

Oakley & Deane Parish Council Planning Committee met to discuss this reserved matters application and object for the following reasons:

### Access Road

The current traffic route through the site is unacceptable, forcing all traffic to the new estate down one narrow road with blind corners, past a children's play area, and houses which will mean a loss of privacy for residents. The Parish Council would like to see alternative routes offered that would distribute the large increase of traffic through the estate. The Committee believe that although access is not a reserved matter, and the outline application is intended to deal with matters of access, the appeal decision notice states the plans provided were only illustrative and later goes on to say an alternative arrangement may come forward that is more acceptable than the illustrative material.

- A condition was added to require further details of internal access and circulation routes as all details shown were considered to be illustrative only, "apart from the existing access road **between Station Road and Canterbury Gardens**". Note the use of the word between, clearly defining the space separating two points. This is also clarified further as "*only the existing access road to Canterbury Gardens has permission so far*".

It is clear from the Appeal Decision Notice that only the access from Station Road **to** Canterbury Gardens has permission, and that permission has not been granted **through** Canterbury Gardens.

In fact, where routes are situated in relation to buildings is part of the reserved matter of layout which is under consideration in this application. It is therefore reasonable to determine that this is open to change, on the basis of the issues presented in this report. Ultimately access was not decided in detail at the outline or appeal stage and conditions were put in place to consider elements of access as part of the reserved matters application. Given the number of issues recorded, it should be possible to bring forward an "equally or even more acceptable" alternative arrangement for the site.

Included below are quotes from the Appeal Decision notice to further illustrate this point, bold emphasis has been added by the authors.

- Point 3 states:  
*The application was made in outline with all matters reserved except for access. I have had regard to the site plan submitted with the application (ref P19039-RFT-00-ZZ-DR-A-0106 Rev P02) **but consider that all the details shown are illustrative apart from the existing access road between Station Road and Canterbury Gardens. The same applies to the design and access statement.***
- Point 107 states:  
*Conditions 1 to 3 are necessary to clarify the reserved matters still to be approved as well as set out the timeframe for applications to be submitted and the development implemented. The timeframes are shorter than the standard amount to encourage the earlier delivery of housing. **As all the plans are illustrative, it is not necessary to include a condition listing specific plans.** The red line site plan merely identifies the site and contains no details that the development would have to accord with. I have found that the illustrative material would be broadly acceptable and note that the appellant intends to pursue something similar at the reserved matters stage. However, **an alternative arrangement could come forward at this stage that is equally or even more acceptable than the current illustrative material.** Therefore, it is not necessary for a condition to require broad accordance with the current material.*

- Point 109 states:  
*Conditions 10 to 15 are pre-commencement requirements, all of which cover necessary arrangements to be addressed before construction begins. **Condition 10 is necessary to ensure that details of internal access and circulation routes are provided, as only the existing access road to Canterbury Gardens has permission so far.** Condition 11 is necessary to ensure construction work has an acceptable effect on highway safety and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, while Conditions 12 and 13 are necessary due to the archaeological interest of the site. Conditions 14 and 15 are necessary to ensure the adequate provision of surface and foul water drainage.*

- Condition 10:  
*No development shall take place until **full details of accessibility within the site, including circulation routes and the pedestrian accesses from the site to footpath 9b adjacent to Caithness Close and adjacent to the north east corner of the Peter Houseman Recreation Ground have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.** The full details shall include the links to the development, siting, width and construction details based on a topographical survey. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the approved works have been fully constructed in accordance with the approved details and made available for use and shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.*

## Highways & Transport

Although the appeal inspector may have dismissed the highways comments previously submitted by the residents and the Parish Council when considering the outline application for the principle of up to 110 homes, and the existing access road between Station Road and Canterbury Gardens; we believe the highways report from Parish Council is still extremely valid, for example safety regarding:

- Issues on station road and bridge
- Pedestrian access
- Potential accident risk on B3400

These above still remain key concerns for the residents and were raised during the planning meeting.

The footpath alongside the access road runs up to Station Road and then goes nowhere, there is also an additional planned path shown in the northwest of the development, which again just goes to a road with no safe access over the bridge.

Interestingly HCC Highways comment on this for the outline application, in their letter dated 1 April 2020 ref 6/3/1/402:

*“The introduction of a footpath that will direct residents west onto Station Road where there is no dedicated footway and where the visibility over the bridge is sub-standard is not acceptable. A stage 1/ 2 RSA for the neighbouring S278 works on Station Road identified that the footway abruptly stopping onto Station Road would be problem that may lead to increased conflict/collision.”*

HCC clearly identified that visibility over the bridge is not acceptable and the impact this may have on pedestrians yet proposes no suitable alternative to use this bridge. This route is the most direct route to community facilities north of the railway line, and even if the footpath is not put in place, it is likely desire lines will appear in the field as this more direct route is used.

