         | 20.00  |               |
|                   | John Pierce | donation to christmas lights         | 200.00 | <b>593.00</b> |

**O/S Cheques not cashed**

|      |  |        |
|------|--|--------|
| 2149 | A. Ricketts                            | 25.00  |
| 2418 | Playdale playgrounds ltd               | 80.10  |
| 2423 | Hampshire Pension Fund                 | 189.11 |
| 2427 | Eversley Village Hall                  | 31.50  |
| 2429 | Eversley and Bramshill Parish Magazine | 10.50  |

**336.21****Total 32,703.15****Balance at end of Dec (24th Dec 2015 as per statement)**

32,703.15

**Cheques for payment 5th Jan 2016**

|              |           |                              |                            |                  |
|--------------|-----------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| <sup>1</sup> | 2432/2433 | Lights4fun Ltd/Sandra Miller | Extension lead             | 26.98            |
|              | 2434      | J Routley, Clerk             | Salary - Dec               | 916.46           |
|              | 2435      | J Routley, Clerk             | Expenses/Admin - Dec       | 53.14            |
|              | 2436      | Hampshire Pension Fund       | Dec contribution           | 189.11           |
|              | 2437      | S Chapman Dep PW             | Litterpicker Invoice - Dec | 87.70            |
|              | 2438      | Nick Robins Ltd              | Grounds Maintenance - Dec  | 743.54           |
|              | 2439      | Eversley Village Hall        | Hire - Dec                 | 52.50            |
|              | 2440      | HMRC                         | Oct-Dec                    | 279.81           |
|              | 2441      | Basingstoke Skip Hire        | Skip Hire - Dec            | 72.96            |
| <sup>2</sup> | 2442      | Word of Design Limited T/A   | 11 picnic benches - grant  | 5,108.40         |
| <sup>2</sup> | 2443      | Glasdon UK Limited           | litter bins                | 2,863.68         |
|              | 2444      | Bentham Ltd                  | Cartridges + free Printer  | 124.61           |
|              |           |                              | <b>Total</b>               | <b>10,518.89</b> |

**O/s Cheques not cashed (as above)**

336.21

**Total Expected in Current****Acc****End of Jan 2016****21,848.05****Balance in Reserve Account (24th Nov as per statement)**

13,695.01

24th Dec Interest

0.58

**13,695.59****Balance in EPC EM Account (24th July as per statement)****0.00**<sup>1</sup> Rewritten and original destroyed as incorrect payee<sup>2</sup> Taken from Grant Fund**(ii) Payments and receipts**

It was **resolved** to authorise the payments, above, for signature.

**PT**

130 ANY OTHER PLANNING ITEMS OF INFORMATION

(i) The Clerk reported the following:

13/00755/CMA Warren Heath Recycling Facility, The Welsh Drive The application for permanent secondary aggregate recycling has been granted.

15/00189/FUL Land Adjacent Hollybush End House The Planning Appeal for a pair of semi-detached 2 bedroom dwellings in the land adjacent to Hollybush End House has been dismissed.

(ii) Councillors had nothing to report.

**Clerk**

There being no further items for discussion The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.45pm.

Chairman.....Date.....

**The next Meeting will be held on Tuesday 19th January 2016 at 7.30pm**

## **APPENDIX A**

**Comment Date: Mon 13 Jul 2015**

Eversley Parish Council held an Extraordinary Council meeting on 7th July to discuss its response to this application. It decided, unanimously, to object to the application, on principle. Put simply, the application should be refused, because it is contrary to the Development Plan, which is in force since HDC can demonstrate an adequate housing land supply. Even if HDC was not able to do so, the application should be refused, because it would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), since the site is not a sustainable one for housing development,

Eversley Parish Council's objections are that the proposal :

- (A) is contrary to the NPPF as it is not sustainable;
- (B) adversely impacts the character of the local area;
- (C) adversely impacts Up Green Conservation Area, a heritage asset;
- (D) adversely impacts neighbours' amenities;
- (E) adversely impacts local highways and highway safety;
- (F) adversely impacts other essential infrastructure - e.g. education, medical services, emergency services, land drainage, foul drainage, etc.;
- (G) adversely impacts protected species and biodiversity;
- (H) provides inadequate highway mitigation;
- (I) provides inadequate SPA mitigation;
- (J) provides no compensatory community benefits to balance against the recognised significant harm that would be caused by the development.

