



BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

RESPONSE TO EHDC's LARGE DEVELOPMENT SITES CONSULTATION

– OCTOBER 2019

Organisation: Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan
Email: admin@bramshottandliphookndp.uk
Address: NDP Office, The LMC Office, 2 Ontario Way, Liphook, GU30 7LD
Date: 14th October 2019
Ref: BLNDP/EHDC-LDSC/V.1

INTRODUCTION

The Bramshott and Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan (BLNDP) have assessed the documentation submitted for the EHDC Large Development Sites Consultation and provide the following responses to the questionnaire questions.

This consultation response draws from comments received from all the NDP Working Parties who are researching the 7 themes for our NDP and refers to evidence gathered from the public during the past consultation events held by the NDP, including the Visioning Event in July 2017, 3 day Design Forum in November 2017 and the NDP Public Consultation in February 2019, which included a 2 day presentation and 2 week online consultation period.

The February 2019 Public Consultation included draft planning policies and vision and the communities response to these policies and the vision for the Parish. Copies of the documentation are attached for reference, including the Atkins Report that sets out evidence on traffic issues in Liphook. We also attach a copy of our response to EHDC's Liphook Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan which sets out comments to this consultation, which are important

to note as in particular the Land South East of Liphook Large Development Site significantly impacts the Conservation Area due to increase in traffic movements in this centre.

The evidence we have collected from all three events, that has been cumulatively emphasised through each sequential event, demonstrates that the community of Bramshott and Liphook Parish require any future developments within the Parish provide most importantly community benefits such as more recreation and open space (documented deficiency of open and recreation space within the Parish), improved infrastructure, mitigation measures to improve the traffic congestion and air quality in the conservation area of The Square in Liphook, the improvement of sustainable alternative modes of transport as the transport method of choice, better access to open countryside, protecting and developing our access to the South Downs National Park (see BLNDP Interim Report March 2018).

The community's visions for their Parish are outlined in our Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy Themes, as set out below. These visions are formulated from the evidence gathered at the Visioning Event and the Design Forum from the community.

- Housing Policy Theme's vision:
 - o 'Ensure new housing developments contributes to the identified local housing needs of the Parish, whilst having regard to affordability, design and sustainability. Any new development must respect our local environment, natural and built, and have a positive impact on the Parish';
- Access & Movement Policy Theme's vision:
 - o 'Improving the circulation of people and goods, around and through the Parish';
- Community Policy Theme's vision:
 - o 'To support an economically vibrant, mixed use centre, and to provide facilities for all generations including those living and working in the Parish';
- Sports and Recreation Policy Theme's vision:
 - o 'Improvement of existing facilities and planning for the future servicing of additional sports and recreation facilities for the community';
- Public Services Policy Theme's vision:
 - o 'To endeavour to provide better access to community healthcare, education and to ensure high standards of environmental sustainability throughout the Parish';
- Employment Policy Theme's vision:
 - o 'Support and promote a vibrant employment base within the Parish. Safeguard existing employment land and identifying new sites and opportunities, along with small business creation, and promote stronger education/ workplace links';
- Heritage and Design Policy Theme's vision:
 - o 'To rediscover the heritage of the Parish and address issues of aesthetics, in geographical areas such as the village centre and with regard to design';

It is important to note that the BLNDP is not anti-development. The BLNDP understands that places grow or decline but nothing stays the same, but it is important that development is located in the correct places to have a positive impact on place and community, both physically and psychologically, and development should not have a negative impact.

Reference is made to the Bramshott & Liphook NDP's consultation response to EHDC's Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation, issued on 19th March 2019.

Please note that this response is mainly focussed around the site proposed within Liphook, and the nearby site proposed in Bordon due to the evidence base that has been collected over the last 2 years specifically regarding this parish. The response also makes positive and negative comments on the other sites within this consultation.

The below response includes public views from our evidence base, and some detailed clarifications and corrections.

EMAIL ISSUED TO EHDC ON 09/09/2019 REGARDING INCORRECT INFORMATION ON PRESENTATION DOCUMENTATION

We note that we emailed EHDC on 9th September 2019 regarding the misleading information set out by the developers/promoters of the 'Land South East of Liphook' in their submitted and presentation documentation for your Large Development Sites Consultation.

These concerns were initially raised by the members of the Steering Group that attended the Consultation event on 2nd September 2019, and their discussions with the promoters during the event who implied that the NDP were positively working with and having meetings with them.

In particular concerns focus on the misleading information and implied working relationships set out in the Large Development Site Information Pack on pages 5, 22 and 23.

