

INTRODUCTION

- 5.6.1 In this Section of Chapter 5 I deal with those settlements that do not have any proposals for baseline or reserve allocations but where Objectors suggest sites that they consider suitable for allocation for residential development.
- 5.6.2 I consider the Council's Accessibility to Land Use Matrix in Chapter 5.2 of this Report. Despite its criticisms, I conclude that it provides a sufficiently clear indication of the most accessible settlements as a useful starting point for the distribution of the required amount of housing in particular settlements. Having examined all the Council's proposed allocations on a systematic and comparative basis, I conclude that some are not appropriate. I do, however, support the general principles of focusing development on the urban areas that provide the best range of services and facilities with the best public transport services, compatible with the main environmental considerations.
- 5.6.3 The Matrix indicates those settlements that, in principle, are the most sustainable in the District. Not all, however, are sufficiently sustainable. The allocation of land in the smaller settlements categorised Groups 2 and 3 would too often lead to intrusions of the built-up area into the countryside and where the limited range of services and facilities would result in yet more commuting and traffic on country roads ill-suited to cater with it. Furthermore, as my recommendations should result in sufficient land to meet Structure Plan requirements, there is no need to allocate more land in these smaller settlements or anywhere else. This is the context within which I deal with the following Omission Sites.
- 5.6.4 I acknowledge the importance of rural areas, their communities, services and facilities. But this must be weighed in the balance with the often limited degree of sustainability of the settlements in question and the likely consequences and disadvantages of steering growth to them. The often lack of previously-developed land in these settlements is another consideration that tells against a more dispersed pattern of future development, as is the location of most Omission Sites beyond the usually well-defined Settlement Policy Boundaries (SPB).

BASINGSTOKE

NO INSET MAP

Objection

First Deposit

1516/10491 Mrs P W Bruce

Main Issue

Whether land at Hackwood Park should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.5 **Mrs Bruce** suggests that Hackwood Park should be allocated for housing on the basis that a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities already exists in the area. She believes this would represent a more sustainable form of development than that proposed in the SDDP and would remove the pressure for development at various sites in Alton.

5.6.6 It would appear that the land to which she refers is located entirely within Basingstoke and Deane, and on that basis I make no comment about it. I deal with objections concerning the Council's proposals for Alton in Chapter 5.3 of my Report.

Recommendation

5.6.7 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BEECH

INSET MAP 2

Objection

Second Deposit SD5.04403

3857/14921 Mrs M A Trice-Waters

Main Issue

Whether land off Medstead Road, Beech should be identified for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.6.8 This land is part of an elevated wooded area, set back behind residential development on Medstead Road. It is located adjacent to, but outside, the SPB and within the Bushby Leaze Wood Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC).
- 5.6.9 Beech has no clearly defined village centre or employment opportunities. Its few facilities comprise mainly a recreation ground and church. There is only one bus service, the No 28, to and from Alton and Basingstoke. It is an irregular service with the last buses to Basingstoke and Alton leaving in late afternoon. There is no weekend service. Whilst these buses are no doubt important to those who travel on them, I am in no doubt that most people travelling to and from the village would do so by car. This is a village of limited sustainability.
- 5.6.10 Despite its elevated position there would be some screening from the mature vegetation and existing development. Development here, however, would still result in visual intrusion. Although there is already some scattered development in the SINC, the intensification resulting from more dwellings would erode the rural character of this part of the settlement. It would also lead to more traffic on the narrow drive issuing from Medstead Road. There is no justification for allocating this land.

Recommendation

- 5.6.11 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BLACKMOOR

INSET MAP 6

Objection

First Deposit

1694/9377 The Blackmoor Estate

Main Issue

Whether land at The Grange should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.6.12 This land is about 1.6 ha in area and includes The Grange, the site of the former The Grange Lodge (now demolished) and The Grange bungalow. The remainder is well-wooded curtilage, as the submitted plans show. The buildings and part of the gardens are in the SPB, which in my view is already somewhat generously defined. The Council excludes the majority of the curtilage from the SPB because it considers that it relates more to the countryside than to the built-up area, and I agree with that assessment.
- 5.6.13 **The Blackmoor Estate** claims that the buildings on the site are substandard and redevelopment is the only option. It suggests that the Omission Site is suitable for 25 low density, well designed, sympathetically constructed, mixed use dwellings as it is located near several key services. But the village has few services and facilities; they include a St Matthew’s C of E Primary School, a village hall, church and farm shop. Buses are infrequent. The Objector highlights the No 38 hourly or so service between Aldershot, Blackmoor Vicarage and Portsmouth, but no evidence is provided of any other services of a more frequent nature. It is unlikely that such a service would attract significantly more patronage, and again there would be all too much reliance upon the private car to travel to settlements that offer more jobs and other attractions.
- 5.6.14 There are few opportunities for employment, apart from those on the Estate. Blackmoor is not a sufficiently sustainable settlement to justify the encouragement of a significant amount of new residential development. The initial proposal of 25 or so dwellings would result in a relatively large increase in population, dependent to a substantial extent upon services, facilities and jobs elsewhere and upon its cars for travelling to them.
- 5.6.15 The village has much character, as is recognised with the designation of a Conservation Area in 1991 and the listing of buildings within it. The site is in the Countryside Heritage Area. I do not consider that any benefits of an allocation in supporting such local services as there are would outweigh the environmental impacts that would result. The basic objections to the Omission Site, however, concern the dearth of services and facilities and

the intrusion that would be invited into attractive, often well-wooded open land that has a greater affinity with the countryside than with the built-up area. The land should not be allocated.

Recommendation

5.6.16 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BUCKS HORN OAK

INSET MAP 8

Objections

As set out in the Annex at page 123.

Latest Proposed Change

As set out in Pre-Inquiry Change PIC006.6 Map No PIC Map 3.

