



WINCHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

www.winchfield-pc.org.uk

- Chairman • Andrew Renshaw • Talbothays Farm, Station Road, Winchfield, Hook, Hampshire RG27 8BZ
• e-mail: andrew.renshaw@talbothays.co.uk • Tel: 01252 843566
- Clerk • Alison Ball • 54 Lapin Lane, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG22 4XH
• e-mail: winchfieldparishclerk@outlook.com • Tel: 01256 810649

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF WINCHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON MONDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2017 IN WINCHFIELD VILLAGE HALL STARTING AT 7.30 PM

PRESENT: Cllr A Renshaw (in the Chair), Cllr H Dicks, Cllr L Hodgetts, Cllr P Jackaman and Cllr M Williams
Mr C Griffin, Footpath Warden
14 members of the public
Mrs A Ball (Clerk)

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs Crampton and Southern (HDC), Cllr Simpson (HCC) and members of the Neighbourhood Policing Team.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND APPLICATIONS FOR DISPENSATIONS UNDER S33 OF THE LOCALISM ACT (2011)

A dispensation was granted in May 2015 to Cllrs Renshaw, Dicks, Jackaman and Williams and in May 2017 to Cllr Hodgetts to participate in all discussions and decisions by this Council relating to the emerging Local and Neighbourhood Plans and associated matters until May 2019.

As at previous meetings, the Chairman declared his ownership (with his wife) of 45 acres of land in the parish which had been the subject of overtures from developers. He reiterated that the land is not available for development.

Cllr Williams declared his membership of Winchfield Action Group.

Cllr Jackaman declared an interest in item 7, Development Proposals at Winchfield Court, as a neighbour to the proposed development site, and also in item 13 Broadband as he would be likely to benefit from any improvement in speeds.

3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WITH REGARD TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

The Chairman invited members of the public to participate in any of the ensuing discussions through the Chair.

4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 September 2017 were accepted and signed as a correct record.

5 MATTERS ARISING

5.1 Potbridge Scrapyard, Totters Lane (item 5.2)

The Chairman reported that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) had been made which designated Totters Lane as a clearway; this would come into effect on 2 December and appropriate signage would be installed soon after. A High Court hearing had been held earlier in the day to set a date to consider the alleged contempt of court by the operator for his non-compliance. Hampshire County Council (HCC) was being urged to take action to clear vehicles from the public right of way adjacent to the

site. Natural England was also being pressed to take action over the vehicles in the field opposite the scrapyard (in Odiham parish) that is part of a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

5.2 Hart Local Plan (item 8)

Cllr Williams reported that the Parish Council did submit a response to the Government consultation on the proposed new methodology for assessing the number of new houses that would need to be provided by councils.

5.3 Fly Tipping (item 11)

Cllr Jackaman advised that he and Cllr Dicks had met with Cllr Oliver from HDC and Adam Green, Ecology and Countryside Manager at HDC, to discuss the problems with fly tipping in the new entrance in Pale Lane to Edenbrook Country Park and details of the future arrangements. He felt it had been a constructive meeting; the Hart representatives would monitor the situation once the country park is adopted in 2018 and the clearance of fly tipping will become Hart's responsibility.

5.4 Trees – damage to trees and opportunities for new trees (item 12)

Cllr Williams had sought professional advice on the copper beech tree at The Hurst which had been cut back and he had been told it should recover.

5.5 Beauclerk Green (item 13)

The Chairman had been advised by Nicola Capon that the board of Bewley Homes had approved works necessary for the estate road to be adopted and a meeting was due to be held on 12 December to agree the work with contractors which should start 'imminently'.

5.6 Any other business (item 20)

It was confirmed that the new post box at The Hurst had been installed.

6 COMMUNITY SAFETY

Cllr Dicks reported that there had been some unusual incidents at St Mary's Church involving the removal of real and silk flowers from graves which had then been dumped on benches or in dustbins. There had also been a sighting of someone behaving strangely in the churchyard. The incidents had been reported to the Police and it was asked that if anyone saw anything odd to report it to the Police. A member of the public advised that a man had also been spotted acting in a strange manner in the woods leading to the canal.

7 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS AT WINCHFIELD COURT

The Parish Council had been consulted on two planning applications for development on land north of Winchfield Court. These applications were as described by Steven Brown of planning consultants Woolf Bond at the last meeting with one being for 17 dwellings and the other for 10 dwellings.

Cllr Jackaman advised that he had been working on a response to the applications on behalf of Winchfield Court residents which he had circulated to councillors prior to the meeting for information.

The Chairman advised that there appeared to be two key issues: a) whether it was a brownfield site and b) if some of Hart's rural policies could be deemed out of date and the effect this could have.

Cllr Jackaman advised that if it was considered that Hart's rural policies were out of date you would then turn to the Neighbourhood Plan which expressly supported these policies. He also stated that the planning officer dealing with the applications had recently carried out a site visit and gave her view that it was not all 'previously developed land' which was a change to the original opinion.

There was a lengthy discussion and the following points were among those expressed by councillors and members of the public:

- The planning officer had found it difficult to explain why the morgue was a heritage asset but the pump house was a brownfield asset;
- There was no evidence of any development on the area of land where the majority of houses were proposed for at least 100 years;
- The site was outside the settlement boundary, as confirmed by a planning inspector in 1999;

- A majority of Winchfield Court residents had expressed a desire to object to the planning applications;
- The Neighbourhood Plan had recognised a need for new housing in the village but it had expressly stated that this should be on sites of seven or fewer houses and on sustainable sites, which this was not;
- Affordable housing was a key issue in the village;
- The developer had not demonstrated a need for affordable housing in the village;
- If these applications were supported in contradiction of the Neighbourhood Plan, it may undermine the Plan, allowing future unsuitable development;
- The Neighbourhood Plan included a statement that it was recognised that the village would need to take a share of new housing but no figure had been put on the number of houses on the advice of the Plan's examiner;
- The proposals were in breach of many detailed policies in the Neighbourhood Plan including those relating to parking, the impact on Pale Lane and on the view (landscape).