This information pack, and how the promoters discussed their proposals with the Steering Group members, implies that this consortium have established a positive working relationship with the Bramshott & Liphook NDP and had meetings with us as a group separate to the consultation events that we have held. In addition they have stated the wrong date for our issued Interim Report.

We make it absolutely clear that the Bramshott and Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan have not held any separate meetings with any of the original promoters or the current consortium members of this proposed large development site.

The only discussions had with these promoters, as with all the other site promoters within our parish, is acknowledging receipt of their submitted documentation to us by email, and conversations during the Design Forum held in November 2017, during which all developers who submitted information for this event had equal opportunities to present to us, and the public, their proposals and to take part in a masterplanning and discussion session that took place during this 3 day event.

The Bramshott & Liphook NDP, and the Steering Group, have not engaged separately with this consortium nor have we provided them with formal consultation feedback on their proposals.

The email requested that the incorrect and misleading information be rectified immediately both online and in the event presentations so that members of the public reading the consultation documentation are not misled, and do not obtain the wrong impression of our NDP. We note that we have received no response to date, nor was the presentation material updated to address the above concerns.

LAND SOUTH EAST OF LIPHOOK CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

* Reference is made to the Bramshott & Liphook NDP's consultation response to EHDC's Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation, issued on 19th March 2019 that sets out more details regarding part of this proposed development site.

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

- Proposed uses not suited to this location due to the actual travel distances to the nearest key facilities, including the local schools, 2 existing local centres with their retail, cafes etc. A third local centre within Liphook will not help the current situation where there is already a separation of key services areas, and the use of the car to travel around the village to access different services in the two centres.
 - o This would make the development a commuter facility rather than part of the existing community, made clear by the developers reference to access to the station and A3. There is no recognition in the proposals of the changing patterns of work or the nature of work for many in the Parish, no encouragement for example work/home spaces, or co-working opportunities or small studio spaces for startups, and if in this location would be segregated and not helping the economic health;
- Proposed uses will increase use of the car due to location of other key services required, meaning increases of vehicles using 3 key crossing points for the railway line that are currently dangerous and inappropriate for existing levels of traffic;
- Existing drainage problems for both surface and foul drainage which impacts housing developments;
- Previous comments from the local schools have stated that a satellite or new primary school is not suitable nor supported in this location. Comments from the public have suggested that a new primary school will cause an East/West side status due to locations of schools;
 - o Evidence gathered and published at the NDP Interim Event in February 2019 by Public Services Working Group (from the Federation of Liphook Junior and Infant Schools and HCC Children's Services) make it clear that the Federation has sufficient places for all children who apply on time at Year R and Year 3 (the main admissions rounds for the Schools) who live in catchment. Out of catchment children are accepted at these times as well and there is sufficient projected capacity for any larger development at the Federation. If need for places did arise, HCC will look to expand capacity at existing sites should demand outstrip supply first as one form standalone schools are more financially vulnerable and the Federation has plans and capacity to expand if needed. The school places driven by the potential development are insufficient to support a one form entry school, and thus will result in additional traffic congestion at peak times as families drive to the new proposed school.
 - o The capital costs of a new school are around £2 million, it is disappointing that the developers offer a community asset that the public evidence shows is not needed, thus ensuring that they do not need to factor in the funding in their actual budget for the project. There are other community projects that capital sum could be used for to produce a viable development elsewhere in the parish that enhances and brings sustainability to the parish from such a larger development and could have the potential to ensure the proposed development becomes part of the parish, rather than the current proposals location, facilities and access points which indicate its design to be a separate suburb on the edge of the parish it is situated within and which it has been designed to have no part to play in or contribute to bring to that

parish other than through negative effects of adding to peak time school journeys in particular from one end of the parish to the other (partly because of distance, and partly because parents do not feel it is safe for children to walk or cycle to school along the pathways and routes available at peak times).

