

Appeal by Gladman Developments Ltd

Land off Goddards Lane, Sherfield-on-Loddon

**Against the Refusal of Planning Permission by
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council on the Application for:**

“Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 90 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS). Demolition of garages to form a vehicular access point from Bow Drive and replacement garaging. All matters reserved except for means of access.”

Statement of Case



April 2019

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Context	3
1.2	Site and Surroundings	3
1.3	Background to the Application	3
1.4	Housing Land Supply	5
2	The Development Plan	7
2.1	Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan	7
2.2	Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan	7
2.3	Weight to be afforded to the Development Plan	8
2.4	Principle of Development	8
3	Other Material Considerations	9
3.1	The National Planning Policy Framework	9
3.2	Other Documents	10
4	Response to The Council’s Reasons for Refusal	11
4.1	Introduction	11
4.2	Reason for Refusal 1	11
4.3	Reason for Refusal 2	12
4.4	Reason for Refusal 3, 4 & 5	12
4.5	Reason for Refusal 6	13
4.6	Third Party Objections	13
5	Planning Conditions and Section 106 Obligations	15
5.1	Planning Conditions	15
5.2	Section 106 Obligations	15
6	The Planning Balance and Conclusions	16
6.1	The Planning Balance	16
6.2	Conclusions	17

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Justification for an Inquiry
Appendix 2	Response to Third Parties

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Case is submitted by Gladman Developments Limited ('the Appellant') and relates to an appeal against Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's ('the Council' or 'BDBC') decision to refuse the outline application for:

"Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 90 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS). Demolition of garages to form a vehicular access point from Bow Drive and replacement garaging. All matters reserved except for means of access."

- 1.1.2 The appellant considers that a public inquiry would be the most appropriate forum in which to test the appeal proposal. A justification for this request is provided in **Appendix 1** in accordance with Annex K of the *Procedural Guide* of the Planning Inspectorate (19th March 2019).

1.2 Site and Surroundings

- 1.2.1 The appeal site comprises 6.70 hectares of agricultural land and is located immediately north of Goddards Lane and west of Bow Drive, Sherfield-on-Loddon.
- 1.2.2 A full description of the appeal site and its surroundings is set out in the Statement of Common Ground for agreement with the Council.

1.3 Background to the Application

- 1.3.1 The planning application for the proposed development was validated by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council on 28th November 2018 (application ref: 18/03486/OUT). The application was supported by a comprehensive suite of technical reports in accordance with the Council's planning application validation requirements, which were set out in the Planning Statement that accompanied the application.
- 1.3.2 The application was refused under delegated powers, which was confirmed to the applicant by notice on 22nd March 2019, with the following reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed development would be located outside of any Settlement Policy Boundary as defined by Policy SS1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 and would therefore constitute residential development in the countryside.

There is no justification, including within Development Plan Policy, or any other material considerations that establishes the principle of development, or is considered to be of sufficient weight for bringing development forward on this site as a departure from the adopted Development Plan. The proposal is contrary to Policies SD1, SS1 and SS6 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029, Policies H1 and H2 of the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

2. The proposed development, by virtue of introducing inappropriate residential development into a countryside location, would not be sympathetic to, and would fail to respect and integrate with the character, visual amenity and scenic quality of the local landscape. The proposal is contrary to Policies EM1 and EM10 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029, Policy D1 of the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan (2018), and guidance contained within the Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document (2018), the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
3. The proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II listed Building Carpenters Farmhouse and its significance as a historic farmstead located within a rural setting. The harm caused would be by virtue of urbanising and eroding its rural context which is integral to its significance and appreciation. The benefits of the development would not sufficiently outweigh the less than substantial harm, and as such the proposal does not comply with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and is contrary to Policy EM11 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029, Policy D1 of the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2029 and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
4. The proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the special character, appearance and setting of the western part of the Sherfield on Loddon Conservation Area and its significance as a separate and rural part of the village. The harm caused would be by virtue of urbanising and eroding its rural context which is integral to its significance and appreciation. The benefits of the development would not sufficiently outweigh that less than substantial harm. The proposal is contrary to Policy EM11 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-