Main Issues

- 1) Whether this settlement, owing to its range of services and facilities, should take significantly more residential development; and in particular,
- 2) Whether land east of the A325 road should remain in, or be excluded from, the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.17 This settlement has a limited range of services. The main ones include a public house, the Halfway House, which is located on the opposite side of the A325 road to the main residential parts. There is a petrol filling station that includes a shop providing for some day to day needs, and a bus service to Aldershot and Haslemere. During Mondays to Saturdays, there is a half-hourly service throughout much of the day in both directions. On Sundays and Bank Holidays there are fewer buses and they stop at the Halfway House at 2 hourly intervals. These, and some of the weekdays services, are financially supported by the Hampshire County Council so there must be some doubt about their future. Although the bus service is at present better than at some other settlements in East Hampshire, it is not so good that it is likely to tempt many more people from their cars.

5.6.18 The limited frequency of buses and the lack of a good range of services and facilities means that the prospective occupants of any additional dwellings built in an expanded SPB would be likely to rely on their cars for most journeys. These journeys would include those for most shopping, leisure and school purposes. There are few jobs in and near Bucks Horn Oak, and so I would expect most employed people to travel to work elsewhere. Again, it is reasonable to presume that the great majority of these journeys would be by car. As **Sarah and James Rose** say, *this is a small hamlet which takes all of its community amenities (ie. school, church, shops) from neighbouring villages*. This is not a particularly sustainable settlement, especially in terms of accessibility, and apart from any infilling that might be suitable within its main built up parts, it should not provide for any significant amount of residential development.

*

- 5.6.19 I turn now to the second issue. The revised SPB of the Pre-Inquiry Change includes buildings located generally at and to the rear of the public house on the eastern side of the A325 road, but excludes the more open parts of the land. Apart from a dwelling, these buildings are of low rise or similar construction. Although they are in employment use and no doubt provide valuable local jobs, they are agricultural in appearance. They do not much intrude into the rural scene and appear to me to be compatible, and have a greater affinity, with the countryside. From my inspection, I agree with **Cala Homes (South) Ltd** that the land to which its objection refers and which includes buildings, storage areas and hardstandings, is previously-developed. I say that on the assumption that the uses are authorised. Be that as it may, such assemblies of features are not unusual in the countryside and I would not describe this land as either urban in character or in urgent need of redevelopment.
- 5.6.20 I agree with the **Dockenfield Parish Council** that residential development that would inevitably be encouraged here by inclusion of the land in the SPB would be on the wrong side of the main road. The steady stream of traffic that can legally travel at up to 50 mph through the settlement would, as it says, make it *dangerous to cross for old and young people and would create a separated development*. It is telling that many local people refer to present dangers, and the undisputed evidence is that accidents, at least one being fatal, have occurred at the busy A325 junction with Dockenfield Lane. No doubt a residential or other type of scheme could include its improvement but that does not alter the unsuitability of more development on this eastern side of this busy main road.
- 5.6.21 There is a significant contrast in character and appearance between the more built-up, urban parts of the settlement on the western side of the A325 and the more open and rural parts of its eastern side. The **Binsted Parish Council** is rightly concerned about the undesirable consolidation and intensification of the existing pattern of development in this rural area that would result from the Council's and various Objectors' proposals. These considerations, the increased risk of danger that would result on the public highway from more development on land to the east of the main road and the unsuitability of this settlement for growth in terms of sustainability, convinces me that the A325 should be the eastern limit of the SPB.
- 5.6.22 This previously-developed land performs poorly when assessed against all the criteria in PPG 3 paragraph 31, and there would be little point in excepting the public house from my recommended approach. I agree with the Council that the inclusion of land within a SPB does not determine its future use but, as agreed several times at the Inquiry, it is a good start for a development proposal. The inclusion in the SPB of land on the eastern side of the A325 would be too much of a hostage to fortune.

Recommendation

- 5.6.23 I recommend that the SDDP be modified by the exclusion from the SPB of all land located east of the A325 road.

HOLT POUND

INSET MAP 11

Objection

First Deposit

1700/7735 Forest Enterprise

Main Issue

Whether land to the south west of Holt Pound should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.6.24 This is a 1.4 ha greenfield site used for growing Christmas trees. To the west it adjoins dense woodland that forms part of the SINC. Residential development is to the north and east, mainly in the form of 2 ribbons of development along the A325 road. **Forest Enterprise** state that its development would consolidate Holt Pound, boost the demand for local services, strengthen the local community and contribute to making this road safer. I find little of merit in these comments.
- 5.6.25 The extent to which Holt Pound would be consolidated, on the doubtful assumption that this is desirable, would be limited. The settlement is somewhat dispersed, with the majority of its built-up area, and that of Rowledge, being east of the A325 road. There is a wide range of services and facilities in Rowledge. They include a shop, post office, church, hairdresser's and butcher's shop. They are, however, about 1 km away from the Omission Site and along a road with few footways or regular street lighting. It would take about 15 minutes to walk to them, assuming a hasty crossing of the road. And their location east of this busy road with its fast moving traffic would result in considerable hazards and potential danger and inconvenience for people crossing it to get to them. It is difficult to see how, in practicable terms, the danger arising from this poor location could be sufficiently reduced. Even more vehicles emerging onto this road, or slowing down to turn off it, in some cases across the path of fast on-coming traffic, should not be contemplated. This is another consideration that tells against the Objector's proposal.
- 5.6.26 There is a limited number of bus services to larger towns and villages. The No 18 Aldershot-Haselmere bus provides a service at generally half hourly intervals during the day. The first bus to Haselmere leaves Holt Pound (Bird World) at 0713 hrs, but the next one is not until 0833 hrs, a gap of well over one hour which is of limited convenience for commuters. Buses to Aldershot during the morning peak period are more frequent. This general frequency is a good deal greater than in many other settlements in East Hampshire, and I accept that these buses could attract some patronage from any additional people living on the Omission Site. This is not enough, however, to support the allocation of this land that is some appreciable distance from such day to day requirements that are available.

5.6.27 Development of this open land would result in a poorly located residential scheme and a damaging incursion into the countryside. It is unsuited to residential development, and the land should not be allocated for it.

