

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE **EVERSLEY PARISH COUNCIL** HELD ON **TUESDAY 15th MARCH 2016** IN EVERSLEY VILLAGE HALL AT 8.16pm

PRESENT: Cllr P Todd Chairman
Cllr S Dickens
Cllr C Hetherington
Cllr A McNeil
Cllr S Miller
Cllr K Neville
Cllr C Young

ALSO PRESENT: Brian Webb, D Simpson (HCllr) and Mrs J Routley (Clerk) and Cllr S Dickens (arrived at 9.04pm)

164 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
(i) Cllr G Macdonald , Cllr K Neville.

165 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
(i) There were no declarations of interest.
(ii) There were no written requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests.
(iii) There was no need to grant any requests for dispensation.

166 MINUTES OF LAST FULL COUNCIL MEETING,
(i) Receipt of Minutes The minutes of the meeting held **TUESDAY 2nd FEBRUARY 2016** had been previously circulated to all Councillors.
(ii) Errors
Min 146: line 5 is missing an Apostrophe before the word 'kind'.
Min 157: line 3 after 'the north side...' insert 'of the B3272...'

It was **resolved** that with these amendments, the Minutes be approved and signed by the Chairman.

PT

(iii) Matters arising
None.

167 DIARY MATTERS
(i) The Chairman would ask Cllr C Young to conduct the Clerk's Performance Review for 2015/16 by the end of April 2016.
(ii) Following a discussion, the Council felt that it would be advantageous to have the playground inspection later in the year after equipment has been repaired or replaced. The Clerk is to verify with insurers of the playground equipment if it is acceptable to have this inspection later in the year.
(iii) Rural Parishes Engagement Event This is due to take place at Hartley Wintney Offices at 6pm on 24th March. The Chief Inspector will be discussing rural policing. Cllr S Miller and Cllr C Hetherington confirmed they would attend.

CY

SM/CH

168 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
(i) Flooding Brian Webb informed the Council that residents of Warbrook Lane are fed up with the flooding issues and, following advice from their insurer's legal department, they had served a notice of a claim on another resident who they believed was aggravating the problem.
Mr Webb asked if EPC could clear the ditch around the common and the entrance to the culvert.
It was noted that HDC and HCC officers were coming out to inspect the ditches and will then have a group meeting.
Residents had also had a meeting with St Neot's Preparatory school about preventing any more flooding as a result of their planning application. The Bursar had given his reassurance

that there would not be an increase in flood water. Residents were keen to ensure that St Neot's flood scheme is adequate.

Culvert on A327 Mr Webb noted that the culvert under the road by the duck farm roundabout exit is narrow. In 2008 a 10" pipe was put across as a temporary measure but in heavy rain it will flood. Mr Webb asked if EPC could ask Highways or Flood Management to sort it out.

Mr Webb also noted that the ditch by the Golden Pot was starting to collapse and may present a problem in the future.

Mr Webb also commented on the mud on the road on the A327 by Collards. His view was that the problem is the mud banks along the road that take water away are too high so water doesn't drain away and becomes dangerous. Channels in these banks needed to be dug out so that water could drain from the road into the ditches.

Webb's Corner Mr Webb asked that once the flooding issues are resolved could EPC ask for the work to restart on the junction modification.

The Chairman made a general comment that there needed to be a greater capacity for water to flow North of Warbrook Lane. HCC were keen to ascertain the full extent of the drainage problem rather than have to do it again later.

It was agreed to take item 18 'Flooding and Sewerage' next, followed by item 17 'Highways Matters'.

169 FLOODING AND SEWERAGE

(ii) EPC owns the ditches on the north side of the road from St Neot's drive to beyond the Lower Common play area.

Following a discussion, it was **resolved** to clear these ditches and to obtain quotes for this work.

EPC should also try to co-ordinate a collective approach with other residents and land owners.

Clerk

(iii) Ditches had been jetted from Up Green to the Corner of New Road but they had not been done from New Road to Yeomans. There are blockages in 3 locations but HCC are trying to establish the route of the gullies. However, HCC have said it is not their responsibility but that of land owners. Chris Murray had written to riparian owners on 5th February. It was noted that there had been 2 car accidents as a result of the excess water on the road.

