



# Hordle Parish Council

*Serving the communities of Tiptoe, Hordle and Everton*

**Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on Tuesday 6 September 2022 at the Pavilion, Vaggs Lane, Hordle.**

Councillor Name		Councillor Name	
Maggie Hill (Chair)	P	Nigel Ferguson (Vice Chair)	P
Sue Knight	P	David Horne	P
Floss Morgan	P	Colleen Sambrook	P
Carol Rook	P	Ivor Spreadbury	P
Valerie James	P	Ben Sandford	P

P = Present.

*In attendance: Sarah Pitt (Clerk and RFO), Chris Halling (Deputy Clerk and minutes) County and District Cllr Carpenter, District Cllr Reid, 3 representatives from Bargate Homes 1 member of the press and 21 Members of the Public (MOP).*

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked all those who had submitted comments to NFDC and those who were attending this evening. She explained that the purpose of the meeting was to allow the Parish Council to submit a view on these applications to the District Council which would take into account views of residents. She reflected that a number of residents had concerns about speeding in the Parish and called on people to volunteer to become part of the Speed watch team of volunteers which is now being headed up by Councillor Morgan.

**1. Apologies for absence.** None

**2. Declarations of interest in items on the agenda.** None.

**3. Planning**

**Planning Application 21/11731 : SS9 Land East Of Everton Road, Hordle.**

*Residential development of site for 97 dwellings, open space, Alternative Natural Green Space (ANRG) vehicular access via Everton Road.*

**Planning Application 22/10958: Land East of Everton Road, Hordle.**

*Application for erection of bat and Owl Mitigation Structure within proposed ANRG ( Alternative Natural Green Space ) of application 21/11731.*

The Parish Clerk explained that the Parish Council does not have the powers to make a decision on a planning application. It is one of many consultees from whom the Planning Authority – New Forest District Council - requests a comment on planning applications. The Parish Council can only make a recommendation based on one of five statutory planning responses to which comments can be added.

The recommendations are:

- PAR1: Recommend PERMISSION but would accept the decision reached by the Officers under their delegated powers.
- PAR2: Recommend REFUSAL but would accept the decision reached by the Officers under their delegated powers.
- PAR3: Recommend PERMISSION.
- PAR4: Recommend REFUSAL.

- PAR5: Happy to accept the decision reached by the Officers under their delegated powers

Certain matters, for the purpose of this discussion and our submission, are officially deemed not to be material planning considerations. These include: a loss of outlook or view, a change in value to surrounding properties, the impact on health provision and land being taken out of Green Belt.

SS9 land was taken out of Green Belt as part of NFDC's Local Plan in 2016. There will be development here – the Parish Council is concerned to get the best development possible for the residents of the village.

The matters which can be considered are:

- Planning history of the site (if relevant);
- Impact on residential amenity of adjacent neighbouring properties, in respect of light, visual intrusion and privacy;
- Creating healthy and safe communities through good design;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area, including countryside landscape, character scenic and amenity value:
- Impact on ecology and in particular protected species;
- Impact on highway safety, including matters relevant to car parking;
- Impact on flood risk on, or near the site;
- Impact on provision of open space, sport and recreation, community services and infrastructure;
- Impact on public health and safety (land contamination, air quality, hazardous substances)

The Parish Council views will go to NFDC's Planning Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> October on Appletree Court, Lyndhurst and Councillors will attend to speak on this application.

The Chair then spoke saying that before the Parish Council considers these applications it is worth reiterating that the SS9 site is no longer Green Belt land and has been agreed in the Local Plan for development for the past five years. We cannot object to there being any development at all, only the detail of that development to achieve the best possible outcome.

Following an Extraordinary Meeting here in February this year, the Parish Council submitted a comprehensive response to an earlier application taking into account the concerns of residents and councillors. The recommendation was for refusal for numerous reasons. This document is available on the NFDC website and the Parish Council website.

Objections to the access onto the Silver Street and the implications of a through road being used as a rat run, are no longer relevant as HCC Highways have objected to that access on road safety grounds and it has been withdrawn.