The general feeling of the councillors was that they supported the development of brownfield sites but it was apparent that this site was not considered to be brownfield. The development also conflicted with policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council wholeheartedly supported the Neighbourhood Plan.

It was agreed that Cllr Williams draft a response to the applications objecting to the proposals, setting out the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan that were not being conformed to and drawing attention to the evidence that the site was not brownfield. This would be circulated to all members for approval prior to submission.

(NOTE: Cllr Jackaman declared an interest in this item and remained in the room during its consideration but took no part in any decision.)

8 WINCHFIELD GARDEN COMMUNITY: 2,000 HOUSES

The Parish Council had been consulted on a planning application for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion under the 2011 EIA Regulations for a new settlement of up to 2,000 dwellings, a new secondary school, up to two primary schools, a children's nursery, two local/neighbourhood centres, up to four hectares of employment land, on-site areas of SANG and other related facilities, services and open space. The Parish Council had consulted with JB Planning Associates on this and they had indicated that an EIA was needed and had assisted in drafting a response to the application. This could be viewed on the HDC website alongside a detailed response from HDC officers regarding drainage at the site. There was no evidence to suggest that this had been submitted because a full planning application was imminent.

9 HART LOCAL PLAN

The Chairman advised that HDC had set three meetings for the new year to consider the Local Plan that would be submitted to the Inspector. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee was due to meet on 2 January 2018, the Cabinet on 3 January and full Council on 4 January. The Chairman was not aware of any changes to the previously published draft Plan and it was his understanding that the new settlement at Murrell Green was still the preferred option.

The Government consultation on a new standardised methodology for working out the housing numbers each council would have to provide had ended on 9 November. If these proposals went ahead HDC would have less housing to allocate but there were some concerns at HDC that the councils that were required to allocate more homes would push back. The difference in Hart would be a reduction from over 10,000 homes to between 6,000 and 8,000 homes, which could mean a new settlement would not be necessary.

It was anticipated that more would be known about the Local Plan on 19 December when the papers for the meetings at HDC in the new year would be published. Cllr Williams advised that it had been reported that should the priority for Murrell Green be changed, the developer would apply for judicial review of the decision.

It was agreed to allocate up to £10,000 from the Planning Counsel Fund for any work needed as a result of details becoming available relating to the Local Plan prior to the next Parish Council meeting in January.

10 SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY TIMETABLE CONSULTATION

South Western Railway were consulting on major changes to train services in the December 2018 timetable. The consultation had opened on 29 September and would close on 22 December. During this consultation period changes had been made to the proposals that some may not be aware of.

The Chairman asked the meeting if they felt a response was needed from the Parish Council. It was agreed that a response be submitted highlighting the Parish Council's concerns about any reduction in services at Winchfield.

11 SOLAR FARMS COMMUNITY BENEFIT PAYMENTS

The Chairman thanked Cllr Williams and Chris Griffin for the excellent work they had been doing to replace the gates on a number of footpaths.

Cllr Williams reported the following:

- four new gates had been fitted: one on footpath 6, two on footpath 7 and one on footpath 8;
- footpath 14/Hook 1 had suffered really badly with flooding and the tenant, Paul Buckland, had filled it in and covered it with wood chips without any cost to the Parish Council. This footpath was now in a very good condition and Cllr Williams thanked Mr Buckland for his work on this;
- attempts had been made to contact the landowners of footpath 3 but as yet there had been no response.

Cllr Williams reported that the installation of the new gates would not have been possible without the help of the HCC Ranger and the support of the Ramblers. Volunteers from North East Hants Ramblers Group had helped fit all the new gates and Cllr Williams asked that a donation be made to the group to thank them. It was agreed to make a donation of £200 from the Community Benefit Fund to the North East Hants Ramblers Group in thanks for their assistance in fitting the new gates.

It was noted that footpath 4, off Pale Lane, across Hungerford Farm, had been fine over the summer but was now impassable as it was so waterlogged. This footpath linked Pale Lane to Pilcot Farm near to the Queens Head in Dogmersfield. Cllr Williams had met with the agent for the land to discuss improvements, and the agent had agreed to the work being done provided it was carried out by Ben Robinson as he was responsible for all such work on the farm. Mr Robinson had quoted for laying a footpath from Pale Lane to the midfield gate to remedy flooding issues and to install two kissing gates and one self-closing gate, the purchase of the gates to be done directly by the Parish Council.

It was agreed to allocate up to £6,000 from the Community Benefit Fund to allow improvement works to footpath 4 to be carried out.

At the last meeting a member of the public had asked that consideration be given to signage of the footpaths and the availability of information on where they went to and the distances involved. A quote had been sought and received from Oak Designs for creating signpost information leaflets and to create a village information board. There were two options for the latter: the first would be a cheaper option and would use real pictures of key sites, e.g. the church and the canal, and the second, which would be significantly more expensive, would involve the use of an illustrator to create the pictures. This would require further consideration as locations had not been identified and the boards would need to be protected from the elements. It was proposed that the group considering the locations for the new weathervane be asked to make some suggestions. A discussion took place regarding the placement of maps on way posts and it was agreed that there were many issues with this including how to protect them from getting wet, how to stop them being dropped and how to stop any receptacle being filled with litter. A member of the public advised that his daughter had suggested using QR codes. This would avoid some of the problems associated with paper leaflets but it was suggested that the website would need upgrading to make this possible. Paper leaflets could still be available to download from the website or in the pubs and station. It was agreed to allocate up to £1,600 from the Community Benefit Fund for creating better signage and guidance on the footpaths.

Chris Griffin advised that the Hook 1 footpath ran through the centre of the proposed Murrell Green site but it would be kept as rural as possible.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Williams and Mr Griffin for all their hard work on improving the footpaths.

12 FOOTPATHS REPORT

This was discussed under the previous item.