These objections are self-explanatory, but are covered more fully in the attached documents. EPC recognises that this list of objections is not comprehensive and the fact that EPC has not included reference to any other reason for refusal should not be seen, in any way, as detracting from its validity.

Yours sincerely

p.p. Julie Routley [sent by e.mail].

Clerk to Eversley Parish Council

### **A) Sustainability**

#### **A.1 Not a 'Higher Tier Village'**

A.1.1 EPC has disputed and continues to dispute the designation of both Eversley Centre and Eversley Cross as 'higher tier villages', as proposed in the Local Development Framework Background Paper 'A Settlement Hierarchy for Hart District' of January 2010. This document has never been tested and, itself, acknowledges that 'There is no established method to draw on for sub-dividing the villages [of Hart District] into two separate tiers' (ASHfHD para 7.7). It states 'Whether this list is the most appropriate cut-off for inclusion in the higher tier is a matter of debate' (para 7.9).

A.1.2 EPC was due to have that debate at the Examination in Public into the Draft Core Strategy in autumn of 2013. Due to the withdrawal of the draft before the EiP was completed, the debate has not yet taken place. Therefore, the issue of whether or not either Eversley Centre or Eversley Cross would be considered a sustainable location for housing development is still moot.

A.1.3 The inclusion of Up Green as a 'higher tier village' is patently an error and has also been disputed by EPC. It is noted that the application refers to " the separate attractive villages of Eversley Cross and Up Green " (D&AS para 3.1), which is exactly EPC's understanding of the situation.

#### **A.2 Pedestrian Safety**

A.2.1 Also, EPC does not accept that showing that services and amenities are within a notional walking or cycling distance to be sufficient evidence that a site is sustainable. As acknowledged by the applicant, the DfE guidance refers to " the shortest route along which a child, accompanied as necessary, may walk with reasonable safety " (TA para 8.10, emphasis added). The evidence

that EPC has is that a road such as Firgrove Road, on the route between the site and the primary and secondary schools and supermarket, is considered to be dangerous by parents of small children. This suggests that it cannot be considered as a route that may be walked with reasonable safety. Incidentally, dog walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders, also find the route dangerous due to the speed of traffic (national speed limit of 60mph) and lack of footways or safe verges.

### A.3 Lack of Public Transport

A.3.1 It is completely wrong to describe a bus service (Route 145) that runs once on a single day in each week as " offering a relatively low frequency service " (TA para 3.59). The very limited bus services that would be available to new residents do not serve the destinations or run at the times that people require for commuting, shopping, sport, recreation, etc., so the bus cannot be considered, honestly, as an alternative to car use. No amount of additional information about the existence of the services (FTP para 5.4.i) or reduction in their fares (FTP 5.6.i & ii) is going to alter that or increase passenger rates. Eversley has one of the highest rates of car use and car ownership in Hart District precisely because it is not located in a part of the District where more sustainable transport options are available. It is not a sustainable site for housing development.

## B) Character of local area

### B.1 Visual impact

B.1.1 It is notable that, in analysing the significance of effects and direction of visual amenity on the 15 visual receptors selected in the Landscape Appraisal (LA), the proposal is assessed as neutral at best and substantially adverse at worst (LA Table 3 pp 15 & 16). Despite the allegation that the proposal advances 'A range of well-designed dwellings in keeping with the local vernacular and materiality (sic)' (D&AS para 6.1) the landscape architects can find no positive visual impact to the whole scheme. They recognise that whatever 'pretty-pretty' design is proposed it will always be worse than what is there at present. EPC concurs. No housing scheme could compensate for the permanent loss of open countryside and the long rural views that exist at the moment.

B.1.2 The LA does note that there are " barns and other infrastructure " on site (LA para 3.3), but does not describe them. They are not beautiful and are an imposition on the countryside, but are the type of structures one would associate with an active farm. The LA could have noted that their removal would have been a visual benefit.

