



KINGSCLERE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM RESIDENTS 1.10.2015 – 18.02.2016

COMMENT/CONCERN	COMMENTS FROM NP GROUP
Porch Farm access	
Using the current entrance / driveway to Porch Farm on the A339 for vehicles that would enter and leave this development. “absolute madness”	Initial review of transport and access indicates that residential development is unlikely to have a severe residual traffic impact on the A339 or the village however the existing access is insufficient. Improvements to the existing access have been proposed but this would be subject to discussions with the Highways Authority.
Access for 50 houses directly onto the increasingly busy A339 would be problematical	
Access through the existing developments would change the character of those areas for the worse and cause traffic to build up at peak times at the estate exists onto the Newbury Road	Access through existing developments is not proposed.
The A339 is a major issue. Aside from development in Kingsclere, the traffic will also increase between now and 2029 (and beyond) due to ongoing development and housing in Basingstoke, Newbury, New Greenham Park and potentially a new industrial park at Catts Farm and further development at the Cottismore Nursery site. My personal view is that it is wholly irresponsible to allow these developments to happen before suitable infrastructural improvements are implemented. Chris Garnett	The Highways Authority must be consulted prior to new developments.
I don't think anyone expects developers to pay for road usage that isn't down to them, but it seems totally insane to me that ANY further development is allowed before the road (and any other) infrastructural improvement can facilitate it. At peak times the A339 is already well beyond its design capacity (when the majority of extra road usage will occur) and not far off capacity at other times. It is all very well talking about re-designing exits and entrances to the new developments but this doesn't lessen the impact of extra road loading at pinch points in Newbury and Basingstoke (as those of us doomed to use this road regularly know all too well) as well as closer to home. I realise that the way	

things are configured the wider issues are not within the Kingsclere Neighbourhood Plan to address. The fact that the current road infrastructure is inadequate appears to “cut no ice” with the planning authorities and / or Governments insisting on a set level of local development. It’s just a shame there is no linkage that forces the planning authorities to insist on proper infrastructure BEFORE development is sanctioned. Chris Garnett	
There is evidence that Manydown will be building a number of houses, also the same in Newbury, Sandleford too. Both these will have a huge impact on our A339. Adding condensed area of dwelling onto an already troubled road can cause more problems. The write up about Porch Farm states that most would be travelling to either Newbury or Basingstoke, not into the village. This is probably as they are on the outskirts of the village. We do not need more issues added to the A339, just improvements on what is there currently.	
Ease of access straight from A339, posing no more of an issue that the traffic currently entering/leaving the supermarket, petrol station and Diner opposite.	
Its own access to the A339 (thus not forcing more traffic through the busy village roads)	
There is a smaller field to the West of the Porch Farm field, which borders the graveyard. Has this site been investigated/discounted? Our thoughts are that this field might enable road access via the Ecchinswell road which might be less hazardous (& less expensive) than access from the A339?	Land which borders the Ecchinswell Road is not available for development.
The traffic situation on the A339 has got increasingly busy and dangerous over the past 5 years. If the only access is directly onto the A339 then journeys from the new properties into the village will increase the pressure on this already over-busy main road.	
Access for 50 houses directly onto the increasingly busy A339 would be problematical and access through the existing developments would change the character of those areas for the worse and cause traffic to build up at peak times at the estate exists onto the Newbury Road. Chris Garnett	
Village boundary/Settlement Policy Boundary	
Far outside the village boundary (Porch Farm)	All sites we are considering are outside the existing Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB).
Please can we try to use sites within the village boundaries?	There are no suitable sites within the current SPB.