- Allotments allocated to inappropriate locations on the site;
- Football pitch located at the most difficult location for visitors by foot and car – lack of connectivity for most of the parish to the North of the railway line = likely increases vehicle movements and car parking issues due to use of car to access site;
 - o It is noted that one of the grounds on which Chichester DC agreed to planning for the new astro and sports facilities at Highfield School (owned directly by a member of the consortium of developers) currently being built, was that the facilities would be available to local clubs, including use by Haslemere and Chichester hockey clubs and Liphook football club. The lighting consists of eight 15m supports each for 7 light units, which seems out of place for the SDNP Dark Skies Policy.
- Housing density higher than adjacent Area of Special Housing Character;
- Employment location creates a third local centre, issues for access and deliveries once in operation due to road network and lack of ease of access from the A3.
- Mixed use development inappropriate in this location due to access – multiple uses not suited to this area as it is segregated and creates its own community even though it is on the fringe of Liphook due to the railway line restricting access;
- The SANGs is far to walk to from the majority of the development at 1.15miles, and already accessible to the public, not considered to be a welcoming area, and likely people will drive to access the SANGs land due to the dangerous roads and the SANGs location;
- No proposals for footpaths to improve the main access ‘lanes’ for the development, it is a rural area at present with a lack of connectivity infrastructure.
- Bramshott and Liphook is not a commuter settlement, it is a community and this should be respected and nurtured – this site focuses on the train station as the centre of the area, which it is not, therefore, the proposals that it is a sustainable location does not apply to the impact the proposals will have on vehicular access and the community and social cohesion.
- The allocation of this site would be against EHDC DLP Policy S4, Health and wellbeing. Policy S4 states that development proposals should take into account and support positive health and wellbeing outcomes by ‘a) contributing to a high quality, attractive and safe public realm to encourage social interaction and facilitate movement on foot and cycle; b) .. the right mix of homes to meet people’s needs and in the right location; ... f) ensuring high levels of residential amenity; g) providing opportunities for formal and informal physical activity, recreation and play...’. It states to implement the policy that development can support health lifestyles by providing quality open spaces, particularly in areas identified as being deficient, for sport, recreation and play whilst improving links to existing spaces and sports facilities.
- The density of houses per ha is appropriate for part of the site which is adjacent to an existing house site which is classed as a “Low Density Neighbourhood” in the EDHC DLP. The threshold in the EHDC DLP as set out in Policy DM30, Residential design in low-density neighbourhoods, is 15 homes per hectare, and the existing adjacent development has an approximate density of 8 homes per hectare. The proposed density is 35-40 dwellings per ha;
- Actual travel distances (not as the bird flies) from the Chitley Farm part of the site are approximately as follows:
 - o 2.5km to Liphook Infants & Junior School;

- 2.0km to Bohunt School & Sixth Form
- 2.9km to Liphook A3 junction
- 1.7km to Village Centre facilities;
- 1.5km to Sainsburys Store;
- 2.1km to Co-Op/Post Office;
- 1.1km to Railway Station;
- 1.5k to Bus Stop (no.13 bus);
- 1.2km to Radford Park
 - All measurements taken from an online measuring tool using the most convenient/direct walking route on pavements.
 - It is the vision of the B&L NDP that our community becomes less reliant on car transport, and this proposed site would not achieve this due to the distances to walk to main services.
- Proposed development will increase the developed area of Liphook village by approximately 20%. There is no reflection or evidence in the developer's proposals that this exponential increase in the physical, environmental and social infrastructure and no recognition of the impact that such an increase will have on the parish, whether positive or negative.
- The developers have not made any attempt in their proposals to address or have regard to the detailed evidence prepared by the NDP Working Parties and published on their website and in an event in February 2019, and have not reviewed the comments and concerns raised by local residents in response to these publications, again available on the website. This lack of engagement with the NDP material conflicts with the developer's stated aim of working with the NDP.
- The developers have indicated that the development would open up access for visitors and residents into the SDNP area that borders the development, the current proposals make no reference to how this is achieved or delivered, apart from the potential SANGs which is already accessible, or whether the developers have discussed this community benefit with the SDNPA especially following publication of the SDNPA Local Plan.

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

- Access to the A3 is only possible via the restricted railway bridge adjacent to the station or by Haslemere Road. This has high potential to cause major traffic congestion and as vehicles accessing the site become larger, whether from construction, delivery to residents, and maintenance vehicles or from larger domestic vehicles, the narrow railway bridges and access points to those bridges close to buildings and walls are already unable to manage to ensure a flow of traffic whenever a larger delivery lorry, school coach (to and from Churchers Junior School, or Highfield and Brookham Schools), or transit vans needed to make progress between Station Road and the junction of the Berg Estate. The recent Atkins Report (commissioned by EHDC and HCC) concluded that the congestion is local traffic travelling from East to West (to access the local primary and secondary schools) which is exacerbated by Bohunt School Pupils crossing the road in the village centre, recently increase by additional pupils using the railway station.
- Lack of good access to the A3 and other roads to the North of the railway line during peak times due to the existing heavy traffic moving East to West in the village centre, creating slow moving traffic in the centre – refer to Atkins Report – Liphook Phase II Transport Feasibility Study July 2018. This states that the average journey time of strategic traffic travelling

between the A3 and Haslemere Road is under 13 minutes at peak time AM and PM, excluding school traffic. Including school traffic this significantly increases to up to 28 minutes for the same route in the PM.