Analysis of the comments submitted for this latest application taken together with the previous comments shows that one of the main areas of concern is the extra traffic which will be generated on Everton Road and surrounding roads which are narrow, the poor condition of those roads and the current speed of vehicles at the upper end of Everton Road. This is supported by the statistics generated by the Speed Indicator Device at that location.

The new access road to the development is considered to be too close to that part of Everton Road which is used for school parking. Our previous submission quoted the traffic hotspots in the village which were highlighted in the Village Design Statement in 2014 and the Local Plan Review in 2016. Also the lack of safe footpaths, cycling options and infrequent public transport.

However, Hampshire Highways state they are satisfied the proposed development would not cause severe impact upon the operation or safety of the local highway network and would therefore recommend no objections to this application, subject to certain obligations and conditions. This includes the pedestrian/cycle access at the southern end of the site which is a key point of access to facilitate wider village connections.

There are many objections to the removal of mature trees, especially for the construction access, which will affect the sylvan appearance of the road. Nevertheless, the NFDC tree officers have not objected to those tree works.

The management of the Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace is of continuing concern as well as the Parish Council having input into the play equipment and other facilities to be provided there. There is a lack of parking for visitors to the ANRG which will be a facility for use by all members of the public not just residents of the development.

There are major concerns regarding the impact on the village, particularly pressure on the local amenities and infrastructure including doctors, dentists and Hordle School where space restraints limit the use of any mitigation money. These were raised in our previous objection to the development. This pressure on infrastructure will be more than doubly increased by the development of the SS8 Hordle Lane site.

Southern Water has objected to the application due to issues with the non-viability of soakaways and insufficient capacity for proposed flow rates if connected to the existing surface water sewer. Even without the second access road there is still a danger of increased flooding on Silver Street from run off from the site.

There are still views that the application is out of character with the rural area and is overdevelopment. There is an enclave of affordable housing at the Silver Street end of the plan which has been flagged to the NFDC's housing team.

Whilst the overall number of 49 affordable homes remains the same, the housing tenure of these homes has changed. This increases the proportion of shared ownership homes (23 units) and reduction of rented homes (9 units) but may not have taken into account the difficulties being faced due to the high cost of energy which will impact on eligibility for mortgages. This is being independently assessed. The remaining affordable housing of 17 units is for social rental.

It is also worth noting that there is another parcel of land that will be forthcoming as part of SS9 but which is not included in this application.

#### **4. Public session for items on the agenda**

A member of the public spoke about traffic on Everton Road saying that there were already issues with parking, access on to Everton Road from side streets; problems which are exacerbated by small rural roads. They asked how this scheme would facilitate extra vehicle movements caused by the new estate traffic and the construction traffic. A representative from Bargate explained that Hampshire Highways had been fully engaged in the discussion at the time that the site was allocated and since then and had agreed mitigation measures that Bargate would need to pay for. He stated that infrastructure mitigation needed to be proportionate to the impact from the number of dwellings. He explained that a traffic survey had been undertaken and traffic flows predicated based on this. Another member of the public asked when the survey had been undertaken and Bargate responded that this information was online. County and District Councillor Carpenter said that County had strict criteria about the surveys requiring that they were carried out over a fixed period and for 24 hours a day including peak times. Other people expressed concerns about

the amount of traffic being generated and the impact on an already difficult situation. A construction transport plan would have to be submitted and agreed with NFDC and standard practice is to avoid school times and provide parking spaces for construction workers on site.

The issue of flooding was raised and it was noted that the Southern Water report had said that the soakaway system was not viable and that the existing sewer did not have additional capacity for surface water. Existing flooding at Cottagers Lane, Silver Street and Everton Road was raised by residents. However, the Bargate representative said that they would work with Southern Water for a solution as Southern Water were obliged to accommodate the new development. He pointed out that there was enough capacity to cope with foul water. He said that the lead flood authority would condition that there should be a solution.

There was a question on parking provision on site and it was confirmed that the development met the newly adopted NFDC parking standards.