Recommendation

5.6.28 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

KINGSLEY

INSET MAP 12

Objection

First Deposit

1277/6996 Beazer Strategic Land

Main Issue

Whether land at Sickles Farm should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.29 **Beazer Strategic Land** considers that this 0.57 ha greenfield site is in a sufficiently sustainable location for it to accommodate 15-20 dwellings. It is suggested that a limited amount of dispersal should be allowed in the District in villages like Kingsley, especially as here where there is a good range of services. This is considered to be consistent with PPG 7, and now presumably with PPS 7, concerning support for local services.

5.6.30 The built-up area is somewhat scattered but it contains some services and facilities. The Kingsley Centre includes a small shop, post office and community centre, and there is the Business Park, a church and public house. There is only one main bus service, the No 13 between Alton-Bordon-Liphook. Document CD7/7 describes the weekday times as *irregular*. The last buses from Alton and Liphook Rail Stations to Kingsley leave at 1745 and 1543 hrs respectively, and this limited frequency and span is not a realistic option for regular commuting to work and for other purposes. Hence I do not regard Kingsley as a local service centre. Inevitably, more development here would lead to the greater reliance upon the private car that is contrary to Government policy set out in PPS 7.

5.6.31 The land adjoins, but is beyond, the SPB. To its east and west is residential development, and to its south is a car park. There are good views across it to the north to the countryside. Its width and openness relate it more to the countryside than to the built up area. Indeed, it is part of the countryside that should be safeguarded for the sake of its open character. And as the Local Plan will identify sufficient land for housing, the allocation of this site would result in unnecessary encroachment into, and damage to, the countryside and the attractive rural setting of this village.

Recommendation

5.6.32 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

ROPLEY AND ROPLEY DEAN

INSET MAPS 15 & 16

Objections

First Deposit

7/5006	The Conham Trust
31/5043	Miss H A Butler
209/5227	Agent – Mr Newman

Main Issue

Whether lands at Ropley and Ropley Dean should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.6.33 Ropley has a limited range of local services and facilities. They include a village hall, recreation ground, post office, shop and primary school. Ropley Dean is a more isolated settlement with even fewer services that include a shop, garage and a doctor’s surgery. Access from it to the better range at Ropley can be gained by walking along a country lane with no footways or street lighting, and crossing the busy A31 with its fast moving traffic. There is little by way of local jobs.
- 5.6.34 Public transport is limited. The 64 and 64X Winchester-Guildford buses provide no more than a generally hourly service with a few more during morning and evening peak periods. There is only a two hourly service on Sundays. The Watercress Line is mainly a leisure and enthusiasts’ railway and not suited to regular journeys. Prospective residents would inevitably rely almost entirely on private transport, contrary to Government policy. These settlements, individually and in combination, display limited sustainability and so significant additional residential development should not be steered to them. I judge the Objectors’ proposals in that context.
- 5.6.35 **The Conham Trust** identifies 2 sites, one in Ropley and one in Ropley Dean. Its Ropley land is a large and rectangular area of about 2.5 ha at the rear of properties on Vicarage Road. To the north and west it adjoins open countryside, and a recreation ground to the east. It is relatively well screened from the main road by mature hedgerows and deciduous trees. But it sits atop a ridge and development would be highly visible from the north due to its open and sloping nature. Its development would result in a large and harmful incursion of the built up area into open and attractive countryside which would be especially damaging. This is another compelling reason for rejecting the Objector’s proposal.
- 5.6.36 **The Conham Trust, Mr Newman and Miss Butler** promote sites at Ropley Dean at the edge of the settlement. One is behind residential development at Dean Acre and for the most part adjoins existing development to the south and west, a road to the east and a field boundary to the north. The larger site extends as far north as the railway land, the

same road to the east and residential development to the south. Both sites rise gently northwards. Their extent and openness gives them a greater affinity with the countryside than the main built up area. Again, development upon them would be prominent, intrusive and damaging. Either individually, or together, schemes for them would be out of proportion and scale with the existing built-up area. This is far from being a logical rounding-off of that area.

5.6.37 In none of these cases does the offer of affordable housing in these settlements of limited sustainability or any support that local services might derive from them, justify the development envisaged. As with so many of these small settlements, proposals for significant growth should be resisted on grounds of limited range of services, its inevitable consequences of more trips by private car and damage to the countryside that should be protected for its intrinsic character. Those considerations apply here; no site should be allocated.

Recommendation

5.6.38 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SELBORNE

INSET MAP 17

*See, Selborne spreads her boldest beauties round
The varied valley, and the mountain ground,
Wildly majestic!*

Gilbert White (1720-1793) – Invitation to Selborne

Objections

First Deposit

696/5885	Mr P Andrew
1542/7374	Mr W Murphy
1543/7375	J Murphy
1544/7377	A M P Murphy
1548/7388	D Murphy
1550/7403	R & L Hooper
1551/7410	Mr D Ronare
1553/7416	Mr R Hoare
1554/7418	A Hawker
1556/7422	Mr H Janson
1557/7423	Mrs F B Janson
1558/7424	Mr P Kirby
1559/7426	Mrs J Howe
1560/7427	Mrs K Hawtin
1592/7511	S Janson
1593/7513	S Sandy
1594/7516	C Lane
1825/7885	E Janson
1883/9685	Mr H Janson

Second Deposit SD5.04431

1696/14898	Village Green Plc
------------	-------------------

Main Issue

Whether Selborne is a sufficiently sustainable settlement to qualify for significant additional residential development, particularly at Barnfield and on land at Burlands Field.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.39 Selborne is one of the most attractive villages in the County. It is a historic settlement of great charm. Its setting, between steeply rising wooded hangers and the slopes that run

down to the Oakhangar Stream, is exquisite and dramatic. The whole of its core and many of the surrounding fields that contribute to its setting are in the Conservation Area. The village is in the AONB.