2029, the Sherfield on Loddon Conservation Area Appraisal and guidance contained within the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

5. The proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the Bulldowns Camp Scheduled Ancient Monument and its significance as an historic monument located within a rural setting. The harm caused would be by virtue of urbanising and eroding its rural context which is integral to its significance and appreciation. The benefits of the development would not sufficiently outweigh that less than substantial harm, and as such the proposal is contrary to Policy EM11 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029, Policy D1 of the Sherfield on Loddon Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2029 and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).
6. In the absence of any suitable legal agreement, or justification for the absence of a legal agreement, the proposed development does not make adequate provision for community and infrastructure contributions in relation to Affordable Housing; Travel Plan; On site open space and Kickabout Area; Biodiversity Management Plan (period of 25 years) to adequately off-set the impact of the development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), Policies CN1, CN6, CN9 and EM4 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and the guidance contained within the Planning Obligations for Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (March 2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

1.3.3 A full copy of the decision notice is enclosed at CD5.02.

1.4 Housing Land Supply

1.4.1 The most recent housing supply position was published in the 2018 Annual Monitoring Report and this finds that the Council can demonstrate a deliverable land supply equivalent to 5.3 years as of the base date of 1st April 2018, which is by all accounts represents a marginal surplus of just 261 dwellings.

1.4.2 Despite the Council's contention, it is the appellant's assertion that the claimed supply figure of 5.3 years is an over estimation of true deliverable supply of housing land in the borough. The appellant will therefore demonstrate that the appeal proposals respond to the urgent requirement to identify new development sites to meet housing needs.

2 THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

2.1 Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan

2.1.1 The Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (BDLP) was adopted in May 2016 and sets out planning policies and proposals for the district to 2029. The Local Plan covers the administrative area of Basingstoke and Deane and replaces the 'saved' policies of the previous Local Plan (1996 – 2011).

2.1.2 A list of the planning policies relevant to the appeal proposal is enclosed in the submitted Statement of Common Ground for agreement with the Council.

2.1.3 The Council's formal decision alleges that the proposal raises conflict with the following Local Plan policies:

- Policy SD1 (RfR#1);
- Policy SS1 (RfR#1);
- Policy SS6 (RfR#1);
- Policy EM1 (RfR#2);
- Policy EM10 (RfR#2);
- Policy EM11 (RfR#3, 4 and 5);
- Policy CN1 ((RfR#6);
- Policy CN6 (RfR#6);
- Policy CN9 (RfR#6); and
- Policy EM4 (RfR#6).

2.2 Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan

2.2.1 The Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan was made on 22nd March 2018 and is therefore part of the development plan for the borough. The appeal site falls within the designated neighbourhood area.

2.2.2 The decision notice alleges that the proposal raises conflict with the following policies of the Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan:

- Policy H1 (RfR#1);
- Policy H2 (RfR#1); and,
- Policy D1 (RfR#2, 3, 4 and 5).

2.2.3 Relevant policies from the Development Plan should be considered alongside other material considerations, which include the National Planning Policy Framework.

2.3 Weight to be afforded to the Development Plan

2.3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 39 of the Act requires decision makers to exercise their functions with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.

2.3.2 In this case, the appellant will demonstrate that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a robust five-year housing land supply. This is material to the appeal, as if in the event an LPA is unable to demonstrate a five-year land supply, Footnote 7 of the NPPF 2019 indicates that the policies which are most important for determining a planning application involving the provision of housing should be considered to be out-of-date. Paragraph 11d identifies that in such circumstances the 'tilted balance' is engaged.

2.4 Principle of Development

2.4.1 The Council cites that the proposal would conflict with Policies SS1 and SS6 of the BDLP. However, in light of the appellant's position on the Council's five-year land supply, these policies should be considered out of date. The weight to be attached to the provisions of Policy SS1 and SS6 should therefore be reduced for the purpose of decision making.

2.4.2 The BDLP establishes the principle of delivering further housing growth in settlements such as Sherfield-on-Loddon through the provisions of policies SS1, SS4, SS5 and SS6, and transposes the national presumption in favour of sustainable development into the statutory development plan for the borough, through the provisions of Policy SD1.