Cllr C Young is to speak with Cllr Simpson to ask him to speak to Highways at his regular meeting with them (see below) to obtain clarification and written confirmation about responsibility for the maintenance of these gullies and drains.

CY

170 OTHER HIGHWAYS MATTERS

Highways Meetings D Simpson (HCCllr) informed the council that he will be meeting with James Holt (Highways) every 6 weeks and if EPC sends him all its outstanding issues by the beginning of May then he will chase on its behalf. This is to replace the parish meetings with Highways.

20mph Sign D Simpson is also to chase the progress of the 20mph sign by Charles Kingsley's School.

CY

DS

At 8.55pm D Simpson (HCCllr) left the meeting.

At 9.04pm Cllr S Dickens arrived at the meeting.

The Council returned to item 6 on the Agenda.

171 HDC HOUSING OPTIONS CONSULTATION,

(i) The working group had previously circulated a draft response.

(ii) Following a discussion, it was **resolved** to submit the response from EPC by 18th March 2016 (See Appendix B).

PT

- 172 TERMS OF REFERENCE,
 (i) The terms of reference for the Planning Committee were not yet completed and therefore this item would be deferred. **5.4.16**
 (ii) Following a discussion, it was **resolved** to adopt the terms of reference for the Open Spaces Committee. Cllr A McNeil is to re-circulate the amended document to all councillors. **AM**
- 173 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OPEN SPACES COMMITTEE,
Bus Shelter
 (i) It was **resolved** to approve to repair 2 bus shelters including (fixing up side and roof at The Chequers, new felt and fascia at Kingsley House and fix corner) staining all 3. Cost £525.27
Ongoing work (report to be circulated)
 (ii) This item was deferred. **3.5.16**
 The Open Spaces Committee was to meet at the weekend to review all playground equipment and to disable any equipment which might prove dangerous. **OSC**
- 174 FINANCIAL REPORT
 i) The Responsible Financial Officer had circulated the Year to Date report.
 ii) There were no cheques to approve.
 iii) Quotes had not yet been received for Internal Auditors.
- 175 REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES ON OTHER BODIES,
 (i) Blackbushe Airport Consultative Committee (BACC) Cllr C Young noted that there were no incidents from Eversley. BACC would be holding a big event in the summer and had asked if this could be advertised in parish magazines.
Charles Kingsley's School Cllr S Miller had attended the Heart of the Community Assembly on 15th March and presented the awards.
- 176 BURIAL GROUND
 (i) Following a discussion, it was **resolved** to adopt the revised Burial Ground Rules and Regulations.
 (ii) The Chairman is to redraft the Burial Ground Plan and include an area for memorial benches. **PT**
 (iii) The revised Burial Ground Rules and Regulations are to be circulated to all undertakers and monumental masons and a note placed in the Parish Magazine. **Clerk**
- 177 EMERGENCY PLAN
 (i) It was agreed that the draft Emergency Plan was nearly complete but needs details of willing volunteers.
Actions:
 • Cllr S Miller will approach people who may be useful contacts for the Emergency Plan. **SM**
 • The Clerk will check the insurance position on EPC and residents assisting in emergencies. **Clerk**
 (ii) The Emergency Plan was not yet ready to adopt.
- 178 PUBLICATION POLICY,
 (i) Following a discussion, where it was noted that a clause regarding CCTV should be added, it was **resolved** to adopt the revised Publication Policy. **ALL**
- 179 COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE POLICY,
 (i) It was **resolved** to adopt the Complaints Procedure Policy. **ALL**
- 180 GRANTS
 It was noted that the Greenham Common Trust will match fund specific projects in North Hants.

- (i) It was decided that the grant on offer from Southern Electric Power Distribution might be more appropriate for the Village Hall than EPC.
- (ii) Not applicable.

181 ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC WORKING GROUP (RSTWG)

- (i) Community Speedwatch The group still needs more volunteers and has again asked for volunteers in the parish magazine. At the moment the group cannot operate on Longwater Road because the police speed van is operating in this area and also cannot do the B3272 due to traffic lights.
- (ii) No further actions were required at present.