13 BROADBAND

Cllr Jackaman advised that he had been on holiday and then fully occupied with the Winchfield Court planning application and was not up to speed on the broadband project; Barrie England, who had been taking the project forward, had kindly agreed to update the meeting on progress to date. Mr England was in the public gallery and reported that support had been sought under the Community Match Funding Scheme which would mean that HCC would pay half of any costs involved. BT had quoted £21,000 to bring fibre cables to Winchfield Court and the two detached houses nearby, Hungerford House and Madison House. Work was being carried out on how to raise the other half of the money and residents were being asked whether they would be prepared to pay a contribution. In response to a question about which green box they would connect to, Mr England stated that he had been led to believe by a BT engineer that this may not be the way they would be connected.

A discussion took place regarding the rest of the village and whether they could be included at this stage. Mr England and other residents of Winchfield Court were keen to continue with the progress they had already made and did not think there would be any cost benefits by including more properties. He also expressed how difficult it had been to reach this stage and he did not want to take on any further work personally. Cllr Jackaman reminded the meeting that he had previously reported that BT had advised that it would only consider looking at such projects in bite-sized pieces but he would be happy to provide a guide on the process for others to follow.

A member of the public living close to Winchfield Court but not part of the ongoing project asked if the Parish Council could take this forward on behalf of the whole village. There followed a discussion about what assistance was available and the best way to get fibre broadband to rural areas.

Cllr Williams agreed to meet with two members of the public who had expressed an interest and knowledge of the subject to discuss a way forward for the benefit of a majority of residents. An update would be given at the next meeting.

14 WINCHFIELD WEATHERVANE

Following on from the identification of the preferred location for the new weathervane as The Hurst triangle, Kerry Wedlock said she had approached a contractor about installation. A quote had been submitted and this was above budget and included a recommendation that an engineer be consulted on the foundations needed which would incur additional cost. As this location was cost prohibitive, alternatives had been considered and progress was being made with arrangements to locate the weathervane on the Village Hall roof in consultation with the Village Hall Management Committee. The design of the weathervane had almost been finalised and would be circulated as soon as possible.

15 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

15.1 Applications received since the last meeting

The following applications had been considered and responses made since the last meeting:

17/02291/HOU Old Barley Mow Farm House, Sprats Hatch Lane *Two storey side extension, First floor extension to garage, New detached double garage, roof alterations, replacement windows and painting the existing brickwork.* Response submitted:

“Winchfield Parish Council notes the changes made by the applicant in this submission which include the removal of a proposed new garage and changes to the elevation of the existing garage. We accept the applicant’s need to modernise and upgrade the property but continue to bring to the attention of the Planning Officer the following issues in arriving at a determination of the application.

The Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area: Character Appraisal and Management Proposals were approved at HDC Cabinet meeting on 3rd December 2009. See link:

https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2_Businesses/Planning_for_businesses/Conservation_and_1isted_buildings/Bas%20Canal%20appraisal%20and%20character.pdf .

This document makes several references to Old Barley Mow Farmhouse and its importance as a key view on the canal. It also describes how the property forms part of the historic settlement of the area around Winchfield Hurst and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The current property is illustrated in the adopted Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan, page 37 photograph number 8 and also on page 15 of the associated Evidence Base document to the Plan. The location of the property is at one of the main public access points to the canal with its own car park and mooring facility directly opposite the property.

The revised Design and Access Statement submitted by the applicant states in section 9: “The extensions and existing property will be clad in natural timber and the brickwork will be repainted in a heritage grey ensuring the property mellows into its surroundings.” In Section 12 it states – “The proposed extension will be in contrast with the amenity buildings using traditional materials to create a modern theme rather than introduce a pastiche attempt to copy the original style”. Indeed the proposed East elevation as shown in Section 5 is predominantly all glass and in total contrast with the character of the existing building. In Section 13 the applicant states in conclusion: “The location of the existing property combined with the scale and design of the extensions means that any impact on the surroundings and the amenities of the neighbouring properties is insignificant. ... The proposed development does not have an adverse impact on the privacy and amenities of the locality by reason of form, scale, height, outlook, noise or light intrusion or activity levels, including vehicular or pedestrian movement”.

This revised proposal therefore continues to be a significant change from the current character of the building as seen in the referenced photographs. We are unable to agree with the conclusions in Section 13. The question that needs to be answered is whether this proposed change of character to the building is in keeping with Policy CON 10. Will the scale and design of the modernised property be contrary to the rules governing the canal conservation area? Policy CON10 states “... development which would adversely affect the landscape, architectural or ecological character, setting or enjoyment of the Basingstoke Canal or which would result in the loss of important views in the vicinity of the canal will not be permitted”. Additionally, the Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan, Policy B1, reinforces CON10 and the opinion we have expressed. It says 'Development should not result in a loss of, or harm to, the significant views from the canal as identified on the map within this policy.

The Arborical Impact Assessment report (July 2017) and the accompanying Tree Survey (March 2017) contain conflicting information. The former says the main feature is trees along the canal bank ... and these trees are to be retained. The tree survey and accompanying map confirms the Willow Tree is to be retained (and refers to historic crown removals etc.) and refers to most of the other canal side trees and three fruit trees as 'removed'. A site visit by the PC shows that two trees have been cut off at the base and two, or three, have been cut off about two metres from the base and this appears to have been carried out very recently, a dead tree has been left standing. This activity may have been at the request of the Applicant. Given that Hart's Tree Officer signed off the assessment as satisfactory and the recent actions by the appellants we recommend a further site visit by the HDC Tree Officer pre determination.”

17/02471/HOU April Wood, Odiham Road *Replace existing balcony and build new balcony. Erection of a rear conservatory.* No comments.

17/02175/HOU Plane Tree Barn, Taplins Farm Lane *Removal of existing flue and replacement with flue that meets building regulations.* No comments.

17/02175/LBC Plane Tree Barn, Taplins Farm Lane *Removal of existing flue and replacement with flue that meets building regulations.* No comments.

17/02566/HOU Oak Tree Cottage, The Hurst *Ground floor rear extension.* No comments.