<p>This land is outside the current village Settlement Policy Boundary. Neither is it adjacent to the SPB. (Porch Farm)</p> <p>Stephen and Lynn Painter</p>	<p>The border to the east is adjacent to the current SPB.</p>
<p>I'm rather mystified as to why this proposal is even on the table, as the area concerned falls well outside of the Settlement Policy Boundary. (Porch Farm)</p> <p>Chris Garnett</p>	
<p>Porch Farm miscellaneous</p>	
<p>Fault line that runs through the middle of the field (Porch Farm)</p>	<p>There is no evidence that there is a fault line.</p>
<p>I have just spent a couple of minutes not only looking at the names on the petition but also the comments on the web link that Mr Painter sent. I'm astonished to see comments like "because my house backs onto this field"!</p>	<p>All policies in the NP will be supported by evidence and not personal preference.</p>
<p>A single site that can accommodate the full demand – one dedicated access road and infrastructure means minimum disruption during construction and when occupied.</p>	
<p>Small number of people directly impacted (I count 5 properties in the Plan - significantly less than the 3 A339 strips).</p>	<p>Only the houses along the A339 will have sight of the development.</p>
<p>We would be in the position of having more to lose than most property owners that back onto any of the proposed sites. Being a larger property, our house value would drop significantly.</p>	<p>There is no evidence to support this. Estate Agents confirm that demand for property in Kingsclere is high and they have no problems in selling.</p>
<p>The Marsh field gets extremely wet and boggy as it takes water from the higher fields. We are concerned that building over this will displace the water onto the properties along Newbury Road, which are lower- lying.</p>	<p>If this site is proposed, there will be no development on The Marsh field. This will be made over to a public open space.</p>
<p>If the access to the Porch Farm development is directly on to the A339, it is possible that the new residents could live there without having an involvement with or commitment to the village.</p> <p>Stephen and Lynn Painter</p>	<p>No evidence to support this.</p>
<p>I may not make myself popular but I'm all in favour of building 50 new houses on Porch Farm field. Despite the pervasive on-line campaigning please don't think that the whole village is opposed!</p>	
<p>Porch Farm - Views, footpaths, AONB</p>	
<p>Development would be seen for miles from the higher ground AONB areas overlooking the village. (Porch Farm)</p>	<p>The proposed development would only be visible from the Ecchinswell Road. At present the same view is of the back of houses along Newbury Road, the garage, Budgens and the electricity sub-station.</p>
<p>The Porch Farm development could be suitably screened to retain the semi-rural character of the area and limit the impact on the 5 adjacent properties</p>	<p>The proposal includes screening with trees/hedges on all sides.</p>

We'd like to ensure that [retention of footpaths] is built into the NP for any developer to follow.	All footpaths will be protected.
This new development would be seen for miles from the higher ground AONB areas overlooking the village. Chris Garnett	No it wouldn't. It is only visible from Ecchinswell Road.
Porch Farm - Further development/urban sprawl	
If this development were to go ahead and a precedent set, it is difficult to see how it would be possible to stop further developments of this type in this area. One could easily see the entire field system between the existing developments and Frobury Farm being developed.	The current SPB is not set in a tablet of stone. Any development will redraw the SPB to incorporate the development. The NP stays in force until 2029 so no further development could take place until then.
The Kingsclere Design Statement "land uses which have a sub urbanizing effect on the landscape are not appropriate". By considering developing PF are we not allowing Village Sprawl i.e. sub urbanization?	
The Design Statement states "future development, however minor, should not adversely affect the natural boundaries of the settlement which help to establish the character of Kingsclere" and furthermore, any future development should respect the "natural limits of the village". By developing the Porch Farm site is the Design Statement not being ignored?	We do not have any sites within the current SPB that can accommodate 50 homes. Policy SS5 (Neighbourhood Planning) of the Local Plan states "The council will support parish/town council ..., through the Neighbourhood Planning process. it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to meet the following levels of development, generally in and around defined Settlement Policy Boundaries" The NP also contains policies regarding protecting the historic character of the village plus housing design.
There is no doubt that Kingsclere will have to join up with Newbury before too long, but I firmly believe that the young of Kingsclere need homes and what else is there?	
From the east at the ramp of the Basingstoke Road, to the roundabout at the Newbury road junction is already 2Km. Building on agricultural land to extend the village by another 500m, to the new proposed access road, would in my view detract from the beauty of the village and appear as an urban sprawl along the A339.	There is no proposal to build along the A339. The proposed development lies behind existing houses on Newbury Road before the garage on the opposite side.
Development of PF will inevitably kick-start a sprawling development northwards, turning Kingsclere into an anonymous conurbation rather than a desirable village community.	
Allowing 50 houses on Porch Farm would inevitably be just the beginning. Whilst we are only looking at the housing needs of the next decade for Kingsclere, what is likely to follow has to be thought about. Once the access road has been laid, further development will follow.	The NP remains in force until 2029. Development will only happen if landowners are willing to sell land. Porch Farm is, and will remain, a working farm for the foreseeable future.