As the Highways Authority, Hampshire County Council has a duty of care to the residents of Oakley and the surrounding area, to provide safe highways for use by all. We agree with HCC that this

access approach may lead to increased conflict or collision. We do not wish there to be a road traffic collision before changes are made to highways to improve safety. Despite receiving an appeal win, the applicants should also consider the highways report and this statement, responding to the community views and evolving their proposals to try to resolve the issues.

Whatever scheme HCC is proposing to mitigate these dangers (based on a transport contribution) must be designed and delivered in place ideally prior to commencement of development, however at the latest prior to occupation of any properties on this development. This is a matter of public safety. This scheme should also include safe footpath access to the community facilities north of the railway. As was suggested in the Hampshire Highway Authority - Agency Agreement Response to 17/02874/OUT dated 18 Jan 18. The third party land referred to, is this site. This further development is this application.

*“8. From an accessibility perspective the extension of this footway further along Station Road would be highly desirable to connect with the community facilities, etc., located to the north of the Railway Line.*

*9. Although the absence of this pedestrian connection is regrettable, given a. that the development of this site is supported by the Neighbourhood Plan; and b. the presence of the alternative pedestrian route via Oakley Footpath 9b, the B3400, etc., the HDMT is unable to conclude that this deficiency would be so significant as to warrant the refusal of this planning application.*

*10. The provision of the proposed footway may also enable the possible extension of this facility in the future (e.g. in the event of further development which involves the third party land, etc.). “*

Regarding point 9 of that response, given this site was not in the neighbourhood plan and is closer to the bridge, i.e., further from footpath 9b, we do believe it warrants a deficiency that is significant, hence it's mention here.

#### **Access through Canterbury Gardens**

In addition to the Station Road issues mentioned above, vehicular access through Canterbury Gardens is inappropriate given the narrow roads, sharp almost right angle turns, and children's play area.

Existing residents enjoy quiet streets here, believing they live on a cul-de-sac style road and did not purchase their homes with an understanding that a large number of new homes would later be sharing this road as a through route. Although not entirely a planning matter it is also believed that this road is unadopted and paid for by means of an estate charge for existing residents which may mean it isn't available for use anyway.

As noted in the access section above, this route should be open to change as it is in no way related to the outline application or appeal decision. An alternative route needs to be provided to avoid the Canterbury Gardens site.

With an alternative route proposed, the Parish Council would like to request additional vehicular access to Peter Houseman Recreation Ground through the new site. It should be possible to provide this through existing gates and access tracks, so as to reduce damage to the hedges. This could possibly provide a much more suitable access than the track which currently runs from the crossroads on Rectory Road. This change may also reduce the impact on the conservation area by reducing vehicular traffic along Rectory Road. These two aspects should be weighed against any damage to hedges if required.

### **Road Surfacing**

Within the development all roads should be designed and constructed to an adoptable standard. Driveways are typically the areas next to houses where vehicles are parked for specific properties - not roads which vehicles travel along to get to other properties. The use of "private drives" shared by multiple properties should be removed. These are shown in light brown on the hierarchy and movement plan. The surface treatments used also affect waste collections as waste collection vehicles will not typically leave tarmac surfaces.

### **Footpaths**

Additional improvements should be sought to the surrounding footpaths (such as 9b) as suggested by point 71 in the appeal decision. As an illustrative example this could go towards making those more wheelchair accessible given the requirement of condition 9 to provide 15% accessible and adaptable homes. This will allow safer access to Andover Road and the local shops in the existing village centre.

### **Parking (car & bicycle) & Car Club**

The Parish Council would like a list to be provided showing the number of parking spaces (car & bicycle) on a per plot basis and the total number of visitor bays.

It's not easy to determine on plans that all plots meet the Parking SPD requirements as partial numbers should be rounded up per plot. Residential parking standards should be rural requirements as outside settlement boundary, with between 20% & 50% unallocated, this means 1 bed 1.25 spaces, 2-3 bed 2.25 spaces, 4+ bed 3.25 spaces. Cycle Long Term 1 bed 1 space, 2-3 bed 2 spaces, 4+ bed 3 spaces. Communal cycle 1.0. space. Design and Sustainability SPD section 7 should also be taken into account when designing the parking arrangements.