2.4.3 The appeal proposals would make an important contribution to the overall supply of market and affordable homes in the borough, helping to sustain Sherfield-on-Loddon as a sustainable and vibrant settlement, whilst also resulting in a number of other environmental, economic and social benefits borne as a direct consequence of the proposals.

3 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework

3.1.1 The appellant will demonstrate that, having regard to the proper application of the Framework, the following can be said of the appeal proposals.

Sustainable Development

An economic role

3.1.2 Evidence will be adduced to demonstrate the beneficial economic impacts of the appeal proposal. The delivery of new market and affordable homes now in Sherfield-on-Loddon would assist Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council in promoting and sustaining a strong, responsive and competitive economy. Economic benefits will arise through the construction process and also from the increased available expenditure available in the area to support services and facilities.

A social role

3.1.3 It will be demonstrated that the appeal proposals will deliver new homes of the right type and mix, at the right place and at the right time to meet market and affordable housing need and in turn will support Basingstoke and Deane's growth aspirations. Without a sufficient supply of new homes, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council cannot meet the needs of present or future generations. The failure to deliver sufficient homes has adverse social consequences.

3.1.4 It will be demonstrated that the site is in an accessible and sustainable location close to key services and facilities, and the wider area, that will help support the health, social and cultural wellbeing of Sherfield-on-Loddon and the wider area.

An environmental role

3.1.5 It will be demonstrated that the appeal proposals have no unacceptable adverse effects on environmental considerations. The proposals involve the provision of a significant area of informal and formal public open space, landscaping and ecological mitigation works which together deliver a net gain to biodiversity as expected by national policy.

The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

3.1.6 It will be demonstrated that the appeal proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 of the Framework.

- 3.1.7 The appeal proposals will deliver new housing development, which will assist Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council by contributing towards providing the requisite land supply and will also assist in meeting the central Government objective of “significantly boosting” the supply of housing whilst also serving to remedy a position of deficit. In addition to new housing, the proposals will generate other benefits that cut across the three overarching objectives of achieving sustainable development set out in paragraph 8 of the Framework.
- 3.1.8 There are therefore significant material considerations which outweigh the statutory presumption in favour of the development plan.

3.2 Other Documents

Planning Decisions / Appeals

- 3.2.1 The appellant may refer to other planning application and appeal decisions of relevance to the appeal proposal. These will be agreed with the local planning authority and provided as Core Documents.

4 RESPONSE TO THE COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR REFUSAL

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section of the Statement of Case sets out the appellant's position in relation to the Council's reasons for refusal (RfR), as set out in Section 1.

4.2 Reason for Refusal 1

4.2.1 RfR#1 alleges that the proposed development would constitute inappropriate development in the open countryside and that there is no justification to establish the principle of residential development in this location.

4.2.2 The appellant will demonstrate that the weight to be attached to any conflict with the provisions of BDLP policies SS1 and SS6 must be reduced in light of paragraph 11(d) footnote 7 and the absence of a robust five-year housing land supply within the borough. The appellant will adduce evidence that will show that the authority's, already marginal, land supply falls below the requisite minimum five years required by national planning policy.

4.2.3 RfR#1 alleges that the development proposal is contrary to policies H1 and H2 of the adopted Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan, related to the scale and location of the proposals. In the first instance, it is acknowledged that paragraph 14 of the NPPF can confer a limited degree of protection from the presumption, but only in instances where all criterion cited in the paragraph 14 are met. It is the appellants position that paragraph 14 does not apply in the case of the Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan.

4.2.4 With regards to the other cited policy; H1 is not directly relevant to the appeal. Policy H2 is supportive of appropriate proposals for new housing within or adjacent to the Sherfield on Loddon Settlement Policy Boundary where they meet the requirements of Policy SS5 of the BDLP. Policy SS5 requires 150 dwellings to be delivered in areas outside the five listed settlements, which does not include Sherfield-on-Loddon. Evidence will be produced to show that the appeal proposals would make a valuable contribution to the overall supply of market and affordable homes in the borough and would represent a boost to the supply of housing land to meet the authority's identified housing needs in accordance with national policy. It will be demonstrated that the appeal proposals would constitute sustainable development, outweighing any perceived conflict with the development plan.