17/02592/EIA Winchfield Garden Community *Request for an Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion under the 2011 EIA Regulations - Winchfield Garden Community. New settlement comprising up to 2,000 dwellings, new secondary school, up to two primary schools, children's nursery, two local/neighbourhood centres, up to 4 hectares of employment land, on-site areas of SANG and other related facilities, services and open space.* Response submitted:

“Winchfield Parish Council considers the proposed development to be a Schedule 2 project, falling within category 10(b) ‘Urban Development Projects’, as set out in the Town and Country Planning

(Environmental impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The proposed development is of a substantial scale, and would clearly exceed the indicative criteria and thresholds provided by the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which are there to assist in determining whether significant effects are likely.

With respect to the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the 2017 Regulations, Winchfield Parish Council makes the following observations:

Characteristics of the Development

The proposed development will result in the loss of a substantial area of agricultural land, potentially including the best and most versatile soils. It is also within a mineral safeguarding area, and therefore has the potential to sterilise a finite resource of sharp sand and gravel.

The proposed development will generate pollution and nuisance in a rural area; with noise and air emissions associated with plant and vehicles during the construction phases, and from vehicles during the operation phase of the development. Furthermore, Winchfield is currently an area of 'dark sky'; the absence of street lighting is an important asset to the rural character and feel of the Parish. The proposed development would inevitably result in substantial increase in light pollution above this base level.

There are sensitive water resources in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development that would be affected, notably the Basingstoke Canal SSSI. The area is also susceptible to groundwater flooding and surface water flooding, which leads to potential "in combination" effects, that could be exacerbated by the development.

Location of the Development

The proposed development would fundamentally transform a rural area. Most of the site could reasonably be characterised as attractive rolling countryside, or open in nature, and development of the scale proposed will cause considerable harm to landscape character. A comprehensive Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required to ensure that the very harmful effects of the development are considered and mitigated thoroughly.

The environment of Winchfield does not have the capacity to absorb a development of the scale proposed. There are a number of significant nature conservation features and designations either adjacent or in close proximity to the site. These include the Basingstoke Canal SSSI, and the Odiham Common with Bagwell Green and Shaw SSSI. Winchfield is also within the 5km zone of influence of the Thames Heath Special Protection Area (SPA). Areas of ancient woodland are also present.

Winchfield is a Domesday village and one of the best preserved Norman settlements in Hampshire. It has significant heritage interest, including a variety of Listed Buildings and other assets such as the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area; Dogmersfield Park (Historic Park and Garden); Winchfield House (Grade II*) and its extensive grounds; St Mary's Winchfield, a Listed Norman Church (Grade I) as well as a further eleven Grade 2 buildings. The impact on the setting of the heritage assets must be fully taken into account.

Types and Characteristics of the potential impact

The proposed development would lead to permanent and irreversible change on a vast scale well beyond the boundaries of the proposed site. The impacts would extend well beyond the site boundary, with vehicular movements in particular causing significant effects to the local, rural road network. Notably, traffic generated by the development is like to affect Odiham SSSI as residents travel along Odiham Road to access Junction 5 of the M3. Any mitigation measures proposed to increase the capacity of local roads will harm their rural character.

The impacts associated with the transformation of a tranquil rural area to an urban centre will inevitably be intense and complex.

In view of the above considerations, it is clear to Winchfield Parish Council that the proposed development is likely to give rise to significant effects on the environment. An EIA should therefore be required.

The Parish Council trusts that Hart District Council will reach the same view, and should an EIA Scoping Request subsequently be submitted, the Parish Council requests that it is consulted at this time."

16/03129/OUT Pale Lane Farm, Pale Lane *Outline application for the development of up to 700 residential dwellings, site for primary school and local centre, together with associated vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, drainage, landscape works and provision of general open space.*

Full details for the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace and means of access. (Transport Assessment Addendum received 6th November 2017). Response submitted:

“Executive Summary

Winchfield Parish Council (WPC) commented on the original Wates traffic assessment, Appendix J to the planning application, and submitted to Hart District Council (HDC) on 11 November 2016. Our review of the Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) dated 6 November 2017 leads the Parish Council to conclude that our original comments have not been addressed and therefore still apply.

Winchfield Parish Council contends that the proposed development by Wates at Elvetham Chase should be rejected. It fails to satisfy the condition of para 32 of the NPPF and Adopted Hart District Local Plan 2009 (saved policies) GEN1 and the adopted Winchfield Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, Wates have not considered relevant Rural Road Standards; traffic flows on Pale Lane have not been assessed realistically and the Rural Road Impact assessment is both incomplete and misleading. No consideration has been made for cyclists and equestrians and the lack of any parking facilities at Winchfield Station after mid-morning is simply dismissed. The Wates report does not take into account the proposed development at the Netherhouse Copse site. This 423 home site will have major ramifications for both Fleet and Winchfield stations and for the road networks either end of Hitches Lane.

Our conclusions remain unchanged and Winchfield Parish Council is adamant that this application should be rejected.

The proposal will give rise to traffic flows on the surrounding road network, which would cause material detriment to the amenities of nearby properties and settlements or to highway safety; will create the need for highway improvements which would be detrimental to the character and setting of roads within the conservation areas or rural lanes in the District; and will lead to problems further afield by causing heavy traffic to pass through residential areas or settlements, or use unsuitable roads.

Our detailed comments on the original Wates Traffic Assessment and the TAA follow below.

Key policies

Winchfield Parish Council submitted the following comments on 11 November 16

National Policy and Guidance.

Paragraph 32 of the NPPF identifies that decisions on development proposals should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. Transport Assessments and Statements can be used to establish whether the residual transport impacts of a proposed development are likely to be “severe”, which may be a reason for refusal, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. (ID42 – 005)

Hart District Policy and Guidance

Adopted Hart District Local Plan 2009 (saved policies) GEN1, HDC identify those proposals for development which accord with this plan will be permitted where they:

“Do not give rise to traffic flows on the surrounding road network, which would cause material detriment to the amenities of nearby properties and settlements or to highway safety; do not create the need for highway improvements which would be detrimental to the character and setting of roads within the conservation areas or rural lanes in the District; and do not lead to problems further afield by causing heavy traffic to pass through residential areas or settlements, or use unsuitable roads.”

Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan

The referendum version of the Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan, expected to be adopted by March 2017, specifies in Policy B1:

“Hedgerows, mature trees (individual or copses) and ancient woodland are valued and should be preserved and retained as part of otherwise acceptable new developments”

And in Watch Point BW2:

“Existing trees and hedgerows should be retained to maintain the current road widths to minimise the adverse impact of vehicular traffic. Proposals which seek to introduce urban-style footpaths beside existing lanes will be strongly resisted”.

Wates contend that the proposed development complies with the NPPF and the HDC Local Plan Policy GEN1 and that the traffic impact of the development will cause no material detriment to the highway network and its safety and that suitable highway improvements can be provided that are not detrimental to the character and setting of roads.

Winchfield Parish Council does not agree with this conclusion as explained below. The Council also notes that no reference has been made by Wates to the Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan regarding the impact of all the traffic routes that exit the development to the West.

The TPA does not address any of the WPC comments presented above and therefore our objection stands.

In addition, HCC Highway Development Planning, in their response dated 9 Mar 17 advised “the applicant must provide 2021 modelling both with/without development traffic”. This has not been done; the original 2019 figures have not been amended. This is further evidence that the developer is ignoring difficult consultee comments.

Rural Road standards

Winchfield Parish Council submitted the following comments on 11 November 16

Wates quote in Appendix J DfT’s Manual for Streets (2007) as the relevant guidance on road width and visibility. Table 3.1 provides the following summary:

“2.75m allows a single vehicle to travel along the carriageway; 4.1m allows two vehicles to pass with care and allows a HGV and a cyclist to pass each other; 4.8m allows two vehicles to pass easily and also allows a vehicle and a HGV to pass with care; 5.5m allows two vehicles along with a vehicle and a HGV to pass each other easily and also allows two HGV’s to pass with care”.

However, Wates fail to take account of a more recent Design approach statement - Roads HS2-HS2-HW-DAS-000-000002 Revision - P01 Date approved – 17 July 2012. This specifies a more rigorous standard which the Wates Transport Plan fails to achieve:

“Rural road widths are subject to a minimum of 5.5 metres (the minimum for two cars to pass in safety at low speed). This minimum width shall be increased to 6.0 metres for lengths with occasional use by buses or heavy goods vehicles and 6.8 metres for roads where buses or heavy goods vehicles are likely to pass each other on a regular basis. Hard strips shall not be provided on minor two-lane rural roads”.

The TA does not address any of the WPC comments presented above and therefore our objection stands.

Traffic flows

Winchfield Parish Council submitted the following comments on 11 November 16

Wates’ analysis (p.52 of the Traffic Assessment) shows a likely distribution of car journeys. Given the congestion that roads through Fleet will suffer, many of the residents on the new development will inevitably seek alternative routes if heading generally South or West of the site. This could be much greater than proposed by Wates and could be between 20% and 25% of the traffic – using Pale Lane, the Hurst, Station Road, Bagwell Lane, Chatter Alley and Church Lane. These are all single carriageway lanes with single vehicle access only at the railway bridges in Pale Lane and Station Road and the bridge over the River Hart in Pale Lane.

This traffic will add congestion to Winchfield, Dogmersfield, Crookham Village and Church Crookham and the access to M3 J5.

Using Wates’ own trip rate assessment of approx. 0.6% per house, 25% of traffic moving south and west would lead to $25\% \times 0.6\% \times 700 = 105$ additional vehicle movements per hour at morning and evening peak periods (a near doubling of current rates) in Pale Lane. This would mean one vehicle only at a time passing through the railway bridge (sharing with pedestrians) and across the single track hump-back bridge over the River Hart, a mere 100m apart, with opposing traffic queuing to await their turn. This calculation also excludes any traffic generated by commercial vehicles delivering goods to the new development of 700 houses, satisfying an ever increasing growth in e-commerce and on-line orders.

The foregoing therefore throws into doubt the comment in para 6.1.5 of the Technical note -Traffic Assessment of Rural Roads: “Traffic impact of the development on the study area is limited with none of the 4 [rural southern] routes expected to experience any more that 16 additional trips in the busiest hour of the day. This represents a negligible increase equivalent to one vehicle every four minutes.”

Seen another way, peak hour movements of $0.6\% \times 700$ houses = 420. Are we to believe that only 16 or 3.8% of cars will turn south-west on Pale Lane rather than join the Fleet to Hartley Wintney road? We cannot agree with Wates that Pale Lane will only experience traffic increases of between 10% and 15%, with an additional vehicle every three minutes expected to route south and two vehicles every three minutes expected to route North on Pale Lane.

In paragraph 8.2 of the TAA two way traffic flows on Pale Lane is stated to increase by 13%, or 16 vehicles per hour. This analysis does not address our original comments. The TAA in paragraph 8.2.3 states that Pale Lane is not a single track road, however it most certainly is, for example on the bridge over the River Hart and several other locations identified in our analysis which follows in the next section.

The developer is adopting the position that it can take full advantage of any spare road capacity with no regard for other sources of additional traffic. Whereas this might be true for transport link roads,

saturation of rural lanes results in a continuous stream of relatively slow moving, closely spaced vehicles, which will not only be inappropriate to our rural lanes but also dangerous.

Rural road impact assessment

Winchfield Parish Council submitted the following comments on 11 November 16

In Appendix J Wates identify four commuting routes west of the proposed development, namely: Route 1 – Pale Lane to Winchfield Station via Station Road; Route 1a – Pale Lane to Winchfield Station via Station Road and The Hurst; Route 2 – Pale Lane to A287 via Dogmersfield and Chalky Lane; and Route 3 – Pale Lane to B3016 via Bagwell Lane. The most critical of these routes are Routes 1 and 1a - the only feed directly west of the development.