- This report sets out that the mini-roundabouts in The Square are congested, but none of the proposed strategic mitigation options would appropriately address the issue due to the movement of local traffic causing the main traffic movements in The Square, and would mainly potentially reassigning traffic along inappropriate local roads. Therefore, it is clear that any new housing needs to be located to reduce the reliance on the car at peak times, in particular to access the existing local schools.
- The report concludes that further assessment is required 'on the double mini-roundabouts at The Square to understand the potential relief that can be attributable to removing traffic from the network from the implementation of sustainable transport options / initiatives (ie. school / workplace travel planning promoting cycling / walking / public transport and discouraging driving).
 - This proposed site contradicts the proposed mitigation methods set out in the report, and would appear to add to the current problems due to the reliance on the car as the local services are not within a short walking distance.
- The Atkins Report did not look at Highfield Lane, therefore the volume of traffic along Highfield Lane and through the village via the narrow bridge at Midhurst Road to access Liphook along this route instead of Haslemere Road, is unknown;
- We note that Hampshire Highways are carrying out further surveys into the pedestrian and vehicle movements in the Parish, in particular focussing on the moving of school children with the aim to reduce the impact on the centre of Liphook. They have been consulting with the Parish Council and District Councillors.
- Widening of railway bridges and access and visibility splays under the Eastern side of the railway track to allow two vehicles to be able to pass each other at the same time in these key 'pinch' locations, this needs to be carried out prior to the development taking place;
- Introduction of missing footpath links on Midhurst Road to link to the railway bridge – currently unsafe for pedestrians to walk from Chiltley Lane through to the Station Road area due to no continuous pavement;
- Introduction of footpaths to link proposed site to the proposed SANGs land – currently no footpaths and on a road that is outside of EHDC;
 - The NDP Feb 2019 event gave evidence regarding concerns about pedestrians crossings on the Midhurst Road and the danger posed to pedestrians from faster vehicles and unclear lines of sight. The Midhurst Road does not have a continuous footway on the Eastern side from Highfield Lane. It is not clear that the developers would have control over the necessary land to develop a sensible footpath route from the development to Midhurst Road.
- Improvements to all existing vehicular roads and 'T' junctions by the site to allow two cars to pass safely, reduction of speeds of vehicles, and introduction of footpaths as Highfield Road and Haslemere Road South of the railway are unsuitable for pedestrians;
- Improvements of junction between Highfield Lane and Haslemere Road, which has a blind corner – the proposed additional vehicular access onto Haslemere Road needs to be investigated into safety of this access due to the two blind corners within short distances of this proposed junction;

- Improvements to existing 'T' junctions that are difficult to use at present, especially due to poor visibility splays due to road alignment and width.
- Bus services as existing are minimal at one bus service no.13 which runs through the centre of the village and would not service this development. The local service (no250) only runs 3 mornings non-peak and is under threat of withdrawal. It is unlikely to still be running if this development were to proceed, and be of no use as a commuter or school bus due to its route. It needs to be researched whether the bus would be able to access the site, and whether the route could be altered to service this site to improve sustainability.
- Increase in capacity of the foul utilities, the local foul is already suffering on the Midhurst Road sewage network, and the Lowsley Farm development proposed foul sewage attenuation scheme is a recent example that foul utility services are key in development, especially as the scheme failed and caused issues for the new residents and problems continue to arise;
 - o The Public Services Working Group's evidence gathered shows that whilst current foul water drainage infrastructure is sufficient for the current size of the parish, it is not likely to be sufficient to carry an increase of approximately 20%, the solution of using onsite cess pits to store foul water before controlled release to the local sewage network has not been effective for Lowsley Farm.
 - o In addition the lower end of the site near to Haslemere Road is liable to flood around and near the railway bridge. Whilst improvement works have been carried out there, there is a physical limit to the effect this can have as more heavy downpours become a regular feature of weather patterns.
- GP surgeries are as existing physically constrained in the number of patients and services that they can offer to existing residents, due to the nature of their buildings. Commissioners of health services, including GP services are reviewing the services offered and the way in which they are offered during this year, and exploring innovative and new ways of providing health care, which will require additional infrastructure, not accounted for in these proposals.
- ALL OF THE ABOVE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS NEED TO TAKE PLACE PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SHOULD IT BE ALLOCATED AS A SITE.
- SANGs should be on site to encourage its use and to detract people away from the SPA, which is on the opposite side of the development – ie. the SANGs is not between the development and the existing SPA, which already has good walking links to the SPA once on Haslemere Road.