4.2.5 It will be shown that there are no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the social, economic and environmental benefits of granting planning permission in this case.

4.3 Reason for Refusal 2

4.3.1 Reasons for Refusal 2 (RfR 2) relate to the alleged impact of the appeal proposals with respect to the character, visual amenity and scenic quality of the landscape.

4.3.2 The appellant will adduce landscape evidence to show that the appeal site could accommodate a well-planned residential development without causing unacceptable harm to the local landscape context and visual amenity. It will also be shown how the proposals would respond to the character and context of their surroundings, resulting in the delivery of a high-quality residential scheme, whilst providing evidence to show that no adverse impacts will arise in relation to landscape character, visual amenity or scenic quality of the local landscape.

4.3.3 It will be shown that the appeal proposals would be consistent with the requirements of policies EM1 and EM10 of the BDLP, Policy D1 of the Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan, guidance contained within the Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document (2018), the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018), as well as the Framework.

4.4 Reason for Refusal 3, 4 & 5

4.4.1 Reasons for refusal 3, 4 and 5 (RfR 3, 4 & 5) relate to the heritage impacts that are alleged to arise as a consequence of the development proposals, as set out below:

- RfR 3 – sets out the Council’s concerns relating to the impact of the appeal proposals on the nearby Grade II Listed Building Carpenters Farmhouse.
- RfR 4 – relates to the relationship between the appeal proposal and the Sherfield-on-Loddon Conservation Area, and the claimed harm that would be caused by virtue of urbanising and the erosion of its rural context.
- RfR 5 – relates to the relationship between the appeal proposal and the setting of the Bullsdown Camp scheduled ancient monument (SAM) and its significance as a historic monument located within a rural setting. It is claimed that the harm would be caused by virtue of urbanising and the erosion of its rural context which is integral to its significance and appreciation.

4.4.2 In view of the above, the Decision Notice cites conflict with Policy EM11 of the BDLP, Policy D1 of the Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan, and also guidance contained within the Framework.

4.4.3 The appellant will adduce heritage evidence that assesses the impact of the proposals on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets including the Grade II Listed Building Carpenters Farmhouse, the Sherfield-on-Loddon Conservation Area and the Bullsdown Camp SAM. As set out in paragraph 196 of the Framework, where 'less than substantial' harm arises, this should be weighed against the public benefits of development. In this context, the appellant will demonstrate that any harm to designated heritage assets would be very limited and, if found to constitute 'less than substantial' harm, would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

4.4.4 It will also be demonstrated that the appeal proposals are consistent with the requirements of Policy EM11 in the BDLP, and Policy D1 of the Sherfield-on-Loddon Neighbourhood Plan, and also the relevant provisions of the Framework.

4.5 Reason for Refusal 6

4.5.1 Reason for refusal 6 (RfR#6) states that a legal agreement has not been completed to secure appropriate community and infrastructure contributions and necessary mitigation. This reason for refusal alleges that the appeal proposal conflicts with policies CN1, CN6, CN9 and EM4 of the BDLP and the guidance contained within the Planning Obligations for Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (March 2018), as well as the Framework.

4.5.2 The appellant will enter into constructive dialogue with the Council to agree obligations for reasonable and necessary on and off-site provisions that are fairly related in scale and kind to the proposed development and which meet the statutory tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010.

4.5.3 It is reasonably expected to be common ground that RfR 6 'falls away' upon completion of a satisfactory legal agreement.

4.6 Third Party Objections

4.6.1 In addition to the Council's reasons for refusal, a number of objections were received from third parties to the planning application. These raise issues similar to those of the Council, as well as a number of other potential material considerations, which are summarised and considered in the table enclosed at **Appendix 2** to this Statement of Case. The Appellant will

also address those material considerations raised in evidence to demonstrate those concerns are unfounded, or that they can be suitably mitigated by condition or planning obligation.

- 4.6.2 Should parties to the inquiry raise issues outside of the reasons for refusal, the Appellant reserves the right to adduce evidence on these matters.