The single car club bay seems insignificant - on what basis has this been calculated as a suitable transport plan for 110 homes? We do hope this isn't an attempt to avoid the correct parking requirements for the development. Point 102 of the appeal notice states that the electric car club "*may only constitute a single parking space within the development, Therefore, only limited weight can be attached to this benefit.*"

### **Garage Sizes and Retention as Garages**

The requirements here should match the latter part of Condition 18 on APP/H1705/W/15/3005729 for the same reasons outlined in that appeal notice and to ensure Parking SPD is maintained long term, to avoid parking issues:

*"Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development shall take place until full details of the proposed garages have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include the provision of minimum clear openings of 2.3m (for single garage doors), 5m (for double garage doors) between the frames of the garage doors and minimum internal dimensions of 3m by 6m (single garages) and 6m by 6m (double garages) as measured internally between the supporting walls, with a headroom clearance of at least 2.3m. Thereafter, the garages shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained for the purposes of the parking of vehicles and cycles."*

### **Refuse**

Parish Council would like to request a plan showing distance for residents and refuse collection workers to be able to provide accurate feedback against policies. Residents should be able to take bins a short distance as part of BDBC kerbside collection. Unable to find exact policy but believe 15-30m from storage area?

On some plans areas are defined as bcp, does this stand for bin collection points, as on others they are designed as cycle storage. Do not believe these use cases are compatible.

### **Emergency Access**

Fire truck swept path analysis should be provided. This is mentioned in other documentation.

## **Housing Layout & Affordable Housing**

### **Gardens & Distance between Houses**

To allow us to review compliance with policies, would like information on garden area (square metres), and garden lengths - ideally plans marking the required distance between properties. Area calculations should exclude refuse storage areas and sheds.

### **Bungalows**

Bungalows are closest to Station Road. Applicants' representative advised this was due to requirements from Outline Planning to reduce height and impact on conservation area. Perhaps this area could be trees to soften the impact instead with the bungalows moved closer to the bottom of the plans to allow easier access to the centre of the village. The approved outline is for up to 110 homes, this does not mean 110 homes must be built.

### **Northernmost part of Site**

The northernmost part of the site should be redesigned to provide more active frontage facing outward and protected garden areas within. (Design & Sustainability SPD SS5). The current gardens for the houses in the north also have inappropriate boundary materials for such an exposed area when compared to other areas. Hampshire Constabulary go into more detail on these matters in their letter of 23rd January 2020 commenting on the outline application.

Flats in the northernmost part of the site have no per flat garden space. The pandemic has taught us that this private outdoor space is important. This area should be redesigned so each flat has access to their own private outdoor space.

### **Affordable Housing & First Homes**

The affordable housing also needs to be much more distributed throughout the development to promote a more cohesive community.

First Homes should be accounted for in the affordable housing mix per the BDBC First Home Interim Policy Statement December 2021. The mix should be 25% first homes, 53% social rent, 22% shared ownership / other intermediate products (point 11). The size mix should comply with point 13. First Homes on this development should have the 6 weeks priority given to those who have a local connection to the parish as per the table in point 16. Although the appeal to outline planning was granted before the cut off date, it would not make sense to miss out on this opportunity to provide this long term affordable home ownership product in Oakley, given the extensive layout changes that should be required anyway.

### **Drainage**

Could the southernmost drainage be redesigned to drain into the large pond instead? This would leave the land in the southwest available for community use. Alternatively, could the drainage pond be moved into the southeastern segment, again leaving the land available for other community use. More detail on this proposed use is included below.

## Sustainable Development

### Solar Panels / PV

Why do only some plots include PV panels? Plot layouts should be redesigned to have better orientation for PV panels, and this should be included on all properties. Oddly some properties that are orientated correctly don't have PV installed.

### Electric Vehicle Charging

Condition 9 of the outline planning application states:

*"Applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be accompanied by a scheme for the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure for both unallocated and allocated parking spaces. The development shall then proceed in full accordance with the approved scheme."*

The legend in the plans provided says these only show on plot electric vehicle charging. For approval of this condition shouldn't the unallocated visitor bays also have electric vehicle charging? The flats also don't show any electric vehicle charging. This should be incorporated for all bays for those properties - a flat should not preclude the use of an electric vehicle.

### Water Recycling

This is covered in the Village Design statement under Development Guidelines - Buildings & Spaces - the recycling of rainwater, the recycling of 'grey' water.

As an example, rainwater collection systems could be incorporated for all plots in the development to reduce the water usage for recreational activities such as gardening. A simple example of this would be water butts, however more complex rainwater collection systems may be suitable, and the applicants should assess this and grey water recycling systems.