B.1.3 However, mentioning the barns would have drawn attention to the fact that an integral part of the proposal will be the relocation of these structures elsewhere on the remaining landholding. Whatever benefit is gained by the removal of the buildings would be more than offset by the harm caused by their relocation. There is nowhere on the landholding where they could be as discretely located or impact on the outlook of fewer residents and be less visible from public viewpoints.

### B.2 Landscape impact

B.2.1 Landscape considerations should not be restricted to the proposal's effect on the wider open countryside. The proposal would also impact on the 'townscape'. Eversley Cross has already had a major addition to its historic core, which was added as a single cul-de-sac development, comprising The Fielders, Grensell Close, Sparvells and Arlott Close. This is noted as being of very high density (D&AS para 2.7) and together with the adjoining site at Yeomans, virtually doubled the size of Eversley Cross in one fell swoop. Eversley Cross has also taken several further dwellings through natural growth of infill and redevelopment since then. The current proposal is for a similar virtual doubling of the size of Eversley Cross, by the addition of a single cul-de-sac development in one fell swoop. This will lead to the overwhelming of the character and structure of Eversley Cross by new and unsympathetic developments.

B.2.2 The proposal also straddles the important gap that separates Eversley Cross and Up Green, leading to their coalescence and consequent loss of identities.

B.2.3 The proposed densities are also very high in relation to the existing village (D&AS para 6.6) and, being located on the edge rather than central to Eversley Cross fail to echo the natural form of lower density development to the outer edge of rural settlements.

### B.3 Highway works

B.3.1 The proposed highway works and junctions on Marsh Lane are very wide and urban and don't fit well with low key rural lanes.

### C) Impact on a Heritage Asset

#### C.1 Up Green Conservation Area

C.1.1 The application notes that HDC's Strategic Housing Land availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2015 states that the southern part of the site 'is unsuitable for development due to the constraint of the Up Green Conservation Area' (LA para 3.17). In assessing the landscape impacts the LA uses, surprisingly, the word 'beneficial' when assessing the effects of development on the Conservation Area, because the proposal includes 'replacing of original Up Green Common (sic)' (LA para 5.6) with an alternative feature with similar public access. It does not explain how the proposal either preserves or enhances the existing features.

C.1.2 Equally surprising is that the LA gives greater consideration to the Up Green Conservation Area than the Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment also referred to as the Heritage Statement (HS). Whilst noting that the Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset (HS para 4.2.4) and noting why the southern half of the proposal site was included within the Conservation Area (HS para 7.15), the assessment of impact on the heritage asset is simply 'In addition the development may have an impact on the setting of Up Green Conservation Area, within which it partly lies, as well as a physical impact' (HS para 10.4). The HS is silent on what the physical impact would be, presumably because it was impossible to say anything without having to admit that the proposal destroys much of the quality of the Conservation Area and fails to either preserve or enhance it.

C.1.3 A test would be to consider whether, after development, that part of the Conservation Area within the development would still qualify for Conservation Area status. EPC believes that the proposal would have such a damaging impact on the Conservation Area that the boundary would need to be reviewed and a large section excluded.

### D) Neighbours' amenities

#### D.1 Neighbours' amenities

D.1.1 EPC need hardly speak for the site's neighbours, who have made their own objections. However, there is a material difference in the impact on residents from a speculative application to one on a site that has been through the full democratic process and been allocated for development in a Local Plan. The impact of unexpected development on a site which is currently protected by Local Plan policies would be far greater than on a known development site.

D.1.2 Residents who currently enjoy a sense of spaciousness with little real awareness of surrounding development have the right to have their amenities and privacy protected. They should not be subjected to a change in their outlook from one of open fields and trees to one of a dense residential estate. They should not have their current tranquillity disturbed by a significant increase in noise from domestic activity, notably from rear gardens or public open spaces and play areas backing onto their properties and increased noise from vehicle movements where currently there are none.

D1.3 It is for the Local Plan to assess and compare sites and make decisions on site selection which balance the interests of particular residents against the wider needs of society as a whole. This application fails to comply with the saved policies of the Local Plan, so neighbours have a right to expect a decision in line with that plan.