- 5.6.40 The village is some 7 km south of Alton. It has a primary school, a shop and 2 public houses. There is no railway station and the bus service is poor. Bus frequency varies between one and 2 an hour to Alton and one and 3 to Petersfield. The service to Alton is supplemented on school and college days. Even with an increased service during term time, any new residents would be heavily reliant on the larger settlements within and without the District. That means even more traffic on the roads. Village amenities are not, therefore, sufficient to provide for a significant housing allocation. **Village Green Plc** argues that Selborne should have additional housing because it is as sustainable as the settlements of Binsted and Liss Forest, where the SDDP allocates land. I agree that there is a broad similarity in terms of limited sustainability and, because neither of these settlements performs well in this important respect, I recommend that the proposed allocations for them be deleted.
- 5.6.41 All settlements in the District can show an often acute need for affordable housing, but my conclusions on the distribution of housing in Chapter 5.2 of my Report apply with equal force to Selborne. I deal with the claim, also made with respect to Selborne, that a development would assist in sustaining local services like the school and shop. More housing would be bound to contribute something to patronage and a school roll, but it is unlikely to prove a decisive factor in the long-term. In my judgement, supermarkets are likely to continue to offer a wider range of goods and become increasingly attractive to shoppers in so doing. The present limited degree of sustainability is a more forceful consideration than the small amount of additional support for local services that might be expected as a result of residential development on either or both of the Omission Sites. Alone, it is enough to reject the Objectors' proposals.
- 5.6.42 **Village Green Plc** promotes a development on Barnfield, a paddock of about 1.9 ha at the southern end of the village. It is outside the SPB but in the Conservation Area. The proposal is for some 21 dwellings on 0.69 ha with 1.21 ha of open space. Affordable housing would be included. SDDP Policy C1, which I recommend should be incorporated in a modified Policy GS3, proscribes against development that would fail to respect sense of place or local distinctiveness. Development proposals, it says, must pay particular attention to the East Hampshire Countryside Design Summary (CDS) (Document CD14/1) and Village Design Statements (VDS). The site is described on the Conservation Area Map as *Under the Hill*. It is one of a sequence of visually prominent open spaces between The Hangers and the built-up parts of the village. The CDS lays down a number of design guides. Briefly, it requires development to reflect the traditional form of settlements, recognise how they relate to their landscape, maintain the linear form of settlements by limiting backland development and by being of small scale, informal and dispersed in small groups.
- 5.6.43 The VDS (Document CD23/4) rightly identifies the open spaces in the village as important in reflecting the way in which the village has developed over the centuries. It describes them as *very desirable features which need to be protected as they contribute much to the sense of rural tranquillity even when viewed from a busy road*. Whilst both CDS and VDS are no more than Supplementary Planning Guidance, their detailed guidance appears to me to accord with the objectives of SDDP Policies C1 and C2, the latter being concerned with the AONB. The 21 dwellings would occupy about one third

of the paddock and, although partially hidden from Selborne Road, they would be prominent in views across the field from the west. The development would result in a major incursion and loss of open space within a meadow that in its open state is important to the attractive rural setting of this historic village. The destruction of the pastoral quality and integrity of this open space would be unfortunate, to put it mildly. The AONB would be damaged, and development would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 5.6.44 It is implied that the development, if hidden, would be acceptable. That presumes that unobtrusiveness is all that matters. It ignores the impact that a scheme would have on the character of the open space. I reject that approach, as does PPS 7, because it would fail to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty. The development would be neither small scale nor dispersed in small groups as the VDS recommends. I also find that the Objector's conclusions on the *existing form of building line* along Selborne Road (Drawing HED408.9) to be ill-conceived. If a notional building line is to be used, I consider that the Council's evidence in Document PR94/1696 (Document 2, Plan 2) is closer to the normal interpretation of the term. That, again, tells against the suggested development of the Omission Site.
- 5.6.45 The offer to the National Trust to manage the site as a meadow to improve the attractiveness of the village for visitors could be made irrespective of any development proposal. It does not have to be conditional on part of the field being developed for housing. That option would be too high a price to pay for the damage inflicted on this delightful historic village.
- 5.6.46 **Mr Kirby, Mrs Janson and Mr Janson** promote an allocation for 28-39 dwellings on land at Burlands Field. The site, roughly triangular in shape, lies at the north of the village. It is outside the SPB and the Selborne Conservation Area, but adjoins both of them. It is an open field, defined by a sunken lane and hedge to the north, a tall hedge along Selborne Road and brick wall and close boarded fence to the south and west where it adjoins low density detached dwellings, one of which (The Grange) is a Listed Building. The sunken lane is a public footpath, and another footpath crosses the site from Selborne Road to the west.
- 5.6.47 The Objectors cite the opportunity to redress the imbalance towards larger dwellings in Selborne, but this consideration applies not only here. Certainly when compared with the national average, the District as a whole displays a greater emphasis on larger houses and bungalows than on flats and terraced houses (Document CD16/8, Appendix 2, page 2). I accept the advantages of redressing this imbalance, particularly in the drive towards balanced communities and in securing the efficient use of land for housing. I am not persuaded in this case, however, that the contribution towards these objectives is justified. It is outweighed by the limited sustainability of Selborne, the implications that arise therefrom and the severe environmental damage that would be caused.
- 5.6.48 Although the site is not within the Conservation Area, development here would adversely affect its setting and that of the village. The VDS refers to Burlands Field as Culvers Croft; it stresses the importance of open spaces, describing the way in which they extend into the village in the form of pasture. It identifies Culvers Croft among those that should be protected. As with Barnfield, the VDS recognises the open spaces as very desirable features which need protection because they contribute to the sense of rural tranquillity even when viewed from a busy road. The scenic value of these open spaces deserves the

strongest possible protection to ensure that the very special qualities of this historic and attractive village are preserved.