Concerns were raised about the loss of mature trees and hedgerows on this site and the suggestion was made that the site entrance could be moved further down Everton Road so that not so many mature oaks would need to be felled and there were better sight lines. Of particular concern was the loss of mature trees to allow a temporary construction entrance. Bargate responded that they would need to apply for works to the trees through the TPO process and that they would be planting additional trees in the ANRG as mitigation as well as paying a financial penalty in the region of £200,000 to HCC for removing their trees.

District Councillor Reid spoke saying that he had added his response to the NFDC website and said that his main areas of concern are:

- Surface water drainage
- TPO trees being removed
- Lack of solar panels and ground source heat pumps on the ANRG
- Lack of rainwater capture and reuse
- Lack of swift boxes and bat boxes
- Strategic sites treated in isolation from each other – no joined up thinking, for example with school places.

The Chair then invited Councillors to express their views and raise any questions.

Councillor Rook asked about the group of affordable houses at the Silver Street end of the development saying she was concerned that it appeared to be segregated from the rest of the estate and was in danger of creating a “them and us” situation. She asked if could it be adjusted so that the affordable houses were spread more evenly throughout the development . Bargate responded that due to the high percentage of affordable homes they were spread across the estate but that in terms of future management and maintenance it was easier to have them grouped together. They felt that they were well mixed in the cul-de-sacs.

Councillor Ferguson asked about the business case for the change of tenure within the affordable housing stock. Bargates confirmed that a viability study had been undertaken alongside the reduction in total numbers.

Councillor Hill raised a concern about the location and isolation of the car park at the Silver Street end. Bargate responded that this had been redesigned as it was originally intended as an access point on to Silver Street but fitted with the NFDC master planning. Concerns were raised about the low level estate fencing and that people could create an access on to Silver Street as the quickest route to village amenities and transport. The Parish Council recommended some barrier planting in this area.

Councillor Spreadbury expressed concerns about lack of lighting on the site as streetlights weren't included in the plan. Bargates confirmed they were carrying out a lighting assessment and looking at bollard type lights and security lights for some areas.

Councillor Horne asked about encouraging other transport methods, walking and cycling and said that the walk to school along the bottom end of Everton Road was extremely difficult. He believed Bargate must address the issue of a safe route to school.

Councillor Sambrook asked why solar panels hadn't been included in the project and Bargate confirmed there would be solar panels on every house and heating would be by air source heat pumps as well as installing electric car charge points.

Councillor Knight asked about parking on site especially when people often had trade vehicles that were parked overnight. Bargate confirmed that the development met the parking standards and any future matters in relation to parking could be taken up by the management company if needed.

The chair brought the discussion to an end and asked for Councillors to make a decision.

**21/11731 Parish 4: We Recommend Refusal** was proposed, seconded and voted on. This was **Resolved 9** for 1 against.

#### **Parish Council response sent to NFDC 9 September 2022**

The Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on these amended plans and is pleased that some earlier concerns have been addressed. However, the Parish Council still recommends that this application is refused on the following grounds:

Many village residents are concerned about the totality of the new developments in Hordle with the increase in population size and loss of a village feel. Although the comments below are specifically in relation to the SS9 application, the Parish Council believes that this development and SS8 together will affect road safety around existing difficult "hot " spots and that there is not the infrastructure to support the totality of these developments.

In addition neighbouring strategic sites in Milford, Brockhills and Pennington will have a negative cumulative effect on many of the issues raised and we ask that the detailed comments below are seen in this context.

**Impact on residential amenity of adjacent neighbouring properties, in respect of light, visual intrusion and privacy.**

The Parish Council and residents are concerned that this development will affect the residential amenity of properties near to this proposed development and in the village. The felling of large established trees will lead to visual intrusion and affect the rural nature of the area. Additional traffic movements will negatively impact neighbouring properties.

***Hordle Village Design Statement ( VDS ) GE02- Setting of the Parish.*** Any changes to buildings or land should respect and seek, wherever possible, to improve the setting of the Parish. Preserving and improving public views onto the countryside will be an important consideration for new development.