### E) Highways and highway safety

#### E.1 Transport Assessment (TA)

E.1.1 The TA notes that the NPPF 'seeks to ensure that 'developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised' (TA para 2.14). In apparent acknowledgement that the proposed site is not located on a site where that is possible, the TA continues 'It notes ' however, this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework' (TA para 2.15), but

omits the words 'particularly in rural areas' (NPPF para 34). It is not obvious if the applicant is suggesting that Eversley Cross is not a rural area or simply suggesting that the need to minimise travel and maximise the use of sustainable transport can be dodged by using the 5 criteria listed in NPPF para 35.

E.1.2 The five questions about the proposal that need to be answered are :

- (a) Does it accommodate efficient delivery of goods and supplies ?
- (b) Does it give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and have access to high quality public transport facilities ?
- (c) Does it create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establish home zones ?
- (d) Does it incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles ?
- (e) Does it consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport ?

E.1.3 The TA fails to provide answers to the five questions. Given that the list is inclusive and Eversley does not have access to high quality public transport facilities it is difficult to see how it could. Since the proposal does not comply with NPPF para 34 or 35, the proposal is not NPPF compliant and should be refused permission.

## E.2 Peak Hour

E.2.1 EPC has serious concerns about the validity of the TA and questions whether any useful conclusions can be drawn from a document based on false premises. The first issue is with the definition of the a.m. peak. Graphs 3.1 (p 19) and 3.3 (p 22) clearly show an a.m. peak in traffic movements at 8.00, which would imply that the peak hour should be assessed as 7.30 to 8.30. By selecting an erroneous peak hour, the TA has artificially reduced the peak flow thus invalidating all calculations based on that figure.

## E.3 Eversley Cross

E.3.1 The TA states that " most of Eversley Cross village falls within 800m of the approximate centre of the site. Facilities available within 800m of the site include a post office, a Church of England primary school, three public houses, a small farm shop and a sports ground' (TA para 3.39). Apart from misrepresentation in trying to suggest that facilities in Eversley Centre are actually in Eversley Cross, the list is wrong. Reference to the map that is in the D&AS at para 2.9 shows that the post office is outside the 800m circle, the primary school is well outside the 800m circle and only just inside the 1,500m circle and only two public houses are within the 800m circle. Similarly, some of the facilities said to be within 2 km of the site are actually only just inside the 2.5km circle. It is difficult to trust an assessment that cannot even get distances correct.

## E.4 Traffic generation estimates

E.4.1 EPC doubts that it is appropriate to assess trip generation by comparison with any 'Suburban Area' (TA para 5.8). HCC has already questioned whether sites with a good public transport service ought to be used as comparators (TA App A Addendum). However, instead of identifying 'Out of Town' sites, the TA has simply deleted those suburban areas with the better public transport services.

E.4.2 As detailed above, EPC does not assess the very limited bus service as a true option for commuters, shoppers, sports or recreation, etc. Therefore, it is wrong to use any sites closely related to urban areas and served by regular bus transport.

## E.5 Arborfield development

E.5.1 EPC finds the consideration given to the committed development at Arborfield to be

farfical. In response to a request from HCC, as Highway Authority, to test the highway impacts of the proposal in combination with those of known development commitments, the applicant has chosen to misread the Arborfield TA and decided to ignore any traffic generated by the development. Even if only 10% of the Arborfield traffic were to be to/from the south, as predicted in the Arborfield TA, the figures that it gives for traffic on the B3272 are considerable and should be included in any 'in combination' assessment.

## E.6 Summary

E.6.1 EPC finds that the TA uses low trip generation figures, incorrect peak hour data and ignores impacts of other developments, so any results and conclusions must be compromised.

## F) Infrastructure

### F.1 Charles Kingsley's School

F.1.1 The local primary school is very successful and very popular. It is a single term intake primary school and intends to remain so. Although it is able to adapt to a slow growth rate associated with the natural development/redevelopment expected in the village, it would be unable to cope with the sudden demands of a vast new estate. EPC does not know how or where children from the proposal would be educated, but it could not be within the village. Therefore, there would be an increase in traffic generation and a social divide within the village.