- 5.6.49 The site lies in the valley of the Oakhanger Stream and is part of the natural and historic rural edge to Selborne. Development would take place on the lower slope of the valley, leaving about half of the eastern part of the site as open space. My reasons for rejecting this proposal are similar to those applying at Barnfield. Development here would destroy the integrity of this sensitive and important open space. The land might not be readily visible from Selborne Road, but it has attractive views within it, towards the edge of the village and beyond it. People using the footpath that crosses it have a ready appreciation of the happy juxtaposition of countryside and village.
- 5.6.50 That enjoyable rural experience of walking along the path would be replaced by a more urban or suburban one. The present views and character need to be retained and protected in their entirety. Because the site plays an important role in the countryside setting of the village, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The introduction of even medium density housing adjacent to the low-density development on the edge of the village and Conservation Area would create an incongruous neighbour in this sensitive location that would be harmful to the setting of both. Vehicle access would be from a new roundabout at the northern end of the site. This would be another discordant, urban feature that would harm the attractive northern approach to the village, much detracting from its rural atmosphere.
- 5.6.51 The Objectors will note my recommendations elsewhere in my Report that allocations at Binsted, Lower Farringdon, Bentley and Medstead, settlements to which they refer, be deleted. A common theme in their rejection is their limited sustainability and the inevitable increase in traffic on country roads ill-suited to accommodate it. Serious environmental damage is another compelling reason.
- 5.6.52 Rejection of the Omission Sites means that there is no cause to extend the SPB to include them.

Recommendation

- 5.6.53 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

BRAMSHOTT

INSET MAP 20

Objection

First Deposit

752/6147 Mr G Williamson

Main Issue

Whether land at the southern end of the village should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.54 This land is located between the southern edge of the SPB and the A3 road. Although it includes a wide, tarmac drive and a dwelling, its allocation would result in the consolidation of development hereabouts and its extension into a locality whose prevailing openness gives it a greater affinity with the countryside than with the mainly built-up area. The last and southernmost of the row of dwellings along the eastern side of Church Road marks the obvious extent of the SPB. There is no cause to extend it into the rural surroundings of the village and towards the busy, noisy A3 road.

5.6.55 There are few services and facilities in Bramshott. Some people may be willing to walk to the nearest amenities in Liphook, but my judgement is that they would rely almost entirely on private transport to travel to larger settlements in and beyond East Hampshire that offer a greater range of services and employment. The land should not be allocated.

Recommendation

5.6.56 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

GRAYSHOTT

INSET MAP 21

Objections

First Deposit

442/5550	Mr D Parvin
750/6436	Mr G F Page
750/7680	Mr G F Page
1670/7705	Mr R James
817/7869	The Classic Home Company Ltd
817/8317	The Classic Home Company Ltd

Main Issue

Whether lands at Kingswood Firs, Vale Wood Lane and Apley House should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.57 Grayshott has a good range of services and facilities for a village of its size. They include a variety of shops, including a Tesco Express and Co-operative Welcome, 2 banks, a primary school, church, public house, surgery, library and village hall. There are 2 bus services; the No 18 Aldershot-Farnham-Bordon-Grayshott-Hindhead-Haslemere service is generally half-hourly in each direction during weekdays with an irregular evening service and a 2 hourly service at weekends (Document CD7/7). The No 294 Lindford-Grayshott-Liphook-Rake-Hill Brow-Sheet-Petersfield bus provides a dial-a-bus Wednesday service. Again, this is a better service than in most villages of its size. Even so, the general level of services and facilities in Grayshott is lower than in those settlements where baseline and reserve sites should be found. I have in mind especially Petersfield, Alton and Whitehill/Bordon, settlements with more employment opportunities. Owing also to the impact upon the surrounding attractive countryside, I do not consider that this village could suitably accommodate significantly more residential development.

5.6.58 Although **Mr Parvin's** land at Kingswood Firs is located between a low density residential area to the east and 4 dwellings to the west, it is an extensive open area of nearly 3 ha (7 acres). It has a closer affinity with the countryside than with the mainly built-up area, and its allocation would result in a substantial extension of that area and a damaging incursion into the countryside. There is neither need on grounds of housing requirements nor any other justification for it. Nor is there any need to extend Kingswood Firs in a northerly direction into open land as **Mr James** suggests. There is a clear edge to this existing residential area along its northern extent, and this suggestion would result in a damaging intrusion into the attractive open land between 2 main parts of the village.

- 5.6.59 Similar considerations apply to **Mr Page's** and **The Classic Home Company Ltd's** sites at Vale Wood Lane. Again, their openness is a vital part of the attractive rural setting of this village and it should be protected. The presumably illegal dumping of old vehicles and other materials is no justification for extending the village into its surrounding countryside.
- 5.6.60 The grounds of Apley House are open and this, with their extent, relates them more to the countryside than to the main built-up area. There is no cause to allocate them for development. It is often the case that a SPB does not follow a physical feature, but the alternative is to draw this boundary too generously and thereby invite development on a site and/or in a location ill-suited for it. There is no reason in this case why the SPB here should not form a readily defensible extent of the built-up area.
- 5.6.61 None of these sites should be allocated. The countryside here should be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, in accordance with national policy.

Recommendation

- 5.6.62 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

PASSFIELD COMMON

INSET MAP 24

Objections

First Deposit

765/6955 Mr & Mrs B Lanaghan
1908/8170 Agent – Kris Mitra Associates

Latest Proposed Change

Pre-Inquiry Change PIC009.2 which excludes Thornhill Fields from the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB).

Main Issue

Whether, owing to its location, its range of services and employment and other relevant matters, Passfield Common is a suitable settlement for a significant amount of residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.63 Passfield Common is a small settlement of 2 main parts located on each side of the B3004 road between Lindford, Whitehill, Bordon and Liphook. It is about 4 km from the A3 road and thence to Petersfield, Portsmouth, Guildford and other towns and cities. The main services include a small shop/post office/off-licence that, as I noted at the time of my inspection, is closed during the lunch hour and after 1730 hrs on weekdays, and a vibrant and well-equipped Social Club of which most local people appear to be members. The Agreed Statement shows that the nearest primary and secondary schools, supermarket and bank are well over the 2 km distance to which PPG 13 describes as having the greatest potential for travel by foot. This provision does not amount to a good range of conveniently accessible local services. That means that most people would be likely to rely on other places for most day to day requirements in terms of food and other goods, education, leisure and other services.