<p>It has been stated that a significant housing development which extends the village along the A339 towards Headley would have a suburbanising influence on the village. There have also been concerns raised about the impact that pushing outwards from the village boundary and how that would impact on community integration.</p> <p>Stephen and Lynn Painter</p>	<p>The development would be behind existing houses along the A339 and not extending along the A339.</p>
<p>The Porch Farm development increases the risk that Kingsclere becomes a dormitory for its larger neighbours of Basingstoke and Newbury instead of retaining its vibrant, village culture.</p> <p>Stephen and Lynn Painter</p>	<p>Surely the same would apply wherever the houses are built?</p>
<p>if this development were to go ahead and a precedent set, it is difficult to see how it would be possible to stop further developments of this type in this area. One could easily see the entire field system between the existing developments and Frobury Farm being developed.</p> <p>Chris Garnett</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan, once adopted, would prevent further development outside the new SPB.</p>
<p>Post 2029 is a great unknown. It must however be the case that after 2029 the existence of a development at Porch Farm will make it easier for the landowner / developer to apply for additions to the built up area. Even prior to 2029, a change of Government policy could bring forward a requirement for more housing and, again, the proposed development would make it more difficult to refuse further incremental building.</p> <p>Chris Garnett</p>	<p>No one has a crystal ball and can see into the future however doing nothing is not an option. We have to plan for the future within according to current law. If we have no NP we would have little protection from inappropriate development proposals.</p>
<p>I consider the larger field at porch farm (with the footpaths running through) as a place of beauty and calm which is priceless and gives great pleasure to many residents be they walkers, dog owners or joggers. I know that houses need to go somewhere but please can we try to use sites within the village boundaries?</p>	<p>Footpaths will not be affected and dog walkers will still be able to access them.</p>
<p>Once we let it [development on PF] happen this will open the flood gates for the future. The future is now necessarily ours, it is that of our next generation.</p>	
<p>Preference for smaller sites/infill</p>	
<p>Opposed to a single large estate being sited at Porch Farm and would much prefer 2/3 smaller sites being used</p>	
<p>From the information gained from the various questionnaires completed over the last years I think the summary for future development sites was: "Overall residents wanted to see 3-4 smaller developments rather than one big development."</p>	