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- Very close proximity to the SDNP which is on the other side of Highfield Lane and the impact of the proposals on Dark Night Skies due to lighting for roads and houses which is in conflict with the planning policies, additional traffic on a rural road adjacent to the SDNP, bring of development up to the edge of the SDNP (negative due to the lack of sustainability of the site's location compared to the heart of the service centre);
- Impact of density and amount of development on the views in and out of the SDNP, and visual impact of its setting. The views to the natural woodland in this location are longstanding and serve several cross county long distance walking routes and bridleways. The views up towards the natural asset that draws some visitors to the parish to walk towards Lynchmere on the Serpent Trail or down towards the Shipwrights Way will be irremediably affected, as well views from the higher land back towards the parish from SDNP land.

- Chiltley Lane is a narrow unlined sunken rural lane with a difficult, part blind junction onto Midhurst Road, not suitable for increased traffic, and limited scope to increase road width and create footpaths due to housing both sides and nature of area being an area of Special Housing Character;
 - SANGs land is in the SDNP and crosses two district boundaries as well;
 - Proposed Haslemere Road access point is between 2 blind corners and a tight access under the railway bridge that currently cannot accommodate 2 large vehicles passing;
 - Devils Lane is a rural sunken lane with a narrow bridge over the railway, not suitable for 2 cars passing. This restricts access to the site, and even if the bridge was controlled with traffic lights or widened, the junction onto Haslemere Road from Devils Lane is blind to the East due to the brow of the hill;
 - Sussex Border Path runs to the South of the Site and impacted in appearance by the proposals, and increased traffic impacting the path;
 - Access from Willow Gardens should not have an access to the whole development as it will increase traffic and change the nature of the Area of Special Housing Character, which remains a protected housing area under the emerging EHDC Local Plan. Using Willow Gardens as a third access point would be in conflict with EHDC Draft Local Plan policies S29, DM30 and DM5.
 - Lack of suitable points for another pedestrian bridge across the railway to help connect the site, due to lack of access points on North side plus financial costs;
 - Near to Ancient Woodland, that would potentially be disturbed by increases in traffic and people movements and additional night time lights;
 - Parts of the site are known to flood and suffers from surface water flooding as existing as greenfields – surface water issues – see Appendix A.
 - Setting of Listed Buildings and views from afar across fields affected by proposed scheme; Listed Building on Chiltley Lane has its setting significantly changed by the proposals;
 - This site is highly constrained with approximately only 1/3 of the whole Parish not impacted by environmental or Conservation Area constraints;
 - The current land is mainly mixed use farmland and supports a diversity of ecosystem and natural wildlife that will be displaced by the proposals, there is no reference to recognising the widely recognised vital role that farmland plays in the natural living landscape in the South East of England.
 - The B&L NDP's Draft Policy HD1 – Rediscover The Square Conservation Area, during the February 2019 NDP consultation received many comments about the impact of vehicular traffic on The Square and the negative impact it is having on the CA, including impact on sense of place, ability to dwell, pollution on health and building fabric, vehicular presence over space presence, discourages notion to dwell, not supported by the lack of wider pavements with planting and places to sit and watch etc., this proposed development and use of the facilities on the existing Local Service Centre, due to the distance to the key services and access to the A3, is likely to increase traffic movements through The Square in conflict with the NDP's draft policy and the EHDC Liphook Conservation Area Appraisal.
1. Current vehicle congestion and associated poor air quality in the centre of Liphook is one of the biggest concerns for residents, workers and visitors of all ages. Road congestion is seen

by the government as a social, economic and environmental burden¹ and even short term exposure to poor air quality has adverse health effects² The new development would add to these issues. The current use of informal link roads and traffic calming systems are not addressing the route cause.

2. Local people have said that they want more opportunities for active travel however additional traffic would add to the already perceived high risk of accidents and continue to act as a barrier. Walking and cycling has multiple health, economic and environmental benefits and is the national policy for travel. However, in Liphook there is little or no room for segregation or shared footway / cycleway provision and to progress this approach unless traffic is reduced. A new development would require a full travel survey and potential significant and costly infrastructure change.
3. Spatial Planning for Health³ guidance shows that active travel is optimal in dense well connected streets with safe and efficient infrastructure. The proposed new site in Liphook is at a corner tail end of the parish and is south of the railway that divides the south of the village. The site has particularly poor connectivity to the village facilities and there is a risk that residents will not choose active travel methods for getting around the village. Road routes are old, already burdened with traffic and take it directly through the centre of the village adding to the congestion, safety concerns and poor air quality.
4. As well as reducing active travel, people in these less well connected areas may be at risk of isolation, loneliness and associate mental health and other health issues⁴. Liphook already has an area of the village with higher than the county average⁵ It is probably that people in this new site would be at risk.