182 VEHICULAR RIGHTS OF WAY ACROSS THE VILLAGE GREEN,

- (i) The solicitor had asked for a copy of the Enclosure Award of 1868 which the Chairman is to send.
- (ii) It was **resolved** to obtain quotes for look into fencing and costs installation of dragon's teeth for which expenditure of up to £900 was approved.
- (iii) EPC is to contact its solicitors and state that it was hoping for substantial movement towards finalising this agreement. EPC has approved in principle putting in dragon's teeth around the Village Green and if it does not see substantial movement towards concluding this contract then will have no other recourse than to put in dragons teeth. If there hasn't been substantial movement by 3rd May then dragon's teeth will be installed and this will be added to the charge for vehicular access. **Clerk**

183 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 1 (C)

At 9.55pm the Chairman requested that Standing Orders be suspended in order to deal with the majority of remaining items on the Agenda. It was **resolved** to continue the meeting until 10.30pm, and to defer certain items until the next meeting if necessary.

184 WEBSITE,

It was noted that there may be people in the Village that may have the expertise to help with designing websites and if not contractors would be looked into.
The Clerk is to ask neighbouring councils which website designers/providers they use.

**CY
Clerk**

185 TASK LIST

- (i) This item was deferred.

186 MATTERS OF URGENCY

- (i) None.

187 ITEMS OF INFORMATION

The Clerk reported the following:

- (i) Lengthsman Scheme It was noted that Yateley Town Council were happy to be a lead Council and EPC is to confirm that it wishes to be a part of the scheme.
- Household Waste Recycling Centres HCC is beginning a consultation on 16th March.
- (ii) Councillors had nothing to report.

188 PERFORMANCE REVIEW WORKING GROUP,

- (i) It was decided that a motion to go into confidential session was not needed. A draft Report from the Working Group was passed to the Clerk to be checked for accuracy. Further consideration of the item was deferred to the next meeting.

There being no further items for discussion the Chairman closed the meeting at 10.24pm

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

**The next Meeting will be held on Tuesday 3rd May 2016
following a meeting of the Planning Committee which commences at 7.30pm**

Appendix A

Min 210: Min 190: <u>Burial Ground</u> Cllr P Todd is awaiting contact with Ron Rietdyk.	PT
Min 210: Min 190: <u>Public Right of Way Evidence Regarding Warren Heath</u> Cllr P Todd has yet to write a covering letter, which will explain the claim clearly, and to find the maps from the Forestry Commission to complete the paperwork.	PT
Min 210: Min 190: <u>Heritage Assets</u> EPC is concerned that since Firgrove Manor now had individual house owners there is a possibility that the gardens may be divided up rather than remaining as communal which would be a threat to the historic gardens. Cllr P Todd had yet to draft a request to HDC to step up protection, by way of an Article 4 Direction to remove Permitted Development Rights in the gardens of Firgrove Manor.	PT
Min 210: Min 190: <u>English Heritage Seminar</u> Cllr P Todd is to seek confirmation from HDC Planning Department about the Conservation Area Reviews and if they will restart the process in the near future and whether Eversley was on the list.	PT
Min 210: Min 190: <u>Vehicular Rights of Way Across the Village Green</u> Cllr P Todd offered to recirculate the traffic plan he had drawn up previously for this area.	PT
Min 210: Min 190: <u>Meeting Venue</u> The Clerk is still investigating other possible venues for holding EPC meetings and obtaining details as to pricing and availability.	Clerk
Min 210: Min 190: <u>Cemetery Management and Compliance</u> Further actions may be required following a review of EPC Rules and Regulations and burial ground fees.	Clerk/PT
Min 210: Min 192: <u>Parish Council Newsletter</u> The newsletter had been printed and distributed to all residents. Cllr D Bradley thanked the Clerk for producing it so quickly and to all Councillors who helped in its distribution. Many Councillors had received favourable comments on the content and quality of the newsletter.	
Min 210: Min 197: <u>S106 Local Leisure Projects Fund</u> Cllr D Bradley is still chasing Dr A Crampton (HDCllr) and Carl Westby (HDC) to get the new project added to the approved list but has been told that there would be no decision until after the Election.	DB
Min 212: <u>Performance Review</u> Cllr C Young apologised for the delay and will arrange a date to meet with the Clerk shortly.	CY
Min 212: <u>Parish Council Election</u> The Election had taken place on 7 th May. There were 5 valid nominations for 8 vacancies so those 5 will be elected uncontested. The new Council can co-opt within 35 days of the Election without the need to call for an Election. Co-option can take place at the Annual Meeting on 19 th May. EPC would welcome any interest.	
Min 214: <u>HALC HR Support Fees</u> The Clerk has confirmed with HALC that the HR Support is not required.	
Min 218: <u>Rural Broadband</u> Cllr S Dickens apologised that he had been unable to respond to HALC's questionnaire.	
Min 219: <u>The Sara Beer Archive</u> The Chairman has the records and is awaiting confirmation from her executors. (<i>Shortly following the meeting, there was a request from the Village Hall Committee that the records could be on display at one of their Coffee Afternoons.</i>)	PT
The Chairman explained that these were not yet in a format suitable for display.	
Min 243: <u>Bypass document</u> has gone out but, as yet, there has been no response.	
Min 250: The Clerk is still awaiting a police contact as is Charles Kingsley's School and Road Safety and Traffic Working Group.	Clerk
The Traveller Document will also need to be updated with the new Police contact details.	Clerk
Min 21, Min 237: <u>Payments and receipts</u> Cllr K Neville offered to contact ex Councillor Alex Ricketts regarding the uncashed cheque.	KN
Min 29: <u>ESA</u> ESA had agreed that this year they will have a bonfire display on CEMEX land and that EPC may wish to be involved. Cllr K Neville and Cllr S Miller offered to be involved. It was suggested that there would need to be a formal request from ESA if they wished to use Cross Green for parking.	KN/SM
Min 43: <u>Final Accounts for 2014-15</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Clerk is to verify the insurance excess.• A working group is to review the assets and report back to Full Council no later than February 2016. This is to consist of Cllr K Neville, Cllr C Young and Cllr S Miller.	Clerk KN/CY/SM