The first choke point heading south along Pale Lane from the development on both Route 1 and 1a will be the rail arch, limited to a 3.43m width carriageway through the bridge to allow for the 2m wide footpath. Immediately after the Arch and on the left, paragraph 4.3.12 states that there will be a link to the car park access to the Edenbrook Country Park - another traffic generator not accounted for in the traffic flows or the consequences of cars exiting the car park into a blind one way flow! Within 100 m traffic is again faced with a 3.1m restriction over the River Hart bridge. No assessment has been made of the potentially severe traffic impact of these concurrent and uncontrolled choke points coupled with the car park access and exit.

In paragraph 4.5.10 Wates accept that Route 1 carriageway after the right turn to the road undesignated but locally accepted to be “Winchfield Hurst” (Pale Lane continues straight on – an error in the Wates report) the width reduces to around 3.5m in places. “At this location there is only enough width to allow one vehicle to pass at a time. There are however a number of passing bays increasing the carriageway width to 4.5m, and allowing two vehicles to pass” - these passing places are not paved and have become established by traffic taking advantage of entrances to private drives, access to fields or areas of rough ground not potholed or rutted.

In paragraph 4.5.11 Wates confirm that a “bend in the road is present where the speed limit reduces to 30mph. Carriageway widths are 4.1m with forward visibility of around 40m, which is in accordance with the SSD requirement for 30mph traffic speeds”. We do not agree that the forward visibility is 40m all through the bend – the final right hand corner going up the incline has no forward visibility.

In paragraph 4.5.12 Wates state that further west, (Pale Lane) or Winchfield Hurst “provides access to some seven residential dwellings and carriageway width reduces to 3.8m. However, this section of Pale Lane is lightly trafficked and passing areas are present which increase the carriageway width to 5.5m, allowing sufficient space for two vehicles to pass each other comfortably”. How can this part of the road be less trafficked than the rest of Route 1 and again the so called passing bays are not paved and have become established by traffic taking advantage of entrances to private drives, access to fields or areas of rough ground not potholed or rutted.

In Paragraph 4.5.23 Wates state that on Route 1a, which is the continuation of Pale Lane to the junction with Chatter Alley and The Hurst, South of Winchfield Crescent “the road narrows to 4m, however, passing bays are present allowing enough space for vehicles to pass comfortably by increasing the available carriageway width to 6m”. Again, this a misrepresentation, the passing bay shown in Image 4.14 no longer exists, it was a temporary bay provided as a turning aid during the build of the solar farm at Hungerford Farm.

As well as minimising and glossing over the difficulty and danger of increasing traffic on these narrow rural lanes, this technical report fails to mention any problem with the Pale Lane/Chatter Alley junction. This is well-known locally as highly dangerous junction as the sight lines to the left are totally obscured by the hedgerow and the Barley Mow pub totally obscures any traffic approaching from the right unless the vehicle has accessed the junction.

Another traffic route, not addressed in the Wates report, is for vehicles on Routes 1 and 1a to elect to travel North and East via Taplins Farm Lane and Dilly Lane to access the A30. Taplins Farm Lane is similar in nature to Pale Lane with a 4.8 m width from The Hurst up to another rail arch followed by a blind left hand bend, maximum width 4.5m with a 2ft deep open concrete gully on the right hand side - an area that regularly floods all the way back through the rail arch adding to the danger for road users. The TAA does not address any of the WPC comments presented above and therefore our objection stands.

HCC Highway Development Planning, in their response dated 9 Mar 17, advised about journeys from Pale Lane to J5 of the M3 stating "considering the similar journey times and distances between the two routes it is expected that some additional traffic may use rural roads to access the A287. Consideration

should be given to mitigating the impact of development traffic ... which may be in the form of a transport contribution to bring forward measures identified following occupation of the development. " In our opinion this was not a particularly helpful comment by HCC, as it is clear already that particularly with increasing congestion in Hartley Wintney a much larger proportion of traffic would travel through Winchfield. It is not appropriate to grant planning on the basis that measures could be identified later, as the cost might be high or they might not be practical. Certainly any such measures would be contrary to the adopted Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Furthermore, in paragraph 8.4.2 the TAA makes the bold assertion that a carriageway width of 4m is sufficient for two vehicles to pass each other, what about 2 HGVs? This is contrary to the detailed submission made by WPC on 11th of November – the TAA provides no technical evidence to justify the claim. In addition, we refer to our comments on Rural Road Standards above, that a 4.1m carriageway width only allows a HGV and a cyclist to pass each other and it requires 5.5m to allow 2 cars to pass in safety at low speed. Damage to verges due to vehicles passing at speed along the derestricted 3.8-4.0 m width sections will increase.

Local experience of rush hour traffic in Hartley Wintney makes it difficult to see how "improvements" proposed to the A30/Fleet Road junction would prevent the current queues becoming longer. Delays at this junction influence how many commuters use other routes to avoid delays. The methodology in which the original TA apportioned usage of local lanes through Winchfield compared to taking the Hartley Wintney route is not proven. We know that nobody in their right mind would travel from J5 in rush hour to Fleet via Hartley Wintney rather than Winchfield.

Road Safety Audit

The TAA in Sections 8 and 9 has belatedly addressed the comments of the road safety audit on the HW roundabout, requested by HCC. In due course all the other "improvements" must be audited before they are approved for construction. On the basis of the changes made at Hartley Wintney it seems improbable that the safety of all the other highway "improvements" proposed is assured. Leaving audits until after determination could lead to insoluble problems identified too late and therefore undesirable compromises could be forced. For Winchfield residents it is important to know that the proposed priority working under the Pale Lane railway bridge is safe. We suspect that signals would be a better solution, especially as they could incorporate a delay for all traffic to deter rat running.

Equestrians and Cyclists

Winchfield Parish Council submitted the following comments on 11 November 16

The Wates report also fails to take account of two liveries on Route 1 and 1a – Hungerford Farm on Pale Lane and Hurst Farm at the junction of The Hurst and Station Road. Neither is any account made of the regular cycling traffic on all the routes. The volume of additional traffic generated by this development will have a severe impact and potentially dangerous consequences for these legitimate road users.