### Gas

No properties should be fitted with gas boilers or stoves. The current government initiatives are encouraging a switch to heat pumps and away from the use of natural gas as a fuel. It is nonsensical to allow new homes to be built with gas supply given this initiative and other current local, regional and national climate change initiatives.

### Bat Boxes/Bricks

Who is responsible for the ongoing maintenance and monitoring of these, and will residents require further information on them to maintain their homes?

## Recreation / Community Facilities

### Community Orchard

The community orchard is not something required in the area. As mentioned, many properties have fruit trees and due to the strong community spirit of the village these are often shared. The Parish Council strongly believe this land could be put to more appropriate use as Allotments. There is already a long waiting list, and this development will place additional pressure on that waiting list. An off site contribution will not mitigate this as the issue is land supply for allotment plots - not just funding.

### Local Area of Play

The local area of play provided in the plans is not of a high quality and will require significant investment before meeting standards for play. If a play area is to be provided it should follow the BDBC Guidance Notes and Standards for the provision of Unsupervised Children's Play Facilities in its design. Its position should also take account of the Design and Sustainability SPD points 4.36 & 4.37, as well as the Green Space Standards in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan. The parish council would not like to see low quality play areas built, as there are significant resources at Beech Park and Kennet

Way park, as well as other areas of the village. Neighbouring residents have questioned the available facilities at Canterbury Gardens being suitable. The current park would be too small to accommodate the new housing, and although Beech Park is close by residents are reluctant to use it due to the lack of safety accessing Beech Park over the railway bridge.

### **Kickabout Area**

Although the borough has requested there be one, is a Kickabout land area in the south of the development, a good location given that there is a large recreation ground just south of the development, which has an accessible kickabout area already? This land could be put to better use for other community purposes and the Parish Council would like to secure ownership of the land on that basis instead.

### **Community Involvement and Land for Possible Community Centre**

From outline application, statement of community involvement.

*"The views of the community are important to Wates. The company embraces community consultation; it is at the heart of their approach to development, not only in the pre-application stage, but for the duration of the project."*

Who is Wates Developments leaflet:

*"Wates Group is a Construction, Development and Property Services business whose work is guided by the purpose of, together inspiring better ways of creating places and community and the business of tomorrow.*

*The importance of community and sustainability is at the very core of the business and we see every development as an opportunity to enhance and improve.*

*Wates is committed to delivering balanced growth, high-quality design and sustainable communities wherever it develops."*

A number of the completed questionnaires from the consultation suggested a new village hall, a bigger doctor's surgery and improved community facilities. These were hardly mentioned in the statement and haven't been represented in the reserved matters application. Wates & Miller Homes now have the opportunity to engage with the community and turn an unwanted housing site pushed through on appeal, into a positive contribution to the community by working with the Parish Council, local community groups and the local doctor's surgery to improve community facilities.

On this basis the Parish Council would like to secure the land in the southwest of the site for community use. This should not affect the housing proposed as no houses are positioned here on the reserved matters plans.

Subject to community engagement, this could be used for a community centre as part of a community hub with Peter Houseman Recreation Ground.

A community centre is different to a village hall in that it is open without someone necessarily booking the hall. This provides an opportunity for facilities such as a locally managed library, historical displays regarding the conservation area and Oakley as a whole, local artwork display and a community meeting place/drop in area for residents (addressing AP002 of the community plan).

This proposed community centre should also include space for a much needed Parish Council office, ensuring its viability and allowing us to better serve the growing community, which this development adds to significantly. It will do this by allowing visitors and deliveries in an appropriate location and providing a fixed space for greater community engagement between Parish, Borough and County councillors and local community groups.

The Oakley Community Association (OCA) constitution already allows for the management of a community facility, the issue has always been finding land for such a proposal. This site provides a once in a lifetime opportunity to secure this for the village, using unallocated space.

The Parish Council have discussed this with the BDBC Connected Communities team, intend to visit similar properties throughout the Borough to review possible layouts and are working on the best method of community engagement regarding this proposal.

The Parish Council would request the land be secured for such community use at this stage and capped utilities (for later connection) be provided in a suitable location on the site. This utility provision (fibre optic broadband, electricity, water etc) would be more cost effective provided alongside the construction of new homes.

The Village Design statement and Community Plan both mention the need for a larger hall space, as do some of the consultation responses in the outline consultation. A community centre could provide all of these and other benefits with few changes required to the layout and no loss of homes as none are in the space proposed.

As previously mentioned, we would also like to see vehicular access provided to Peter Houseman ground from the new development also as a part of this community hub.

The Parish Council would like to request statutory consultation on any subsequent changes to this reserved matters application and encourage both the applicant and the Borough Council to actively engage with the Parish Council and the local community on all aspects.