Min 51: Additional Actions EPC will look again at Neighbourhood Plans. This is to be included on a future Agenda.

Appendix B

Local Plan Consultation 2016 ^[1]

This new consultation replaces the earlier consultation which started in November 2015 and was stopped on 14 January 2016 because it became apparent, following feedback from local residents, that not all the settlements that were anticipated to be included within one of the key questions had been correctly captured.

If you have read the new consultation material below and would like to re-submit your original response, please visit www.hart.gov.uk/confirmation-of-local-plan-response ^[2].

Refined Options for Delivering New Homes paper and New Homes Sites Booklet

This part of the consultation gives you an opportunity to reflect upon the best approach to delivering the district's growth needs. For background information to this part of the consultation please read the following documents:

- [Refined Options for Delivering New Homes](#) ^[3] or [Refined Options for Delivering New Homes version showing main changes](#) ^[4]. You can also view the [summary booklet](#) ^[5]
- [New Homes Sites Booklet](#) ^[6]

Draft Local Plan Vision and Strategic Priorities

The Vision and Priorities Consultation document is available for public comment alongside the Refined Options for Delivering New Homes paper and New Homes Sites Booklet. This will allow early community input into the development of a Vision and Strategic Priorities which can be considered in preparing the draft Local Plan.

For background information to this part of the consultation please read the following document:

- [Local Plan Vision and Strategic Priorities](#) ^[7]

The draft local plan consultation is open between the 3 February 2016 and 4pm on Friday 18 March 2016

Please note: The questions are also set out in the above consultation documents. You cannot save this response form part way through, so if you wish to make detailed comments please prepare your responses in advance. You can [download a PDF of the response form here](#) ^[8].

***Indicates a required field.**

Please enter your name:

***You must give us your name otherwise it will invalidate your response to this consultation.**

Eversley Parish Council

Please enter your postcode:

***You must give us your full postcode. Invalid postcodes will invalidate your response to this consultation.**

GU46 7SD (Parish Clerk's postcode, not directly related to area of interest of the Parish Council)

If you would like to be sent a copy of the results of this consultation and to be notified of future Local Plan consultations, please enter your email address below:

eversley.clerk@virginmedia.com

If you enter your email address here you will receive a confirmation email, with a copy of your submission.

Consultation questions regarding the Refined Options for Delivering New Homes

You need not answer every question or make comments but you must answer Questions 4 and 5; and, you must complete those two questions in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

Q1. Do you have any comments on how to meet the needs of specialist groups such as affordable and Starter Homes, Custom or self-build homes, specialist homes for older people, and sites for the Travelling Community?