5 PLANNING CONDITIONS AND SECTION 106 OBLIGATIONS

5.1 Planning Conditions

- 5.1.1 The parties will seek to reach agreement on planning conditions in advance of the inquiry. An update will be provided accordingly.

5.2 Section 106 Obligations

- 5.2.1 It is proposed that the obligations will be provided by way of a unilateral undertaking. This will be issued to the Council for comment in good time to provide reasonable opportunity for agreement to be reached and for the respective positions of the parties to be set out in evidence and in order for a draft Section 106 legal obligation to be provided to the appeal inspector 10 days in advance of the inquiry, in accordance with the Procedural Guide of the Planning Inspectorate (March 2019).

6 THE PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 The Planning Balance

6.1.1 Section 38(6) of the Act requires that development proposals should be determined in accordance with the development plan. However, the second limb makes clear that this is unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.1.2 It is the appellant's position that the Council cannot demonstrate the requisite five year housing land supply and evidence will be adduced to demonstrate this and by consequence, that the most important policies of the development plan for the determination of the application are out of date.

6.1.3 Therefore whilst the development plan is the starting point for decision making, it is not determinative in this case. The lack of a five year housing land supply engages the 'tilted balance' at 11(d) of the Framework, which states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

6.1.4 The appeal proposal will secure a range of benefits that will be demonstrated in full in evidence. These include, *inter alia*:

- The delivery of up to 90 market and affordable dwellings to make a valuable contribution to the borough's housing needs;
- A policy compliant provision of 40% affordable housing (totalling 36 dwellings) to be delivered on site by Vivid Housing;
- Economic benefits, including New Homes Bonus payment totalling £600,000, total gross expenditure of £3.1m, and the creation of 114 and 124 full time and indirect jobs;
- The provision of green infrastructure totalling 2.9ha, incorporating public open space which includes informal footpaths, biodiversity enhancement and 'kick about' space to the south, and also a community orchard within the reinstatement historic field boundary and hedgerow to the west of the site; and
- Ecological and landscape benefits, through the protection and enhancement of existing ecological habitats, green space and tree planting, helping to enhance the green edge to the village.

6.1.5 The Affordable housing offer provided by this scheme is of particular benefit given that Vivid Housing is an affordable housing provider, which came about as part of a large-scale voluntary transfer from BDBC. There is also a legal agreement in place that requires Vivid Housing to deliver the affordable housing provision on site

6.1.6 It will be demonstrated that the harm arising in respect of the appeal proposal would be no more than might reasonably be anticipated when changing a green field to one of built form.

6.2 Conclusions

6.2.1 In accordance with paragraph 11 of the Framework, it will be demonstrated there would be no material adverse impacts arising from the appeal proposals that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits the development will deliver. Rather, the benefits are significant and tip the balance firmly in favour of a grant of planning permission.

APPENDIX 1 – JUSTIFICATION FOR AN INQUIRY

With reference to Annex K of the Planning Inspectorate's 'Procedural Guide' for planning appeals (March 2019), the appellant requests a public inquiry for the following reasons:

Need for the evidence to be tested through formal questioning by an advocate

Matters in relation to housing land supply, planning, heritage assets and landscape are contested between the Council and the Appellant. Case law in relation to the interpretation of national policy means detail legal submissions will be necessary, as well as testing through formal questioning by an advocate in support of their respective positions.

Complexity of Issues

The appellant disputes objections made by the Council in relation to housing land supply, planning, heritage assets and landscape which will need to be dealt with through evidence adduced by both parties. As such, it is the view of the appellant that these matters will require detailed cross examination to understand the basis upon which the Council has made their decision and how respective witnesses have reached different conclusions.

The appellant expects to use 4 expert witnesses to advance its case in respect of planning, housing land supply, heritage and landscape matters. Detailed scrutiny of the Council's claimed housing land supply is a matter that will require detailed evidence. At the time of the decision, the Council considered it could demonstrate a housing land supply but the appellant considers this is an overestimation of the Council's true deliverable supply.