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

- Apart from helping achieve housing numbers, only financial gain for the developers, who have not listened to the concerns of the community raised during the Design Forum consultation.

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

- Proposed site is within at minimum 3 Local Planning Authorities and district areas – EHDC, SDNPA, and West Sussex Council/Chichester District Council, including the key roads to service the site, with potential implications that the proposed infrastructure improvements required will not happen due to different LPAs/District Councils.
- Proposed SANGs land is in the SDNPA and crosses District boundaries, potentially making it difficult to obtain and implement infrastructure improvements for footpaths, SANGs car park access etc. Also more difficult to control/enforcement on land not within the same LPA as main site.

¹ Cabinet office (2009) The wider costs of transport in English urban areas, London: Cabinet Office, Strategy Unit

² DEFRA, PHE, LGA (2017) Air Quality: A briefing for directors of public health

³ PHE (2017) Spatial planning for health: an evidence resource for planning and designing healthier places

⁴ PHE (2015) Local action on health inequalities: Reducing social isolation across the lifecourse

⁵ Hampshire County Council (2016) Social isolation and loneliness in Hampshire, a health needs assessment

- Part of site is within the SDNP which is the area for water and play area – community facilities that may not come forward due to another LPA being in control of enforcement action (very badly shown on the proposals maps!).
- Main access points are within different district areas, and lead onto roads not within EHDC, potential difficulties obtaining consents, implementing proposals, controlling improvements to infrastructure required.

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

- Lack of suitable infrastructure in place for both transport, existing traffic issues and foul drainage utilities. The existing traffic and vehicular access issues in Liphook need to be addressed and dealt with first prior to any further development that is not centrally located to the actual main centre of Liphook. The train station is not the centre of this village. The village centre is where as existing 5 roads converge onto a series of mini roundabouts.
 - o If the current traffic issues in the centre cannot be addressed prior to commencing works if this site is allocated, then the development shouldn't take place.
- Lack of capacity of the existing utility services;

WHITEHILL & BORDON CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

- Proposed uses supplement the existing approved development in this area and help further expand an existing 'newly envisaged town';
- The proposed housing and much SANGs land helps support the existing, proposed and additionally proposed economic provisions and facilities;
- The proposed uses naturally supplement and extend this revitalised town centre;
- Positive as the SANGs are mainly on the site and not physically separated;

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

- The key road infrastructure has already been constructed, which would service the majority of this new proposed extensions;
- Already has immediate access to the new A325 relief road.
- The foul sewage and other utilities appear to have already been upgraded to address the current developments being constructed here;
- The Atkins Report – Liphook Phase II Transport Feasibility Study Report July 2018, states that the majority of vehicles entering and exiting Liphook during the AM and PM peak was recorded travelling in the AM, entering Liphook from Headley Road, and exiting Liphook from London Road (and the A3), and in the PM, most vehicles entered Liphook from London Road and the A3, and most vehicles exited Liphook from Headley Road (page 19). These ANPR survey data does not clearly define why the main traffic appears to come from the North into Liphook, but the Whitehill & Bordon site is located along this main road into Liphook. It is highly advised that further studies are carried out to ascertain whether the high volume of traffic are due to the Bordon developments or due to use of this road for access to the A3 by the villages in between.

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- SPAs and SINCs in close proximity, but the proposed extensions to the already approved development appear to have accounted for this through no development within the 400m buffers of the SPAs & SINCs, and the creation of the buffers as SANGs to help create open space;
- Constraint could be how would people be stopped from moving from the SANGs directly into the SPAs/SINCs that are adjacent to the SANGs? Which is the whole point of the SANGs to stop people walking/using the SPAs.

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

- Extends and supplements an existing proposed development, bringing more people to help support the new centre, which should make the centre more viable;
- This location has already been carefully designed to be a sustainable town;
- Uses mainly brownfield land, and also creates a large amount of SANGs land that is accessible to the public and helps to create and retain buffer zones with the existing SPAs and SINCs.
- Provides more population for the new employment centres and live/work units etc., and scope for people to see the new employment opportunities on the 'door step'.
- This one site could encompass all the required housing numbers outstanding in the EHDC Local Plan.

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

No comments.

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comments.

CHAWTON PARK CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

- Could encompass all the outstanding housing number in the local plan.

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

- Good access to the strategic road network, but relies on one main road in = negative impact on these residents

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- Impact on the listed building and its setting that is highly central to the scheme.
- Lack of turning and movement for the bus service and not as well connected as Holybourne settlement which already feels disconnected due to main road.
- Surrounded by woodland and ancient woodland and SINCs.