EPC has worked tirelessly to bring forward affordable housing sites for local people through the rural exception sites policy and it recognises the need for at least one more Eversley site for up to nine units during the Plan period.

A high proportion of the infill and redevelopment sites in the village have been purchased specifically for custom or self-build homes. EPC expects that trend to continue.

EPC has worked with a local landowner to identify an extension to the existing elderly people's site at Paul's Field to allow it to expand from 16 to approximately 50 units. This is because it can, then, be re-established as a fully wardened (24 hour) facility again. In the absence of any agreement, EPC will be seeking to identify an alternative site, elsewhere in the parish, for the full 50 units that are required.

There are, already, two travellers' sites within close proximity to the border of Eversley, so other permanent or transit sites, if required, will need to be found elsewhere in the District.

Q2. Where are the sites within Hart District that you think may be appropriate for:

a) Affordable and Starter Homes?

For the most part, within the larger urban areas, where the availability of facilities close at hand mean that the cost of living is not as great as that in less sustainable areas. Within smaller settlements they should be on sites identified as appropriate by the local community and should be designed to address local needs.

b) Custom and Self Build?

EPC notes that there will be approximately 50 to 60 homes that will come forward on infill and redevelopment sites within the parish over the Plan period and that many of these sites would be suitable for custom or self-build homes.

c) Homes for older people?

Within the larger urban areas on sites close to essential facilities (shops, leisure, public transport, health, etc.) where they can continue to lead independent lives as long as they would wish to. Within rural settlements there should be sites available that are close to facilities and to their immediate families, so that they can continue to interact with their friends and family.

d) Travelling communities?

Over half of all of Hampshire's local authority pitches are within 1 mile of Eversley. There are very good reasons why any further transit/permanent sites should not be established in such close proximity to existing sites. However, Eversley does have a relatively high proportion of residents with a gypsy and/or traveller

background and the EPC treats these families in exactly the same way as all other residents in the allocation of affordable/starter homes for local residents.

Q3. Do you agree with the current Settlement Hierarchy?

The Council has an existing Settlement Hierarchy (2010) which is:

- Tier 1** - Main Urban Area - Fleet, including Church Crookham and Elvetham Heath.
- Tier 2** - Primary Local Service Centres - Blackwater & Hawley, Hook, Yateley.
- Tier 3** - Secondary Local Service Centres - Hartley Wintney, Odiham & North Warnborough.
- Tier 4** - Main Villages - RAF Odiham, Crondall, Crookham Village, Dogmersfield, Ewshot, Eversley, Long Sutton, Rotherwick, South Warnborough.
- Tier 5** - All remaining villages and hamlets.

Yes	
No	X

If not, how should it be changed?

(i) Eversley Cross and Up Green must be regarded as separate settlements.

(ii) If there is any need for a separation between Tier 4 and Tier 5 Settlements, then there should be proper consultation and assessment, because the current split is neither logical nor practical.

EPC has consistently challenged the draft 'Settlement Hierarchy for Hart District' and was prepared to debate it at the last Local Plan Examination. However, the examination was abandoned, so the document has never been tested. The settlements listed in para.2.3 have been arbitrarily re-grouped for the purposes of the assessment in Appendix I, rather than each being assessed on its own. The five hamlets in Eversley have been redefined as three – Eversley Street & Lower Common; Eversley Centre; and, Eversley Cross & Up Green. There is no explanation why. Nor is there any obvious reason why HDC has identified a need to divide Hart's villages into two tiers (Tiers 4 and 5). Paragraph 7.6 acknowledges that the division would only be necessary if the Local Planning Authority was to wish to adopt differing policy approaches to the two tiers. Paragraph 7.7 acknowledges that "the cut-off for inclusion in the higher tier is a matter of debate". However, no consistent methodology has been adopted in segregating the two tiers. Hart has sought to present Tier 4 settlements as "sustainable" and, hence, developable and Tier 5 settlements as "unsustainable" and, hence, not developable. The criteria counted in Appendix 1 fail to measure sustainability. Not only is the access to a useable public transport system left out of the summation, but the existence of "comparison shops" is included. The fact that there is a horse feed shop or antiques centre within walking or cycling distance has no relevance to "sustainability", since they are visited infrequently by few households and, almost exclusively, by private car or lorry.