Public Interest

There has been a considerable level of interest in the application from Sherfield-on-Loddon Parish Council, whom opposed the application and are anticipated to wish to present their case at an inquiry. Given the number of interested parties who may wish to speak, it is likely to make this difficult to manage within the time and procedural constraints of a hearing.

Likely length of inquiry

It is considered that having regard to the above, to address all matters 6 sitting days will be required. This exceeds the single day usually reserved for a hearing, suggesting that a public inquiry is necessary.

Summary

For the above reasons, the appellant considers a public inquiry is the only appropriate procedure in this case.

APPENDIX 2 – RESPONSE TO THIRD PARTIES

Purpose

This document summarises, responds, and gives due consideration to the relevant interested third-party representations submitted to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council as part of the planning application process. Responses to the planning application are summarised, together with the appellant's response, in the table below:

Summary of Comments	
Highways and Transport	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed vehicular access is totally inappropriate, it leads directly onto Bow Drive/ Bow Grove which is a very narrow roadway due to the fact that most properties along this road have no off-road parking and therefore residents have no option but to park on the roadside. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Highways Officer is satisfied with the proposed access arrangements and does not consider that it would lead to any highway safety issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing traffic on the A33 is relentless in the morning. The congestion getting into and out of Basingstoke can already add up to 20 minutes at peak times and sometimes more. The additional traffic created by this proposed application would add significantly to the existing problems on the main A33 and local roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposals impact on the highway would not be so significant as to result in a severe detrimental impact on the operation and safety of the local highway network.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The carriageway of Goddards Close is of very light construction and is in poor condition and is unlikely to be able to sustain construction traffic related to the development without major rebuilding. - The construction of a vehicular access point will not alleviate the congestion caused by building contractors in Goddards Lane during construction and access for delivery vans once houses and built will be very difficult and in all probability to the detriment of those who live close by and certainly for those who use the Lane for horse riding, walking, running (i.e. residents who seek pleasure from the area). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should planning permission be granted a planning condition would be imposed to require a construction traffic management plan. - It is the County Councils responsibility to maintain local roads.
Location	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building on green belt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is not situated within the greenbelt.

Landscape, character and appearance	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application would introduce inappropriate residential development within the countryside which would fail to respect and integrate with the character, visual amenity and scenic quality of the local landscape. - This development would be out of scale for a village of this size and would negatively impact the character of this village. It also does nothing to protect or enhance the character or rural setting of our village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As the proposals are on a greenfield site, it is inevitable that some limited harm may arise from the introduction of built development. However, a range of mitigating factors (including the introduction of new planting within the site, a landscape buffer at the southern edge of the site to minimise the impact on the conservation area and the provision of open space and informal kickabout space to the south of the site) would ensure that any adverse effect would be minimal.
Infrastructure	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sherfield Village does not have the infrastructure for an extra 90 dwellings. The schools and doctors' surgeries are full. The local GP surgery is struggling with numbers, and it currently takes 3 weeks for a GP appointment - As more people move into the area, the facilities will have to improve. I believe the GP surgery at Chineham is looking at moving to larger premises and the GP surgery at Bramley has already extended their practice and taken on more staff. The local Bramley school has also been given a grant by a house developer to help expand their facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gladman would be agreeable to making CIL compliant financial contributions towards local education and health care provision. - No formal response was received from the NHS or Hampshire County Council to request provisions to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in sewage to an already near capacity sewage works with an additional 200 homes to be connected to it from Bramley. This site would add to the problems we regularly see with the drains on Bramley Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thames Water have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed development regarding the foul water sewage network infrastructure capacity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bus service is inadequate, and the cycle routes are non-existent. - Much mention is made of the site being adjacent to the No. 14 bus route; however, the frequency of this service is shortly to be halved due to County Council subsidy reductions, so that by the time any Goddards Lane development users are installed, there will be just one bus in each direction every two hours. It might as well be non-existent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bus service no. 14 provides a number of services per day which allows residents to access facilities in Basingstoke and the wider area and is suitable for commuters. - Cycle access will be provided to the site via Bullsdown Close, providing a connection onto Goddards Lane and the wider settlement.