<p>I believe that we should infill first to protect our green fields and village environment.</p> <p>Ian Norris</p>	
<p>I think a large development would cause more problems than we currently have. It would not add to the village life at all and I would prefer to see development within the village itself and smaller developments in order to keep the village feel.</p>	
<p>That where possible the additional 50 houses should be split across multiple sites internal to the village.</p>	
<p>Our preference is for the quota of 50 homes to be built on 2 or 3 smaller sites before any development of Porch Farm.</p>	
<p>[The 2 village questionnaires]whether villagers wanted 50 houses on one large site or 2 / 3 / 4 smaller sites was addressed. Of those responders who expressed a preference (137 questionnaires), 89% (122 questionnaires) stated that they would prefer to have multiple smaller developments rather than one large site. The public meeting held on 14 November 2014 reiterated the villagers' preference for several smaller development sites. Recommending the Porch Farm site at the referendum would clearly be against the wishes of the villagers, who have engaged in the KNP process.</p> <p>Stephen and Lynn Painter</p>	
<p>My preference is for a number of the smaller sites to be earmarked for development in the NP rather than a single site such as Porch Farm. Any growth in the boundaries of Kingsclere into the surrounding countryside should be minimised and that the sites that infill to the A339 are more appropriate provided that safe vehicle access is achieved.</p>	
<p>I think that each site needs to be developed one by one over the designated time period rather than all 50 houses being built at once.</p>	
<p>I would like to record that I am definitely against the development of the Porch Farm site in Kingsclere. I believe that this development would be the “thin edge of the wedge” towards further development in Kingsclere and that the village should retain its village charm. Please consider the options to prefer the “infill” development sites for the 50 homes which I believe will be lower impact to the village both now and in the future.</p> <p>Ian Norris</p>	
<p>Preference for Porch Farm</p>	

It makes little sense to me to try and shoehorn houses into 3 separate thin strips of land alongside the busy and noisy A339 with all the additional overheads in terms of infrastructure that this will demand, when there is a proposal (Porch Farm) which will accommodate the need in one single and more suitable location.	
Porch Farm - Open agricultural land – minimum ecological impact and no threat to mature trees.	
On attending the public meeting, the objections raised to the use of sites such as Porch Farm cantered on the damage to the views and convenience of a small handful of residents. This to us seems less damaging than squeezing the properties onto an already oversubscribed area that has neither the space nor road capacity to accommodate them and will seriously lower the quality of life for the many residents who are already housed there.	
I have looked at all the relevant information available and to me and the site at Porch Farm appears to me the best and most suitable site for Kingsclere village as a whole. Access onto the A339 with local facilities on the doorstep i.e. bus services and shop opposite the development. This site will cause very little strain on the roads within the village area of which are congested at the best of times. Robert Bowden	
Type & style of housing/affordable homes	
I also would favour small houses / flats being built which could be within the reach of young people to buy.	
We would like to ensure that the mix of affordable homes is representative of the needs of the people on the waiting list, e.g. a representative mix of 2/3/ (4?) bedroom homes - not just a few 'cheap' 2 bedroom homes to keep developer costs low to tick the box.	
We would like to see some controls put in place to try to ensure that affordable homes remain affordable after changes of ownership (whether rented or purchased, if that becomes a possibility) to enable the community to continue to benefit from affordable homes in the future.	
We would like to see the 'at least' figure increased to 50%+ to make as big a dent in the village housing requirements as is possible.	
I feel that [Strokings/Coppice/Fawconer] offers the best opportunity to provide the housing that the village needs in order to cover the shortfall of reasonably sized houses that we currently lack. Whereas the other proposed sites would	