### F.2 Medical services

F.2.1 EPC has been informed that there is no spare capacity at the Monteagle Surgery in Yateley and is not aware of any spare capacity at Finchampstead Surgery. Whilst there was a site reserved for the provision of a medical centre within the village, the landowner gained permission to build houses on it, because he was unsuccessful in finding anyone prepared to establish a new practice locally.

### F.3 Emergency services

F.3.1 Whilst Police, Fire and Ambulance Services are under pressure and subject to re-organisation to reduce costs, the aspect of the proposal that concerns EPC is the accessibility of the site for emergency vehicles. The applicant is obviously aware of the issue, having suggested establishing an emergency access/egress through the significant hedgerow on Chequers Lane. However, EPC is unaware how this would work in practice with security from abuse and whether emergency vehicles would necessarily be able to negotiate estate roads that may be subject to pavement parking.

### F.4 Land drainage

F.4.1 EPC is very aware of the issue of frequent flooding in Marsh Lane and the subsequent run-off flowing through Eversley Cross to Eversley Centre down the B3272, to rejoin the surface water drainage network opposite Lindum Nurseries.

F.4.2 The proposal provides no off-site work to help the situation, relying on on-site balancing ponds, swales and other engineering features to limit run-off. It is noted that the existing groundwater levels are high and that infiltration into the subsoil was 'extremely poor' when trial pits were dug and tested (FRA para 6.3.2). Therefore at the time that flood restriction measures will be most needed their capacity is likely to be at a minimum. This can only lead to excessive, swift run-off from all impervious surfaces - roofs, parking, roadways ' into an off-site network that is demonstrably inadequate.

### F.5 Foul sewers

F.5.1 EPC alerted the applicants to the problems of the local sewer network and its lack of capacity to cope with additional developments, almost two years ago. Despite that warning, there is no indication of how or when the network and its capacity can be upgraded or what the physical impacts of those off-site improvements would be.

## G) Ecology

### G.1 Biodiversity

G.1.1 EPC recognises the site as being semi-improved/less improved grassland that forms a transition site between ancient woodlands on the south west and freshwater valley habitat in the north east. This situation contributes to the site's very high biodiversity and wealth of rare and protected species of flora and fauna. It is a vital link in the local ecological network. It would be naïve to suggest that its loss can be compensated for by habitat creation on the proposed SANG ' an area of improved grassland remote from woodlands and isolated by the proposed new highway works.

G.1.2 EPC believes that it is essential that, where information is absent or necessary Phase 2 surveying is incomplete, a precautionary approach should be adopted, to prevent adverse impacts on protected species and their habitats.

## H) Highways mitigation

### H.1 Mitigation measures

H.1.1 The only highway mitigation proposed are (a) a minor diversion of the north end of Marsh Lane; and, (b) an adjustment to the limits of the 30mph zone.

### H.2 Marsh Lane

H.2.1 The alterations to the line of Marsh Lane and its junction with the B3272 is not, strictly, a mitigation measure. It is not required for highway safety purposes as the existing junction has no safety issues. However, since the applicant currently has no highway access from the site to Marsh Lane and there is nowhere along his boundary where a safe access could be created, the diversion is required in order that the site can be accessed and developed. For the application to suggest otherwise is disingenuous.

### H.3 Speed limit

H.3.1 According to the TA it is " proposed to reduce the speed limit on Marsh lane to 30mph. Marsh lane currently operates as a shared space with vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists sharing the carriageway. A reduction in the enforceable speed limit will be a significant benefit to all road users' (TA para 4.7). Although EPC would support such a move, it is aware that it would comply with neither the Police's nor the Highway Authority's criteria for a 30mph limit. Therefore, it is not something that the applicant can deliver, so should not be used to 'sugar the pill'. Moreover, the removal of the double bend in Marsh Lane is likely to lead to increased speeds on the road, rather than lower ones, so the proposal will not only add traffic but also increase speeds and danger.

### H.4 Other highway impacts

H.4.1 EPC is far more concerned about increased traffic flows and their direct impact on junctions such as Firgrove Road/Marsh Lane/Up Green and Coopers hill/Fleet Road; on users of Coopers Hill- a far more dangerous and narrow road than Marsh Lane; on Eversley's Conservation Areas; and, on the amenities of residents living close to and/or using the highway network. In order to inform consideration of all these issues it is necessary to have credible figures in the TA.