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

No comments

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

No comments

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comments

EXTENSION OF LAND EAST OF HORNDEAN (HAZELTON FARM) CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

- Appears to facilitate the proposed economic growth and housing growth aims for this area;
- Appears to be a logical extension of a proposed scheme, in a good area linked to the A3.

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

- Access to the A3 and improvements to the immediate road network.

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- Woodland and many services crossing the site, potential issue with flooding for Havant Thicket winter storage reservoir.

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

- Creates more employment and links to a main road with better ease.

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

No comments.

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comments.

SOUTH OF WINCHESTER ROAD CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

No comment

2. **What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**
Appear to be extension of ribbon development with immediate access to the strategic road network, but remote from the existing village centre.
3. **Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?**
No comment
4. **What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.**
No comment
5. **What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**
No comment
6. **The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?**
No comment

FOUR MARKS SOUTH CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

1. **Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?**
 - Does the primary school need to be moved? Do they want to be moved?
 - Does not appear to respect established pattern of settlement growth.
2. **What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision**
 - Appears to have better connections to the main road infrastructure compared to the Land South of Liphook proposals.
3. **Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?**
 - Rather piecemeal development, are there any existing features on the site that are impacted?
 - Extends into the countryside, potentially not help integration into the community.
4. **What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.**
 - Infills development, would improve connections of rights of way and allow for 'back garden' infill.
5. **What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?**
No comment.

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comment.

NEATHAM DOWN CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

Would it give anything back to the local community in Alton apart from some additional employment facilities of 1ha? Appears unlikely existing residents will have a need to access the rest of the site, unless using the trails and footpaths to walk around the wider area.

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

- Has ease of immediate access to the strategic road network with existing roundabout, the A31, but is distant from the train station which is difficult to mitigate.
- Is there suitable foul drainage services nearby or that can be connected to?
- Is the footbridge over the A31 suitable for increased pedestrian use?
- Is SANGs required due to the centre being 5.5km from the Wealden Heaths SPA Phase II, ie. part of the site may be within 5km of the SPA.

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- Encroaches into the countryside, appears remote from the town centre which is not beneficial for sustainable communities making use of existing facilities and enhancing existing communities.
- Distance from the train station for this number of new residents is not sustainable at 1.2km and difficult to overcome without encouraging cycling or taking the bus to the train station.
- Only one road access into the site, heavy traffic impact on the houses on this entry point.

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

- Benefits as it is near to an existing established settlement and large economic area.
- Less impact on road system as roundabout already exists in this location, ie. no major road alterations required, impacting long term flow of traffic. Footbridge already exists which is a major benefit to the implementation of this scheme compared to other development sites needing to cross over the A31/fast moving traffic roads.
- Opportunities to open up links to existing rights of way and create better access and improve knowledge of existing public rights of way routes.

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

No comment.

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comment.

NORTHBROOK PARK CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

- Appear to be well thought out on how to maintain longevity of the community services and the community bus route, that may help reduce the reliance on the private car and give sustainable access to the railway station.
- Has its own SANGs on site – better access and more likely to be used.

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

- Need for footbridge over the A31 – difficult to develop and key to create links between the two parts of the site that are otherwise difficult to access due to the fast movement of traffic on the A31.
- New roundabout required – is the cost feasible and achievable? Does it impact on other traffic movement negatively?

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- Listed building on site, important to retain its setting, is this impacted by the proposals? The more traditional design of housing appears to show some thought towards protecting the character and setting of the listed buildings.
- The ancient woodland – is 15m enough buffer for a high density of dwellings in close proximity, as one cannot restrict ownership of plots.
- Need to cross the A31 to reach the employment site on a main road that has much fast moving traffic.
- The car park for the SANGs is at the far end of the green areas, surely better near the main entrance to the site?

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

- The Village Trust may help this stand alone community succeed if the community facilities can stay open and active.

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

No comment.

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comment.

SOUTH MEDSTEAD CONSULTATION QUESTIONS RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

- Would potentially result in the loss of the identity of Medstead, removing any difference in style of area (strategic gaps) between Medstead and Four Marks, making it a large build up area.

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

- New road access junctions onto existing roads.

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- Would appear to result in a large built development blurring the boundary/style difference between South Medstead and Four Marks.
- Poor access to the strategic road network, A31 due to the railway.
- Piecemeal development that could have several issues whilst developing in sections.