***VDS - GBE04- Sympathetic design.*** Future developments should be encouraged to be sympathetic to adjoining development, (including appropriate recognition for buildings of historic and /or local significance) taking into account the size, scale, density and design of the surrounding buildings, including story heights and spacing. The over- shadowing of neighbouring properties should be avoided.

## **Creating healthy and safe communities through good design.**

The Parish Council has some concerns about the overall design of the site. There is a large grouping of affordable housing at the Silver Street end of the site which appears as a segregated “ enclave “ away from the rest of the site. There is also a carpark which is tucked away behind buildings with a lack of oversight and informal supervision. The Parish Council ask that this area of the site is reconsidered and redesigned.

There are concerns about the overall density of build on the site and although the development meets the newly relaxed NFDC Parking Standards which accepts tandem parking, there is concerns that householders trade vehicles will be parked on the road causing an urban feel to the area

**VDS RBE02- Housing Density:** *It may have been seen from examples in the Parish where a high density of dwellings have been constructed this can create a cramped environment and impact on the amenity of the residents. Unless these concerns may be demonstrated as clearly mitigated at the design stage this form of development should be discouraged.*

Some areas of the site show “ estate “ fencing as boundaries. This is out of keeping in a rural area and does not accord with the VDS standards.

**VDS GBE19- Preferred boundary treatment:** *Ideally boundaries should be a defined with an open style wooden fence backed up by hedging(preferably using local native species) in order to reflect the rural character of the area, maintain views and create a more open feel to the street scene. The use of Cupressus hedging for front boundaries should be discouraged.*

The Parish Council is concerned about the lack of cycling and walking routes in the plan which gives the development a sense of isolation from the village. Although two pedestrian access points are shown on the plans they are labelled “ potential “ access points and the Parish Council would ask that they definitely be included in the development.

The Parish Council note that the proposed vehicular access onto Silver Street is no longer included in the plan but have serious concerns that pedestrians could create an unofficial access on to Silver Street as the quickest access route to local amenities (community centre, local garage shop, pharmacy and bus stops). It appears from the plan that this boundary is to be provided by low level estate fencing which will not prevent pedestrian access and ingress and which could be dangerous for pedestrians and others. Steps must be taken to prevent this – perhaps some mature planting of prickly shrubs could be conditioned.

## **Impact on the character and appearance of the area, including countryside landscape, character scenic and amenity value.**

The Parish Council and residents are very concerned about the significant loss of mature trees with a high amenity value and the negative impact this will have on the visual appearance of the Everton Road area. Of particular concern is the loss of mature trees to provide a temporary construction access. The Parish Council feels this is totally unacceptable and that an alternative solution should be found.

**VDS GE04- Trees and Hedgerows.** *Important trees and hedgerows that contribute to character of an area should be retained. Every effort should be made to include strong structural landscaping based on appropriate indigenous tree and shrub species where possible.*

**VDS RBE07- Existing green frontages and verges:** *these contribute to the rural character of the street scene and every effort should be made to preserve such features.*

## **Impact on ecology and in particular protected species.**

The Parish Council would like to see more environmental measures included in the scheme. We support the bat and owl mitigation but would like to see additional bat and swift boxes included in the plan.

## **Impact on highway safety, including matters relevant to car parking.**

The Parish Council and residents have very strong concerns about highway safety.

Everton Road access - the Parish Council considers the location of this junction to be poorly placed with limited visibility. There is already an issue with speeding in this location as demonstrated by data from the Parish Council's Vehicle Activated Speed Device which was placed on Everton Road Hordle, for 3 weeks from 13th January - 7th February. During that time, it captured the movements of 46,059 vehicles; 21,162 incoming (southbound) and 24,897 outgoing (northbound). Only 75% of incoming vehicles and 76% of outgoing vehicles were travelling at under 30mph. (94% were under 35 mph, 95% for outgoing vehicles; 1% over 40mph. 117 vehicles were travelling over 46mph). 11,174 vehicles travelled above the 30mph speed limit. The highest speed recorded was 62mph on 23rd January at 8.30pm.