## I) SPA Mitigation

### I.1 SANG

I.1.1 EPC shares the concerns of many that the SANG will fail to be attractive enough an alternative to achieve its objective of limiting adverse impacts of increased footfall on the SPA due to development. It sees no thrill in walking along an artificially convoluted pathway in a field next to a main road and questions how long any planting would require until it would provide anything like the experience of walking through forestry or across heathland remote from traffic noise.

## J) Community Benefits

### J.1 Statement of Community Involvement

J.1.1 Members of the Parish Council first met the landowner and his agents in August 2013, at which councillors advised that the worst form of development for the, then, suggested 50 ' 70 houses would be a single urban cul-de-sac. A number of possible community benefits that might also be considered were suggested at that and subsequent meetings.

J.1.2 The SCI submitted with the application appears to EPC to be a work of fiction. There is no adequate explanation of why every single community benefit has been rejected or why the proposal is now for twice the number of homes and for the form of development that they were advised would be the most objectionable and most damaging to the parish.

J.1.3 An SCI is meant to be a document to show how an authority has been responsive to the wishes of its electorate and it is reviewed by an independent Inspector in assessing the soundness of an authority's plan. It is not a mechanism by which an applicant can claim to have been responsive to suggestions if neither the consultations nor their outcomes are revealed and the applicant decides, themselves, whether they have done it correctly. EPC certainly does not recognise the SCI as an accurate record of its experience of the process.

## J.2 Possible benefits

J.2.1 The applicant has rejected the suggestion that land be made available for the retention, extension and redevelopment of Paul's Field, so that Eversley can re-establish and retain a warden-assisted old people's housing complex within the village.

J.2.2 The applicant has rejected the suggestion that land be made available for the formation of a route from Hall's Lane to the B3272, to enable ESA traffic to use a far safer junction with the main road and reduce the adverse impact on Fox Lane residents.

J.2.3 The applicant has rejected the suggestion a mini roundabout or other gateway feature on the B3272, to help control the speed of traffic entering Eversley Cross.

J.2.4 The applicant has rejected the suggestion that some of the affordable housing be proposed to address Eversley's identified local needs, rather than simply addressing the wider District and out-of-District needs.

J.2.4 The applicant has rejected the suggestion that any proposals should integrate development with the existing settlement structure and match the housing densities and rural character of the area.

J.2.5 The applicant has not responded positively to any other suggested community benefits.

2015.07.11

## APPENDIX B

### E.P.C.'s ADDRESS TO H.D.C.'s PLANNING COMMITTEE, 14<sup>th</sup> October 2015

Chairman, Members,

You may wonder why Eversley Parish Council wants to speak, when you have its considered response to the application in full. Moreover, the Report in front of you shows that, whatever the benefits of the proposal, the demonstrable harm that would be caused to practically every interest of acknowledged importance means that this application must be refused.

I just wish to confirm the immense impact that this proposal would have on a rural parish. The Report, at page 22, refers to an increase in settlement area of the two settlements, Eversley Cross and Up Green, of 58%. In terms of house numbers, an increase of 121, over the existing 173, is actually 70%. The impact of an increase of 121 on the existing 500 houses in the five settlements of Eversley combined would be 24%, which is itself substantial.

I assure you that refusal of this application will not mean that Eversley is “saved” from development. The Council expects that, during the Plan period, 50 to 60 units will come forward through infill and redevelopment – and current permissions indicate that this is, indeed, likely. The Council also wants to expand old people’s accommodation, so that fully wardened provision can be re-established in the parish. Now that this landowner has indicated his unwillingness to help, we will be seeking 50 units elsewhere in the village. Similarly, the Council is aware that there will be a need for at least 15 further affordable homes for local people during the Plan period. Again, this landowner has indicated his unwillingness to help, so these will be sought elsewhere in the village.

So, even without further allocations, Eversley expects to provide in the order of 120 homes during the Plan period. This represents a higher growth rate than for

Hart as a whole. Eversley will still be making a very substantial contribution towards accommodating the District's recognised housing needs and, more particularly, Eversley's own specific needs, without this proposal.

There is no reason why you should not refuse permission tonight.