Our priority will be to deliver new homes on brownfield land (land that has previously been developed). However we do not think there will be enough brownfield land available to meet our needs. Any development that cannot be built on 'brownfield land' will have to be delivered elsewhere. This will essentially be on 'greenfield' sites outside our towns and villages. The possible 'greenfield' approaches are set out in Questions 4 and 5.

Q4: Of the three possible approaches that could deliver new homes in Hart, which one should we prioritise to deliver the majority of our housing needs?

*** You must complete this question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.**

Please note that this question only seeks your views on what should be our primary approach to delivering Hart's housing needs. It does not mean it would be our only approach. We will need to ensure that we deliver a constant supply of new homes throughout the Local Plan period. Some elements of lesser preferred approaches may need to be included in the plan.

Please rank your choice in order of preference (1 = most preferred to 3 = least preferred).

Option	Rank
Approach 1 : Disperse development throughout the towns and villages in the following parishes: Blackwater & Hawley, Crondall, Church Crookham, Crookham Village, Dogmersfield, Elvetham Heath, Eversley, Ewshot, Fleet, Hartley Wintney, Heckfield, Hook, Rotherwick and Yateley.	3
Approach 2 : Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements (West of Hook, Pale Lane Farm adjacent to Elvetham Heath and land west of Fleet)	1
Approach 3 : A new settlement at Winchfield	2

Please provide any further comments on this below.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets great store on balancing and maximising the economic, social and environmental benefits of new development in order to secure sustainable development. EPC believes that the concentration of investment in the regeneration of existing urban centres has the greatest chance of being sustainable. A properly designed "new settlement", wherever it might be most appropriate, as long as it is of sufficient size, has the opportunity to be sustainable in itself, but at a far greater environmental cost than urban regeneration. The least sustainable approach is to disperse development in the form of planned extensions to smaller villages which are themselves dependent on neighbouring towns and urban centres and are inherently non-sustainable. One cannot minimise the dependence on private car use by siting new developments in those settlements that are the most reliant on the private car.

Q5. If we need to combine approaches, which combinations do you prefer?

*** You must complete this question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.**

Please rank your choice in order of preference (1 = most preferred to 4 = least preferred).

Option	Rank
Approach 4 : Combine Approach 1 and 2 Disperse development throughout the towns and villages in the following parishes <u>and</u> Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements	3
Approach 5 : Combine Approach 2 and 3 Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements <u>and</u> A new settlement at Winchfield	1
Approach 6 : Combine Approach 3 and 1 A new settlement at Winchfield <u>and</u> Disperse development throughout the towns and villages in the following parishes	4
Approach 7 : Combine all three approaches Disperse development throughout the towns and villages in the following parishes <u>and</u>	2

Strategic Urban Extensions at main settlements and A new settlement at Winchfield	
---	--

Please provide any further comments on this below.

The selection of these approaches follows on, naturally, from the explanation given under Q4 above. Given that any new settlement option would be most unlikely to be able to deliver a significant number of houses within the Plan period, it is very difficult to assess how the addition of that approach to any other will have any significant impact to the outcomes, but in ranking Approach 7 in second place, EPC has assumed that some small proportion of expected growth would be taken up by any new settlement, thus reducing the levels of development on the least sustainable sites.

Q6. The New Homes Sites Booklet shows, by Parish, sites that are available for the development of new homes.

Do you have any comments on any of these sites?

Please select which parishes that you would like to comment on. For parishes where there is a choice of two or more shortlisted sites (in red, and listed in the tables on each map), please rank the sites in order of preference (1= most preferred, then 2, 3, 4 etc. to least preferred). Please add any comments to support your ranking.

You may also comment on any 'rejected' sites (in blue and listed on the tables on each map).

You may complete the ranking for as many parishes as you like. Particular regard will be paid to how close you live to the sites being ranked. Please read the New Homes Site Booklet for more detail.

Please note that Question 6 and the New Homes Sites Booklet relate only to 'non- strategic' sites. Very large 'strategic' site options covered under Approaches 2 and 3 (Strategic Urban Extensions and New Settlement) are not included in this ranking exercise. If you wish to make comments on those sites please do so under Questions 4 and 5 of the response form.