mean larger more expensive houses being built which are not what is needed.	
The need for affordable housing, either rented, discounted or part ownership with preference for those with village connections was well made during the meeting. I would only suggest that effort should be made to maintain that situation following initial occupancy.	
As an adjunct to the discussions regarding social housing, waiting lists etc. Is there a possibility of the village, perhaps via a Parish Council sub- committee, being more actively involved in the local management of the social housing 'stock' and potentially ensuring a better utilisation of it to the benefit of Kingsclere residents. Len Potts	This is not one of the statutory responsibilities of a Parish Council.
Local amenities	
"proximity to local amenities" Porch Farm (PF) and Poveys Mead(PM) are almost equidistant from St Marys (which I took to be the centre of the village) but PF scored 6-so minus 4) whilst PM scored 2 (minus 8). I do not understand this weighting as the amenities e.g. library, Village Club, tennis courts, bowling green are actually closer to PM with PF being closer to The Fieldgate. Both are equidistant from local shops.	Porch farm residents would have access to Budgens, the garage, an ATM machine and the Diner. These are also village amenities.
Biodiversity/environmental/ green space/ trees - Porch Farm	
Biodiversity is key to the area" and the wish is" to see it conserved and enhanced particularly for farmland birds, protected and rare species as well as those in decline". PF received 16 out of 20 so only minus 4 which is surprising as this is the natural place to find our wildlife - badgers, hedgehogs, deer, bats and owls can be seen or heard. There is also an established bee colony- bees are in decline - very nearby. I do not really understand why PF received such a positive score so clarification would be appreciated.	The proposed area for development at Porch farm is currently arable land. The ecology briefing paper concludes that the site has negligible ecological value. All trees and hedges surrounding the site would be retained and additional hedging planted.
The "illustrative masterplan" for the Porch Farm development offers no firm commitments or guarantees that the "proposed open space" or "proposed soft landscaping buffers shown on the plan will be delivered." Stephen and Lynn Painter	An open space on the Marsh Field has been included in the indicative proposal.
Biodiversity/environmental/green space/trees - Strokins, Coppice, Fawconer Road sites	
The loss of this thin band of green space that separates Kingsclere from abutment to the A339 is part of the character of the village, and its loss would be detrimental.	

Judging from aerial photographs, the occupation of the land behind Fawconer Road would require the destruction of a number of mature trees – aside from the ecological impact, the trees provide a necessary sight and sound screen for properties from the busy A339.	There are no plans to fell existing trees.
Direct contravention of Guideline #1 in the Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base October 2015 (Conserve ribbon of scrub and tree planting between the A339 and urban form of Kingsclere, retaining and enhancing its landscape and biodiversity value).	This is taken from Basingstoke & Deane's Landscape Assessment of 2001. All three sites are included in Basingstoke & Deane's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2013 with the comment that ".....the site could come forward through alternative mechanisms, such as neighbourhood planning if the physical constraints can be addressed."
The vacant land on the three smaller sites is untidy, unused and arguably could benefit from some development.	
The traffic from the bypass can be heard from my parents' house. However, due to the amount of trees between the house and the bypass, the noise is at a level that is not a nuisance. If these trees were to be removed, my parents' are likely to be subject to noise at such a level that it will affect the enjoyment of their property.	There is no plan to remove the trees. Development between existing housing and the A339 would further reduce noise levels for existing residents.
The land in question [Fawconer Rd.] is marshland, and building on this will substantially increase the risk of flooding to both new and existing properties in the area. The increased risk will also affect insurance premiums. We are also concerned for the wildlife in the proposed development area, trees would have to be cut down and removing such natural beauty would further reduce the character of this already overcrowded and densely populated village.	This site does not have a flood zone category. There is no evidence to support the opinion that insurance premiums would increase.
Access issues Strokins Rd., Coppice Rd., Fawconer Rd.	
The road network around Fawconer road is already very busy – forcing more traffic into that space is a bad idea both during construction and when occupied.	An initial traffic assessment has been produced. It concludes that "The predicted number of vehicular trips from the proposed development would be low and capacity assessments on the access options demonstrate minimal impact on the wider road network. Capacity assessments demonstrate that a simple priority staggered junction will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development with minimal queues and delay."
If the three smaller sites (Strokins Road, Coppice Road, Fawconer Road) are recommended in the referendum, there is the opportunity for the developers to contribute towards the local infrastructure (s106) and create a new junction which improves the recognised accident blackspot (the junction of the A339 with George Street and Little Knowle Hill). This would represent a real improvement to road safety around the village.	