5.6.64 There is a wide range of employment for a settlement of its limited size, with about 300-400 jobs. Their nearest concentration is at the Passfield Business Centre, opposite the land to which **Mr and Mrs Lanaghan’s** objection refers. It is within the SPB. There is another employment area within walking distance of the main parts of Passfield at Passfield Mill. This latter area includes a gymnasium. The former Passfield Oak public house is now used as an office. I am told, however, that drinks can still be purchased at the Social Club. Some prospective residents might have local jobs and walk to their places of employment, but I would expect the majority to be employed where there are more opportunities in, for example, Petersfield, Portsmouth, Guildford and London. Any significant development would again, therefore, be contrary to Government policies of reducing the need to travel and especially by car.

- 5.6.65 There are buses to and from the villages in this part of the District. The submitted timetables show that the No 13 bus service between Alton and Liphook calls at the former Passfield Oak at varying intervals. During Mondays-Fridays, there are 7-8 buses in each direction. The first bus to Liphook rail station is at 0732 hrs, but the second is not for more than 3 hours, at 1044 hrs. There are then further intervals of one to 2 hours or so. Some of this service is operated under contract to the Hampshire County Council, and so its continuation is perhaps more a matter of speculation than are other services. There is no service on a Saturday or Sunday. Buses travelling in the opposite direction to Alton College and/or rail station provide a broadly similar frequency, or infrequency, of service.
- 5.6.66 The No 223, 994 and 995 buses to the Liphook Bohunt School operate only on school days. There is a circular rail link bus service to and from Liphook Rail Station that calls at all recognised stopping places on the route, including the former Passfield Oak public house. Essentially, this is a Monday-Friday hourly service. No doubt these buses are much valued by those that use them, especially perhaps by people commuting by train to various towns and cities. Even so, the 2001 Census shows that only 4% of people aged 16-74 in employment and living in East Hampshire travel to work by train. For Liphook, whose parish includes Passfield Common, it is 8%. Therefore the importance of this rail link as a contributor to the sustainability of the settlement must not be exaggerated. Nor should a bus service with a frequency of 2 hours or so, or one that operates only on school days, be regarded as good.
- 5.6.67 And so public transport here is not good. It is not as good as at Hogmoor Road Bordon, a site that can be distinguished further by its generally sorry state that cries out for redevelopment. Even if the bus service were improved as a result of the recent construction of 14 (12 net) dwellings in the settlement and another 30-40, a doubtful assumption, its chances of tempting people from their cars to travel to Liphook, Petersfield and other places are remote. The result would be yet more people travelling by car, often on rural roads and through villages ill-suited to take yet more traffic.
- 5.6.68 **Mr and Mrs Lanaghan's** property, Thornhill Fields, was excluded from the SPB in the FDDP, included within it at the SDDP stage and then excluded by way of PIC009.2. It is a large detached house set back from Lynchborough Road in large grounds of about 1.3 ha, and so accords with the definition in PPG 3 Annex C of previously-developed land. The less erudite observer, however, would note its mainly open character and, notwithstanding the more dispersed pattern of development with 5-6 dwellings to the south-west, reasonably conclude that it had a closer affinity with the rural surroundings than with the built up area.
- 5.6.69 Its status in PPG 3 terms is an important point in favour of redevelopment. But it is not the only consideration. Its suitability as an allocation must be assessed against the criteria set out in paragraph 31 of that Guidance. Owing mainly to a limited range of local services and poor accessibility to those at larger settlements, I conclude that Passfield Common is not a sufficiently sustainable settlement to warrant development of the scale envisaged. It is not previously-developed urban land that would benefit from redevelopment. The precise score in the sustainability matrix does not alter that conclusion.
- 5.6.70 There are some mature trees in the garden, but most of the vegetation in the form of other trees and thick hedges at and near the boundaries. In other words, the land is

substantially enclosed. Assuming PPG 3 densities, it could accommodate 30-40 or so dwellings. Lynchborough Road benefits from footways and lighting on both sides, is 4.8-5.5 m wide and serves the Business Centre. Whilst it would be appreciably busier during peak periods, I do not consider that it would result in so much danger and inconvenience on the public highway that an allocation of the land should be precluded on this count. The Highways Authority accepts that, in principle, a suitable access could be provided, and I have no reason to dispute that advice. The development could contribute towards improvements of footways in the locality. But these matters, like affordable housing which should generally be provided in settlements with more facilities, do not outweigh the objection in principle on grounds of limited sustainability.

- 5.6.71 A comprehensive Shadow Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken to investigate the possible effects of the development on the nearby Wealden Heath Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA) and the candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC). Inevitably, there is much uncertainty in assessing impacts arising from such sources as trampling, accidental and deliberately lit fires on heathland and predation by cats. These risks exist at present, and there is no compelling evidence to show that the integrity of these important nature conservation interests is being undermined. Whether another 30-40 dwellings would tip the balance against them would probably much depend upon the value that occupants placed upon these interests, their sense of responsibility and measures of mitigation.
- 5.6.72 I do have serious reservations on this matter, mainly because these Areas are no more than about 30 m at their closest parts from the Omission Site. But this is not a crucial matter because I place a good deal more emphasis upon other issues of sustainability. Had Passfield Common been a sufficiently sustainable development and had there been an intense need for a significant amount of residential development there, these interests could have been outweighed. But that is not the case. And so, irrespective of the effects on these nature conservation interests, I do not uphold **Mr and Mrs Lanaghan's** objection.
- 5.6.73 Planning permission was granted, subject to a legal agreement, in February 2003 for the above mentioned 14 dwellings. The land concerned is better sited within the built up area than is Thornhill Fields, and since then the Government has continued to promote sustainable communities and the principle that residential development should be located near a good range of services and be well-related to public transport. This decision does not therefore oblige me to recommend the allocation of the Omission Site. Thornhill Fields should not be included in the SPB.
- 5.6.74 Similar considerations apply to the objection lodged by **Kris Mitra Associates** concerning land at Passfield Road. In fact, owing to the substantial extent of this open land, about 16.5 ha, even more so. The land is well contained by trees and hedgerows but neither that nor the mixture and type of uses proposed outweighs the unsuitability of Passfield Common for the scale of development envisaged.