- Blackwater & Hawley
- Bramshill
- Church Crookham
- Crondall
- Crookham Village
- Dogmersfield
- Elvetham Heath
- Eversley
- Ewshot
- Fleet
- Greywell
- Hartley Wintney
- Heckfield

- Hook
- Long Sutton
- Mattingley
- Odiham
- Rotherwick
- South Warnborough
- Winchfield
- Yateley

Blackwater & Hawley

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 2 shortlisted sites for Blackwater & Hawley - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 2 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
100	Sun Park, Guillemont Park North (216)	
153	Brook House (60)	

Comments box

Bramshill

There are no shortlisted sites for Bramshill.

Comments box

Church Crookham

There is one shortlisted site for Church Crookham.

Site		Rank
90	Stillers Farm (shared with Ewshot parish) (106)	1

Comments box

Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.

Cron dall

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 2 shortlisted sites for Cron dall - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 2 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
73	Land west of Cron dall (184)	
74	Land north west of Cron dall (66)	

Comments box

Crookham Village

There is one shortlisted site for Crookham Village.

Site		Rank
116	Cross Farm (150)	1

Comments box

Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.

Dogmersfield

There is one shortlisted site for Dogmersfield.

Site		Rank
COM001	Land at Dogmersfield (141)	1

Comments box

Elvetham Heath

There is one shortlisted site for Elvetham Heath.

Site		Rank
104	Land at Elvetham Heath (40)	1

Comments box

Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.

Eversley

*** You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.**

There are 9 shortlisted sites for Eversley - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 9 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
23	Land west of Marsh Lane (134)	9
26	Land north of Reading Road (41)	1
103	Land adjoining Crosby Gardens (11)	2
112a	CEMEX site A (105)	8
112b	CEMEX site B (19)	7
122	Land west of The Fielders (41)	4
246	Area B, land at Eversley Cross (20)	3
247	Land north of Hollybush Lane (38)	6
273	Land between Eversley Road and Firgrove Road (88)	5

Comments box

EPC has ranked these sites, because it is required to do so. However, the opportunities for Eversley to accommodate planned new developments in excess of natural growth rates has been seriously compromised by decisions made by Wokingham Borough Council.

In evaluating the highway impacts of the new settlement of 3,500 new homes at Arborfield Garrison, less than 1 mile north of Eversley, WBC acknowledged that projected traffic levels on the A327 would exceed the theoretical capacity of its junctions, such as that with Fleet Hill, Finchampstead, before 2026, whether the Arborfield Garrison development took place or not. This break down, particularly in rush hours, was attributable to the projected increase in traffic levels arising from natural growth. Therefore, WBC felt that it was unable to secure any financial contribution towards highway improvements on the A327 from the Arborfield Garrison developments, on the basis that WBC would need to both find and fund a highway solution anyway.

EPC has proposed a viable solution to the problem that is both cheaper and less environmentally damaging than the Eversley Street Diversion that has been in Local Plans for a considerable number of years. However, any solution will require a new river crossing and will cost upwards of 12 million pounds. WBC has neither made budget provision for this level of expenditure, nor sought any contribution from HCC, so there is very little expectation that any highway improvement will be forthcoming for a considerable number of years.

In planning terms, it would not be sound to advance any proposal for housing allocations in Eversley that generated new traffic volumes on a road that is known and acknowledged by the Highway Authority to have no capacity for that traffic.

EPC is aware of the growth figures that have been used in the Wokingham Strategic Traffic Model (WSTM) and has assessed that its housing needs can be satisfied at that level. It has calculated that approximately 50 or 60 dwellings will come forward on infill and redevelopment sites in the Plan period. Planning

permissions and completions, to date, bear out that estimate. It also plans to identify a suitable "rural exception policy site" for up to nine more affordable homes for local people within the Plan period. It also wishes either to expand its current elderly people's facility at Paul's Field from 18 to approximately 50 units or to find an alternative site of that overall capacity, so that it can re-establish a fully warded (24 hour) facility in the village again. These three elements combined equate to a growth level higher than that of Hart as a whole and higher than that allowed for in the WSTM. However, given that the alternative to housing local elderly within the village would be that they would have to be housed elsewhere, with a considerable increase in traffic occasioned by their friends and families having to travel to see them, EPC believes that traffic growth levels of its proposals would be compatible with those within the WSTM. In other words, the parish would not be placing any greater traffic load on the A327 than WBC expects.