The pavement on Everton Road which is a main route to the primary school is very narrow in places, especially at the southern end, and does not allow a safe walking route to school. Additional traffic from the new development and additional children accessing the local school will make this even more hazardous.

Increase in traffic - Hordle has narrow, rural roads. The increase in traffic from this development will undoubtedly have a negative impact on them. There are existing concerns about traffic hotspots in the village which were highlighted in the Parish Council Village Design Statement (2014) as well as during the public consultation for the Local Plan review in 2016. Specific areas are:

- the crossroads at Everton Road with Woodcock Lane and Hordle Lane where there has been a number of accidents and which are adjacent to the primary school (this is exacerbated at school drop off/ pick up times due to school related parking and the number of people crossing);
- Everton Road south of the crossroads, which is effectively a one-carriageway road until the junction with Kings Farm due to residents' on-road parking;
- Hordle Lane during term time which is also narrowed due to parking for the school;

Many of the existing routes to access the school and shops are via rural lanes with no pavements. Entrance and access to the village is through local small roads before accessing more major "A" and "B" roads. Public transport is infrequent and cycling options limited due to busy narrow rural roads. There are very limited employment opportunities in Hordle meaning residents need to travel to work. Consequently, most journeys in the village are by private cars.

There is concern about construction traffic being routed in and out of the site via the A337 especially if this development overlaps with SS8, SS7 and SS5. This junction with Everton Road is already problematic and issues of car parking and safe access to the school have already been flagged as a major concern.

**VDS RRTS02 – Future development.** *This should be influenced by the need for safe access and egress onto existing roads and the suitability of existing roads to carry any increased volume of traffic. New development proposals should ensure that roads and pedestrian safety concerns are addressed through dialogue between Highways and the Parish Council at the planning stage.*

**VDS RRTS05 – Safety of cyclists.** *Proposals designed to facilitate safe cycling routes to access neighbouring communities and the National Park would be welcomed. The creation of off road routes and measures which improve safety on the roads and lanes of the Parish, such as the “cycle route network” initiative of HCC / NFDC should continue to be supported and progressed by the Parish Council working together with the Authorities*

**Impact on flood risk on, or near the site.**

The Parish Council is concerned that several areas in close proximity to this site are already prone to flooding. This includes Silver Street, Cottagers Lane and Everton Road. This coupled with Southern Water’s report that the proposed soak away system and ditches and existing sewers are unable to cope with any new development is extremely concerning and must be adequately addressed.

**Impact on provision of open space, sport and recreation, community services and infrastructure.**

The Parish Council is concerned that although mitigation money to improve local schools will be in place, that space constraints of the site of Hordle Primary School will mean that any tangible benefits to education provision for the village’s children will not be maximised.

Places for safe school bus pick up/ drop off points for children living on the new development have not been considered (see the earlier point about pedestrian safety to access to the bus stop on the Ashley Road).

The Parish Council is concerned about the proposed arrangements for a management company to oversee the management of the ANRG. It is concerned about the robustness of such a company which relies on residents to pay a fee and become actively involved in perpetuity. In addition, it is concerned that such a company may not have the best interests of the whole of the Hordle community at heart when managing the site. The Parish Council would like to see the management of the site remain with a local authority to ensure that the site is protected and management for the benefit for all of Hordle’s residents.

The Parish Council feels that it is best-placed to contribute the selection and design of the facilities on site and would like to be part of the consultation process for this to ensure the optimum scheme is produced for the benefit of the whole community.

No parking has been provided for people wishing to access the ANRG space and this with the proposal that the estate will not be adopted by highways mean that cars will park on Everton Road which will impact on pedestrian and road safety especially at school times

**Hordle Parish Council strongly recommend Refusal – Parish 4**

**22/10958** This was discussed and **Parish 1:** We recommend **permission** but would accept the decision of the planning officers under their delegated powers. **Resolved Unanimous.**

The meeting closed at 8.37pm

Signed..... Dated.....