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

- Benefits are that it will infill between existing residential properties and not significantly sprawl into the countryside, though it is infill greenfield sites that are partly bounded by development.
- No environmental designations, not significant encroachment on countryside and does not impact on the setting of any listed buildings.
- Close to existing facilities and a train station is within 5-7mins walking distance.
- A relatively sustainable site to encourage walking, cycling etc.
- Protects the surrounding countryside from further encroachment.

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

No comments

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comments

WEST OF LYMINGTON BOTTOM ROAD SOUTH MEDSTEAD CONSULTATION QUESTIONS
RESPONSE:

1. Do you have any comments on the proposed uses?

- Employment centre may be at the wrong end of the development? Is this a good location for the existing facilities and access in the area?

2. What infrastructure is required to support the proposal and when? This could be on or off-site provision

No comments. Similar to proposed development site at South Medstead.

3. Do you know of any other constraints to developing the site?

- Similar to proposed development site at South Medstead.
- Highly restricted for access to main road due to railway line

4. What opportunities and/or benefits do you think the proposal could bring.

- Close to existing services centres and no impact on listed buildings.

5. What are the cross-boundary considerations and the potential implications? How can they be overcome?

No comments.

6. The site promoters consider their proposal to be deliverable within the Local Plan period up to 2036. Is there any reason that this is not achievable?

No comments.

OTHER CONSULTATION QUESTIONS:

7. Is there any other Large Development Site that could deliver over 600 homes and other supporting uses by 2036, this is not included in this consultation?

- More practically sustainable sites within the SDNPA which are adjacent to the centres of existing service centres, which would require EHDC passing some of its housing allocation to SDNPA for allocation in these locations.

8. Do you have any comments on the assessment of Large Development Sites, as set out in the Council's background paper?

- The assessment does not take into consideration the traffic and infrastructure impact of the proposals on the existing infrastructure and roads. It is noted that the reports required to demonstrate whether or not there would be an impact, and potential mitigation schemes are not carried out until after the sites are allocated, however, this is deemed inappropriate when considering sites of 600 homes +. This amount of homes significantly impacts any location, and the sites should be assessed for impacts on transport and traffic prior to formal allocation, and not allocated then the report undertaken, as by this point it is likely too late as the main decision has been made. The main complaint about this is that mitigation schemes will be proposed instead which are not always implemented prior to the commencement of development or at all, leaving existing residents negatively impacted by the proposals.

9. Do you have any comments on the relationship between Large Development Sites and the draft Local Plan (2017-2036), particularly in relation to what other policies and proposals the draft Local Plan should contain?

- Focus should be made on making place and enhancing existing communities;
- Reducing the reliance on the use of the car by appropriate locations of development to be able to access services required by foot or cycle;
- There

10. Is there any feedback you would like to give us about this consultation?

- The lack of communication with Parish Councils and emerging NDPs that could be impacted by a proposed Large Development Site, such as ourselves. We would have appreciated communication that this consultation is taking place and why prior to it being formally promoted as it would have assisted passing of relevant information;
- The lack of communication to the public about the consultation, and lack of promotion – very few people seem to be aware of the consultation taking place;
- The venues of the presentations are badly spread out and do not cover all the areas that are potentially impacted by one of the proposed sites, should it come forward. The locations are impractical for most people who do not live in the event location itself.
- Lack of promotion of availability of the information being online, not just at the events.

CONCLUSION:

It is the vision of the B&L NDP that our community becomes less reliant on car transport, and the NDP is seeking ways of promoting the safe and connected use of active modes of transport across our Parish, the proposed Large Development Site on Land South East of Liphook would not encourage less reliance on car transport due to its location and distance from key services.

It is considered that most of the other 9 sites are more suitable than 'Land South of Liphook' with far better sustainability overall, closer links to the major road system, frequent bus services, which are sustainable because of the size of the populations they serve and upgraded sewage and surface water drainage systems. Liphook is highly constrained as a whole Parish, and has many environmental restrictions compared to other proposed Large Development Sites.

It is important to note that the BLNDP is not anti-development. The BLNDP understands that places grow or decline but nothing stays the same, but it is important that development is located in the correct places and with suitable architectural styles and design so to have a positive impact on place and community, both physically and psychologically, and development of any level of intervention should not have a negative impact on the existing positive quality of the local area.

The cumulative conclusion of the evidence base to date is that if development has to happen, the right infrastructure, facilities and services have to be in place and improved as part of any proposals, not only to ensure these meet the current needs, but also the needs of the proposed development, whilst not negatively impacting the existing community of this Parish. This is also applicable to all places and should be applied to all the proposed Large Development Sites to ensure there is no negative impact on the existing communities.

Yours Sincerely,

The Steering Group of the Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan

APPENDIX A:



Figure 1: Photograph of flooding at the Chiltley Farm site.