Until WBC (and/or HCC) is able to provide increased capacity, there is no way that Eversley can accommodate more.

Ewshot

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 3 shortlisted sites for Ewshot - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 3 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
90	Stillers Farm (shared with Church Crookham parish) (106)	
COM005	Land south of Church Crookham (158)	
COM006	Land east of Redfields Lane (89)	

Comments box

Fleet

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 4 shortlisted sites for Fleet - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 4 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
320	Town Centre, zone 2 (26)	
322	Town Centre, zone 4 (17)	
338	Land at Great Bramshot Farm (10)	
357	Land at Sankey Lane (20)	

Comments box

Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension options at Pale Lane and West of Fleet please see questions 4 and 5.

Greywell

There are no shortlisted or rejected sites for Greywell.

Comments box

Hartley Wintney

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 3 shortlisted sites for Hartley Wintney - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 3 = least preferred). Comments box

Heckfield

There is one shortlisted site for Heckfield.

Site		Rank
92	Land south of Riseley (69)	1

Comment box

Hook

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 3 shortlisted sites for Hook - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 3 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
9	Land at Owen's Farm (43)	
130	West of Varndell Road (44)	
COM003	Hook Garden Centre, Reading Road (117)	

Comments box

Note: to comment on the strategic urban extension option at West Hook please see questions 4 and 5.

Long Sutton

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 4 shortlisted sites for Long Sutton - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 4 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
30	Land at Hyde Road (17)	
31	Land east of Copse Lane (42)	
62	Granary Fields (10)	
291	Land south of Chaffers Close (46)	

Comments box

Mattingley

There are no shortlisted sites for Mattingley.

Comments box

Odiham

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 3 shortlisted sites for Odiham - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 3 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
79	Land south of Hamilton House (80)	
327	Land to the south of Crownfields (west) (10)	
COM004	Land to the north of Deptford Lane (174)	

Comments box

Rotherwick

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 3 shortlisted sites for Rotherwick - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 3 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
87	Land north west of Rotherwick Village (38)	
115	Land at Green Lane (24)	
290	Land at Rosemary Cottage (8)	

Comments box

South Warnborough

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 3 shortlisted sites for South Warnborough - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 3 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
33	Plough Meadow (23)	
71	Land adjacent to Nash Meadows/ Ridley's Piece (40)	
172	Granary Court (16)	

Comments box

Winchfield

There are no non-strategic shortlisted sites in Winchfield. Please provide comments below.

Comments box

Note: To comment on the Winchfield New Settlement option please see questions 4 and 5

Yateley

* You need not answer this question or make comments but if you seek to answer it you must complete the question in full by ranking all preferences otherwise it will invalidate your response.

There are 2 shortlisted sites for Yateley - please indicate your preferred site (1 = most preferred and 2 = least preferred).

Site		Rank
11	Land at Moulsham Lane (180)	
20	Land at Reading Road (24)	

Comments box

Q7. Do you have any other comments on the refined housing options paper?

It has been pointed out to EPC that the capacity figures associated with some of the housing sites are those that have been calculated by HDC officers and, in many cases, bear little relationship to the actual housing proposals being advanced for those sites by their owners. Residents would have been better able to give useful rankings, if they had been aware of the real proposals.

Consultation questions regarding the Draft Vision and Strategic Priorities for Hart

The following questions relate to a document called 'Draft Vision and Strategic Priorities for Hart' which is available alongside the 'Refined Options for Delivering New Homes' and the 'New Homes Sites Booklet'

Q1. We have identified a set of key issues for the Local Plan in table 1 on page 5. Do you agree with them?

Yes	
No	

Do you have any comments on the key issues?

Q2. We have drafted a vision setting out how the district might look by 2032 on page 6. To what extent do you agree with it?

Agree	
Slightly agree	
Slightly disagree	
Disagree	

Do you have any comments on the Vision?

Q3. We have identified some draft strategic priorities for the Local Plan in table 2 on page 7 & 8. Do you agree with them?

Yes	
No	

Do you have any comments on the strategic priorities?