Recommendation

5.6.75 I recommend that the SDDP be modified in accordance with the Latest Proposed Change (PIC009.2).

GREATHAM

INSET MAP 27

Objections

First Deposit

1905/8167 Eurotec International Plc
1864/10500 Defence Estates

Second Deposit SD5/04415

3887/14967 Mr P Catt

Main Issue

Whether land at the former Silver Birch Inn, Liss Forest Nursery, Longmoor Road and at the rear of the Church should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.76 Greatham has a limited range of services and facilities. The main ones are a shop/post office, Church and a public house. Trading has ceased at The Silver Birch Inn and at a 'specialist' shop. The No 38 bus between Aldershot and Portsmouth provides an hourly service. This is not of sufficient frequency to entice many people away from the greater convenience of their cars, especially as the main employment opportunities are in larger settlements in and outside East Hampshire. This would all too often result in commuting. This is not a village where significant additional residential development should be encouraged, and this is the context within which I assess these Objections.

5.6.77 **Eurotec International Plc** puts forward for housing a 1.5 ha site that includes the former Silver Birch Inn, part of its curtilage (which should be included in the SPB) and land to the west of it. It suggests that the land, which extends in a westward direction behind existing development on the A325 (Petersfield Road), could accommodate about 45 dwellings. The majority of the site is located in the AONB. Its extent and openness relates it more to the countryside than to the main built-up area and there is no justification to extend the village into this especially protected countryside. The offer of such benefits as pedestrian and cycle links to other parts of Greatham and improvements to bus stops and better public transport information does not outweigh the damage to the rural setting of the village. Moreover, this scale of development would result in a relatively large increase in population for Greatham, the majority no doubt relying on shopping, employment and other attractions elsewhere.

5.6.78 **Mr Catt** says that the 2.3 ha Liss Forest Nursery site should be included within the Settlement Policy Boundary and allocated as a Reserve Site for housing. This land lies between the School to the south and Bakers Field to the north. It includes a dwelling as well as glasshouses and various ancillary buildings that support the horticultural use that,

in long-established planning terms, is included within the definition of agriculture. For the most part, it is open in character. This openness, its use and its significant extent along the Petersfield Road frontage, persuade me that this land has more in common with the countryside than with the mainly built-up area. It should be neither allocated for development nor should the SPB be modified to include it.

5.6.79 The **Defence Estates** suggests that the SPB at Longmoor Road be extended to produce a natural rounding-off of the settlement in this area. I conclude in Chapter 2 of my Report that circumstances do not warrant such a modification to the SDDP.

5.6.80 Land at the rear of the Church is open and part of the attractive rural setting of the village. It is in the AONB. There is no cause to extend the built-up area here and to intrude into this protected countryside.

Recommendation

5.6.81 I recommend that no modification be made to SDDP.

LANGRISH

INSET MAP 30

Objection

First Deposit

1695/9265 Tooling Products Ltd

Main Issue

Whether the Objector's land should be allocated for mixed use development and a SPB be defined around this part of Langrish.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.82 The Objector considers that its 1.3 ha site could accommodate about 20 dwellings and 10,000 sq ft of Class B1 office/light industrial units. It says that this is a sustainable brownfield site close to a bus stop for buses to Petersfield, Southampton, Arlesford and Winchester. But Langrish has few facilities; there is a church but no shop. The nearest school is in Stroud and not within convenient walking distance for children.

5.6.83 There are 2 main bus services, the Nos 7 and 67. The No 7 between Petersfield and Southampton provides a mainly 2 hour service on weekdays to both destinations. The No 67 provides a generally hourly service to both Petersfield and Winchester. No doubt these buses are important to those people who use them, but I do not consider that they are of sufficient frequency to attract much of the additional potential patronage from the proposed residential development. Once again, as with these small villages, there would be yet more reliance upon private transport, contrary to Government policy.

5.6.84 Policy IB4 seeks to retain those industrial and business uses that provide local jobs. The Council suggests, and I agree, that if the Company wishes to relocate its business and can show convincing and overriding reasons why part of the industrial use could be lost with little disadvantage, the matter could be given more detailed attention with an application for planning permission. Material considerations would include the location of site and settlement in the AONB.

5.6.85 The FDDP included a SPB for that part of the village at the junction with the A272 road. The SDDP deletes it on the basis that there is no recognisable core to a settlement that consists of little more than groups of linear development in a rural area lacking a sufficient range of services. I agree, and therefore conclude that there are no grounds for defining a SPB and hence for including the Omission Site within one. Location, lack of services and the inevitable consequences of both demonstrate that this is not a sufficiently sustainable settlement for a development of the scale proposed.

Recommendation

5.6.86 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

STEEP

INSET MAP 33

Objection

First Deposit

1634/7618 Mr R Saunders

Main Issue

Whether any land between Durwood Wood, Adhurst and Westmark should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.87 **Mr Saunders** suggests that approximately 8.1 ha of land in this locality should be considered, in part or whole, for residential development, including luxury homes. There is an OS reference, but precise boundaries are not defined. Some of the land appears to be in West Sussex which is off my watch.

5.6.88 Land bordered by the B2070, the A272 and the County boundary is in the AONB. It is open countryside and is mainly arable use. It is a good way from the main built up area of Sheet in both visual terms and in distance to even the most basic services and facilities. There is a bus service of limited frequency, but it is highly likely that any new residents here would depend almost entirely on their cars for travelling for usual day to day requirements.

5.6.89 Residential development here should be resisted for all the usual reasons of limited sustainability, undue dependence upon private transport and intrusion into the countryside that enjoys especial protection as part of the AONB. There is no reason to overturn Government policies on these matters.