Stephen and Lynn Painter	
I appreciate that the access to the Coppice Road and Fawconer Road developments could be an issue but I am sure the Developers would do their best to ensure this problem is addressed appropriately.	
[The opinion that...] access from Ashford Hill Road is problematic, and that access via Fawconer Road should be considered. Whilst I had no issue with the former proposal (and don't really see the problem), I would vehemently oppose any plan to funnel additional traffic through the narrow confines of Fawconer Road.	There are no proposals to access any sites from Fawconer Road.
I had not been given to understand from the meeting that there was any indication the site would be accessed via the cul-de-sac. There has also been some speculation whether the garage area would be used as an access way. [Fawconer Road]	The garage area is not affected. Access would be from Ashford Hill Road only.
Residents on the A339 side of Fawconer Road are concerned about the recent surveying taking place at A) the garage access and forecourt between 16 and 18 Fawconer Rd. and B) the cul de sac beyond.	
We note that, at present, the plans suggest an entry point behind the Fawconer Rd. bus stop. This is within yards of perhaps one of the most dangerous junctions on the A339. Already a crossroads with multiple entrance and exit points, it has been the site of several serious accidents in recent years.	The traffic assessment states that "The junction with the B3051 does not experience a high level of accidents, with six noted in total over the past five-year period. These comprised five of slight severity and one severe accident.
Impact on existing properties - Strokins, Coppice, Fawconer	
The extremely linear nature of the 3 A339 plots means that dozens of existing properties and hundreds of people will be directly impacted during construction and afterwards	All new developments will impact on existing residents however this is time limited and not a reason for no development.
3 separate plots mean 3 separate challenges of access, disturbance, infrastructure (water, gas, electricity, drainage) and traffic management through narrow, congested housing estate roads never designed for the present volumes of traffic, yet alone significantly more.	Developments can be staggered to help limit disturbance.
By building on the proposed site [Fawconer Rd.] I believe this will affect my parents' Article 1 Rights: <i>"Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions..."</i> (Article 1, First Protocol of the EU Convention on Human Rights).	The NP must go to an independent inspector. Part of his/her brief is to ensure policies in the plan are in conformity with national and EU legislation.
This area of the village is already densely housed with narrow roads congested with residential vehicles.	
The village was assured at the time of the construction of the bypass that the	The three plots have remained on Basingstoke & Deane's SHLAA. This lists all sites

piece of land adjacent to the A339 and abutting the rear of the properties on Fawconer Rd. would remain undeveloped in order that it could function as a natural buffer to the noise pollution generated by the road.	within the Borough which could be considered for future development.
By building on the proposed site [Fawconer Rd.] this will further congest already busy roads outside my parents' house.	The site would be accessed from Ashford Hill Road. All houses will have off street parking with additional parking spaces where possible. It is difficult to see how this would further congest Fawconer Road.
Number of houses to be built	
We would like some assurances that the current NP will be capped at 50 new homes for the duration. Stephen and Lynn Painter	Once adopted, the NP forms part of Basingstoke & Deane's Local Plan which is the blueprint for development within the Borough until 2029.
Parking/garages/visitor's spaces	
We would like to impose realistic parking quotas on developer(s) to try to avoid cars parked on kerbs & generally abandoned. In our village with its limited public transport & lack of parking facilities available in its centre, 3-4 bedroom house dwellers are highly likely to own 3-4 cars. This reality should be accommodated when planning any developments within the NP.	Off road parking is included in our plan.
Views, footpaths - Strokins, Coppice, Fawconer	
Farmland is beautiful. We don't think the same can be said for the smaller three proposed sites.	
Other	
I felt an extremely complex, and potentially emotional subject, had been addressed logically, methodically and comprehensively and then presented with enough detail for everyone in the room to clearly understand the options and implications. I suspect that the generally constructive tone of the meeting indicated that most of the attendees felt the same. At the end of the day it is important that the villagers of Kingsclere takes as much control of their own future as is possible and I look forward to seeing the final outcome of the work, and to a positive vote upon it in the referendum. Len Potts	
At the meeting held last year when we were given an update on the sites that were possibly going to be developed, I had understood there was going to be a consultation meeting in the early part of 2016 which we would all be given an opportunity to attend.	We have held four public meetings to date. We have made no commitment for a further meeting in 2016.