This issue is addressed in the Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan – Watch Point EW1. This highlights the concerns regarding the presence on the rural lanes of pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian road users and the need to deter overuse of the lanes by commercial traffic using them as a short cut.

In paragraph 8.4.3 of the TAA there is a passing reference to accidents caused by animals. Again the TAA does not address the concerns raised by WPC regarding cyclists and equestrians submitted on 11 November 16. Any increase in traffic in the lanes around Winchfield makes them increasingly unsuitable for use by pedestrians, horses or cyclists.

Accident Data

Accident data quoted in Appendix E of the original TA is misleading as it does not include non injury events, of which there are many on local roads in Winchfield. Increased traffic will lead to more and potentially more serious conflicts.

Winchfield Station

In paragraph 3.3.4/5 and table 3.4 the TAA states that up to 9 AM there are somewhere between 14 to 22 parking spaces available. The TAA goes further in paragraph 3.3.7 to make the glib statement that therefore there is adequate commuter parking and this is supposedly for the 93 new commuters they identify elsewhere in the TAA. No statement is made with regard to the impact of Grove Farm on the parking facilities at Winchfield. Neither does the TAA offer any solution to anybody who wishes to travel either on business or leisure after 9 AM – what are they supposed to do?

Cumulative Impact

In paragraph 8.5.4/8.5.5 the TAA states that "HCC has long-term concerns about growth within HDC on the rural road network".

The developer's EIA scoping proposal was to assess developments within 3 km that have reasonable prospects of construction before or at the same time as the Proposed Development. Projects to be considered in the search would include major developments that are incomplete and major developments for which planning applications have yet to be determined. Para 6.5.1 & 2 of the original TA advised which developments would be taken into account in the traffic flow forecasts. Only consents that had been issued prior to early 2016 were included.

Table 5.4 of the original "assessment of rural roads" summarised estimates of vehicle flows on rural roads other than Pale Lane. Identical figures are included in Table 8.2 of the addendum TA. This demonstrates that the addendum, published in November 2017, does not take proper account of traffic generated by consents granted since early 2016 or those applications already made where there is a reasonable prospect of consent.

The TA is silent about how traffic from the developments that were allowed for was estimated. In practice the only development included in the developer's list that would have a significant impact on Winchfield traffic is the Edenbrook Village extension, 13/02513, for 193 dwellings including 50 "extra care flats" plus the replacement sports centre. The TA was not correct to have excluded Edenbrook 11/01326 and 13/01221 (the same part of the Edenbrook site, different layout) from cumulative impact assessment as that development was only partially occupied by the time of the traffic count in March 2016. However the traffic generation from incomplete parts would be relatively small.

It is clear that Netherhouse Copse (16/01651), 423 dwellings, and the enlargement of Edenbrook (17/00372) by 59 dwellings should have been included in the assessment of cumulative impact in the addendum TA. The TAA offers no mitigation for this new situation. Indeed in paragraph 8.5.5 the TAA asserts that "The Elvetham Chase development has already considered and identified improvements to fully accommodate its impact (and that from all committed unplanned growth)". Winchfield Parish Council disagrees with this unjustified statement as part of the TAA mitigation proposals.

In a meeting with the developer in March 2016, minuted in the TA, Highways England advised that if the "Local Plan" process were to "overtake" the proposed development, the developer would discuss with Highways England how this would be included in the development. The draft Local Plan was published in Spring 2017. A valid view is that the Local Plan process now has overtaken the proposed development, therefore such discussion should take place before the application is determined."

17/02663/HOU The Yard House, Sprats Hatch Lane *Single storey extensions to dwelling to include an extension to the front entrance, a new boot room to the rear together with a new breakfast/kitchen room also to the rear.* No comments.

17/01793/FUL Shapley Ranch, London Road, Hartley Wintney *Redevelopment of site to provide 7no. dwelling, with associated access, car parking, hardstanding and landscaping.*

17/01794/FUL Shapley Ranch, London Road, Hartley Wintney *Redevelopment of site to provide 5no. dwelling, with associated access, car parking, hardstanding and landscaping.*

The same response was submitted to both the above applications for Shapley Ranch:

"Winchfield Parish Council gives a joint response for both applications which appear identical other than one is for 5 dwellings and the other for 7 dwellings.

Our preference would be the 7 dwellings format because it would provide more houses of the size Hart needs.

We would remind you of our previous response for this site under reference 16/02374/OUT (October 2016) in which we raised no objections to development on this brownfield site but did raise concerns regarding the non-provision of affordable housing and the number of parking spaces proposed.

We again raise no objections to development of the site and note the revised guidance provided in 'Hart's Affordable Housing Informal Development Guidance August 2017' under which the applicant is not required to provide affordable housing contributions.

However, we still have concerns regarding the number of parking spaces to be provided and ask you to consider the following:

The applicants say each dwelling has been allocated parking spaces in accordance with Hart's parking standards and that further visitor parking is also provided on site but does not give a total for the two. The total number of spaces provided cannot be ascertained from the site maps.

Application 17/01793/FUL is for 4 x 4-bed houses and 3 x 3-bed houses. Hart's Provisional Guidance requires provision of 28 spaces. The adopted Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan requires provision of 32 spaces.

Application 17/01794/FUL is for 5 x 4-bed houses. Hart's Provisional Guidance requires 20 spaces, while the Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan requires 25 spaces. Again, the applicants do not state the total of spaces they propose."

17/02621/FUL Land North of Winchfield Court, Pale Lane *Erection of 17 no. dwellings together with associated access, parking, landscaping and amenity space.*

17/02620/FUL Land North of Winchfield Court, Pale Lane *Erection of 10 no. dwellings together with associated access, parking, landscaping and amenity space.*

After the meeting the following response was agreed and submitted for both the above applications for Land North of Winchfield Court:

"Winchfield Parish Council objects to both applications, 17/02620/FUL and 17/02621/FUL, and our comments apply to both.

The Winchfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (W NDP) was adopted by Hart Council in March 2017. This Plan is post-NPPF and uses up-to-date evidence gathered in the preparation of the Plan, supporting sustainable development and respecting the wishes of the community. The policies are in general conformity with HDC policies but enhancing them, incorporating "key principles designed to provide additional specificity to the principles set out in Hart Policy RUR2 ... and RUR3" (W NDP page 27). It cannot therefore be argued, as the applicant seeks to do, that RUR2 and RUR3 are out of date.

Both applications fail to meet various policies in the W NDP:

Policy A1. The plans are for developments of more than seven homes on a largely greenfield site, so fail under Policy A1. Hart's response (June 29, 2017) to the pre-app stated that "the land in question [is] identified for potential development within that Plan under Policy A1". That is not the case: no sites are identified in the W NDP. Although Policy A1 states that "appropriate redevelopment of brownfield sites will be supported in preference to greenfield sites", Winchfield Parish Council understands that this site is not considered to be previously developed land.

Policy A2. The plans fail to meet the requirements for parking spaces.

Policies A4, B2 and E1. The proposals are not in keeping with the rural environment of Winchfield and would adversely affect the existing layout and rural character of Pale Lane.

In addition:

The plans are for a largely greenfield site which is beyond the settlement boundary of Winchfield Court. The proposed houses would be prominent in the landscape.

The developments fail to meet the NPPF 'three dimensions' of sustainability."

16 FINANCE

16.1 Statement for the period 19.09.17 to 21.11.17

Deposit Account (Lloyds)

19 Sept	Balance	£18,054.32
9 Oct	Interest	£0.69
9 Nov	Interest	£0.77
21 Nov	Balance	£18,055.78

Current Account (Lloyds)

19 Sept	Balance			£6,884.63
25 Sept	Alison Ball – September Salary	Exp 17/24	£270.83	-£270.83
26 Sept	Alison Ball – September Expenses	Exp 17/25	£27.00	-£27.00
	BDO – Audit Fee	Exp 17/26	£360.00	-£360.00
	NALC – LCR Subscription	Exp 17/27	£17.00	-£17.00
	O M Williams - Expenses	Exp 17/28	£34.56	-£34.56
28 Sept	Centrewire – New Gates	Exp 17/29	£710.40	-£710.40
25 Oct	Alison Ball – October Salary	Exp 17/30	£270.83	-£270.83
20 Nov	Centrewire – New Gates	Exp 17/31	£268.80	-£268.80
21 Nov	Balance			£4,925.21

TOTAL deposit and current accounts

£22,980.99

Invested at Cambridge & Counties Bank

£42,000.00

Invested at Hampshire Trust Bank

£30,000.00

TOTAL FUNDS

£94,980.99

Comparison with 2017/18 Budget

Budget heading	Allocation	Spend to date (ex VAT)	Available
Clerk's Salary	£5,000.00	£2,158.84	£2,841.16
Training	£300.00	£90.00	£210.00
Subscription to SLCC	£80.00	£0.00	£80.00
Hire of Village Hall for meetings	£80.00	£0.00	£80.00
Admin costs	£650.00	£107.01	£542.99
Insurance	£290.00	£280.00	£10.00
HALC/NALC Subscriptions	£450.00	£409.00	£41.00
Audit & Information Commission fees	£510.00	£501.00	£9.00
Section 137 payments	£600.00	£200.00	£400.00
Grants (Churchyard maintenance)	£600.00	£600.00	£0.00
Contingencies	£475.00	£0.00	£475.00
Total A	£9,035.00	£4,345.85	£4,689.15

Reserves	Balance	Spend to date	Available
Earmarked funds	01.04.17	(ex VAT)	
Basingstoke Canal	£250.00	£250.00	£0.00
Community Benefit Fund	£48,466.12	£858.34	£47,607.78
Election Expenses Contingency	£953.45	£0.00	£953.45
Events (Litter Pick)	£179.38	£43.90	£135.48
Maintenance	£301.29	£0.00	£301.29
Neighbourhood Plan	£1,098.06	£191.00	£907.06
Parish Lengthsman	£1,731.80	£0.00	£1,731.80
Planning Counsel	£48,355.10	£13,555.48	£34,799.62
Pension (new Clerk) <i>new</i>	£300.00	£0.00	£300.00
Street Lighting	£2,250.00	£0.00	£2,250.00
Website Development	£443.02	£0.00	£443.02
Winchfield Festival 2018	£300.00	£0.00	£300.00
Office Equipment	£850.00	£400.00*	£450.00
Total B	£105,478.22	£15,298.72	£90,179.50

* £400 expenditure on PCC Grant agreed July 2017

	Total A + B	£94,868.65
Money at bank	£94,980.99	
VAT to be reclaimed	£227.42	
	Total	£95,208.41
	Less Total A+B	(£94,868.65)
Current surplus/working balance		£339.76

16.2 Request for Grants and Donations

A request from Dogmersfield, Winchfield and Crookham Village Horticultural Society for a grant to help towards the costs of staging the Annual Show in July 2018 was considered and it was agreed to make a grant of £200 under Section 137 of the Local Government Act for this purpose, payable in May 2018.

16.3 Payments for Approval

The following payments were approved:

A Ball	Salary: December 2017	£270.83
	Salary: January 2018	£270.83
	Expenses	£18.00
Kerry Wedlock	Litter Pick Expenses	£31.96
O M Williams	Footpath Expenses	£102.72

17 CORRESPONDENCE

Items of correspondence detailed in the Clerk's report were received and noted.

18 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Kerry Wedlock advised that the Spring Litter Pick would be taking place on 25 February 2018. This was a bit earlier than usual but was the only date available due to holidays, bank holidays and Village Hall availability.

19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday, 15 January 2018 at 7.30pm

Monday, 19 March 2018 at 7.30pm

Monday, 21 May 2018 – Annual Parish Assembly and Annual General Meeting - TBC

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.26 pm