Recommendation

5.6.90 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

STROUD

INSET MAP 34

Objections

First Deposit

139/5146	Mr N Wright
744/6135	C Wright
965/10315	Mr W A Morgan

Main Issue

Whether land at the former brickworks between Ramsdean Road and North Stroud Lane and a site adjoining the Seven Stars Public House should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.6.91 Stroud has few local jobs. Its small range of amenities include the Langrish County Primary School, a village hall, a public house, garage and a small area of public open space. There is a bus every hour or so to Petersfield and Winchester, but such limited frequency does little to encourage more use of it. As with so many of these small villages, any additional residents would have to rely all too much upon larger settlements for most of their day to day needs, and the obvious means of transport to them would be the private car. Stroud is not sufficiently sustainable to qualify for any significant increase in residential development. I deal with the Objections on that basis.
- 5.6.92 **Mr N Wright and C Wright** consider that previously-developed land at the former Brickworks, subsequently used as a Council rubbish tip to fill in the excavated clay pits, would be suitable for residential development. The Council accepts that it does have some advantages for this purpose, including its previously-developed status, but rightly points out that this is a rural settlement with few amenities. To that extent, it performs poorly against the tests in PPG 3 paragraph 31. I agree with that assessment.
- 5.6.93 **Mr W A Morgan** suggests that land next to The Seven Stars Public House could take some additional dwellings towards Structure Plan requirements. But similar considerations apply. In particular, its development would result in the loss of a large and attractive area of open countryside that is part of the dispersed pattern and character of the village.
- 5.6.94 There is no need to allocate either of these Omission Sites. My recommendations should ensure sufficient land for housing to meet Structure Plan requirements, and at larger settlements with more convenient access to a wider range of amenities. Nor is there any need to countenance the loss of countryside that enjoys the special protection of its natural beauty by virtue of its being in an AONB.

Recommendation

5.6.95 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

LASHAM

INSET MAP 40

Objections

First Deposit

1580/7453	Mrs A D Elliott
1707/8976	Winchester College
1875/10162	Swan Hill Homes

Main Issue

Whether Lasham is a sufficiently sustainable settlement to accommodate significantly more residential development, and particularly at Camoys Mead, at the former Station Yard and west of Tapestry Cottage.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.96 Lasham is a village of some 80 dwellings and 180 inhabitants. It is located in the north of the District between Alton (7 km) and Basingstoke (9 km). Its historic core is designated as a Conservation Area. There is a church and public house, but no school or shop. Buses leave for Alton and Basingstoke during the week at 2-3 hour intervals, with extra ones on school days. A 0.6 ha site to the rear of Camoys Mead is proposed for public recreation use. There is a business park on the nearby former airfield, about 0.6 km from the village centre. Lasham has no SPB, a correct reflection of its limited built-up area, its lack of services and poor public transport. Inevitably, any new residents would depend on their cars for virtually every need of a modern household, including education, shopping, leisure, recreation and employment. The village is not sufficiently sustainable to accommodate any significant addition to its stock of dwellings, and that is the context within which I consider the Objections.

5.6.97 **Swan Hill Homes** promotes a site to the south of Camoys Mead, a scheme for whose development would include some 10 dwellings, including 30% or so affordable homes. It comprises development of the area allocated for open space and what are described as improvements around the village pond. The Council acknowledges that there is an identified need for affordable homes in the Parish and that the proposal for open space is a long-standing one. The site is an integral part of the attractive countryside setting of the village. Any development here would be conspicuous and, by introducing housing into this rural landscape, would detract from this setting and that of the Conservation Area. This damaging incursion into the countryside is another compelling reason to reject the Objector's proposal.

5.6.98 Any need for affordable housing has the prospect of being provided as a rural exception scheme in accordance with national policy in PPG 3 Annex B. Arguably, Lasham is an even more unsuitable place for this type of housing than it is for general market accommodation. Almost entire reliance upon one or 2 cars would not be a sensible

imposition to place on families with low income. I agree with the Council that affordable housing should be provided as close as possible to the wider range of facilities of the larger settlements, and preferably within or adjoining them. The Objector cites the housing allocation at East Meon as being of similar circumstances. But development there has already taken place and there are more services including a school and a shop. There is limited similarity and no justification.

5.6.99 To conclude on this Objection, I do not consider that the provision of open space and the carrying out of environmental improvements to the village pond and its surroundings justifies this scale of residential development in a settlement of such limited sustainability. Alternative means should be sought.

5.6.100 **Mrs Elliot** suggests the 0.36 ha or so site of the former Station Yard to accommodate 2 or 3 detached houses or a larger number of smaller dwellings. It is used for open storage and lies in open countryside about 1 km from the village centre. The Council accepts that it is previously-developed land, but it is not in a sustainable location for reasons outlined above. It is not suitable for even a small housing development. There appears to be no reason why it should not continue in its existing use, in accordance with SDDP Policy IB4. The land would benefit from effective screening along its southern boundary, and its present exposure has the unfortunate effect of advertising the presence of the use. These unsatisfactory circumstances do not, however, justify the Objector's proposal.

5.6.101 **Winchester College** promotes a 2.8 ha site to the west of Tapestry Cottage on the grounds that insufficient allocations have been made in the SDDP to meet the Structure Plan housing requirements. I comment on that point in Chapter 5.1 of my Report, but any insufficiency does not justify the allocation of land for housing in villages of limited sustainability, like Lasham. The proposal could double the size of the local housing stock. Development at this scale and in this position would overwhelm and detract from the character and appearance of this attractive village and its delightful rural setting.

Recommendation

5.6.102 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.

SHALDEN

INSET MAP 41

Objection

First Deposit

661/5929 Mr B Dibley

Main Issue

Whether land at Greenwood Farm should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

5.6.103 **Mr Dibley** suggests this 26.5 hectare greenfield site currently in agricultural use could accommodate a new “village environment” comprising residential and retail areas and public open space. Affordable housing would be included. But the land has little physical association with the village of Shalden and is poorly related to residential areas in the north western parts of Alton, about 2 km distant. The centre of Alton is further away, beyond convenient walking distance along unlit roads with few footways.

5.6.104 There are some dwellings in the locality, mostly large houses in large plots, but this part of the District is countryside with no ready access to day to day needs. Despite the mix of uses proposed, development at the scale envisaged would intrude into the countryside and would all too often result in more traffic on rural roads as residents travelled to larger settlements for jobs, shopping, leisure, education and other purposes.

5.6.105 There is no need for the proposal. My recommendations should ensure that enough land is allocated to meet Structure Plan requirements on previously-developed and other land in, or close to, larger settlements with a wider range of service and facilities.

Recommendation

5.6.106 I recommend that no modification be made to the SDDP.