Environment and ecology	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of agriculture land will greatly affect wildlife as a huge amount of wildlife relies on the green land that separates Sherfield-on-Loddon from Bramley to survive. - The banks of Bow Brook are also a good habitat for a variety of wildlife, and I regularly see birds of prey such as Buzzards, Kites and Owls flying over the site. All of these would be damaged if driven off this stretch of brook by the development. There are also Great Crested Newts in the village, and they have been sighted near Bow Brook. I live in Bullsdown Close, just a couple of hundred metres from the Brook and have seen Great Crested Newts in my garden. - The area of land involved is full of wildlife with sightings of newts, snakes, slow worms, skylarks, owls and bats. - The area is used by migratory birds and is within the 7km consultation zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This proposal includes the retention of hedges and buffering of sensitive features, as an appropriate way of protecting the ecological value of the site. - A planning condition would require that, prior to the commencement of development, a scheme of ecological mitigation and enhancement measures must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. There is also the potential for biodiversity gain within the site. - The Council is satisfied that subject to appropriate mitigation the proposed development would not have a significant adverse effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.
Heritage	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development adjoins the south and east end of the Conservation area. The proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the special character, appearance and setting of the western part of the Sherfield-on-Loddon Conservation Area, and its significance as a separate and rural part of the village. - The proposal is very close to the listed building Carpenter's Farmhouse, an important historic building in Sherfield and one that is very old. The building process, in such close proximity, is bound to have a detrimental effect on the physical material of the building. - The development would destroy the vista to Bullsdown Camp scheduled monument (List entry 1001944) which is noted in BDBC conservation map of SOL 2000. - The developer claims that the development will not have a significant visual impact on the Bullsdown Camp hill fort ancient monument. This is clearly incorrect as almost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any harm to designated heritage assets has been assessed as part of the application. This identified harm has been assessed, both by the heritage consultant and the local planning authority, to equate to less than substantial harm for the purpose of decision-making in accordance with national planning policy. Historic England also agree with this conclusion. - The Appellants heritage consultant considers that no harm is anticipated to the heritage significance of Bullsdown Camp scheduled ancient monument. - The proposals also include for the historic field boundary, situated at the southern end of the site near Carpenters Farmhouse, to be reinstated which will allow for a substantial offset of development in the area to the north of the farmhouse.

<p>the whole of Bullsdown and all the camp are plainly visible from the proposed site entrance which is lower than the highest point of the development site. Therefore, the visual setting of this ancient monument will be heavily impacted by the development.</p>	
Flooding	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This particular area floods easily in heavy rain, even without the impact of houses on the natural drainage system and building more houses on this land would only make the situation worse. - Every winter seems to bring with it more flooding and road closures due to overflowing ditches and rising water tables. This has been attributed to the 1000s of new homes still being built less than half a mile away in Sherfield Park as well as the 100s currently being built in neighbouring Bramley. - It is noted that part of the development is classed as being in Flood Zone 3 as it borders Bow Brook which makes it inadvisable to consider building anything there. - Since the 80's no maintenance work has been carried out on Bow Brook, and in parts it is blocked by fallen branches, and fences where debris collects and causes flooding. - The local river Loddon and its tributaries (including Bow Brook, being the nearest to the proposed development) already carry an unacceptable level of pollution which has been well documented. The proposed development would only increase this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submitted Flood Risk Assessment confirms that the developable part of the site is not in an area at risk of flooding. Hampshire County Council, as lead local flood authority, has no objections to the scheme. Full details of the design of the drainage solution would be secured at the reserved matters application stage. - The Environment Agency also have no objection to the proposed development, subject a condition. - There is no built development proposed to take place within the area of land in Flood Zone 3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the final plans include a balancing pond, who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance this will need? It would have to be a permanent fixture and it does not seem fair to expect the local community outside the new development to have to fund it in future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The maintenance of any attenuation features will be secured through the S106 legal agreement.
Design	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scale and style – the applicant's description is suggestive of a more urban, or suburban style environment, which does not reflect and would not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council have not raised any concerns about the density of the proposed scheme, and there is no evidence that the scheme would negatively affect local residents.

comfortably mesh with the existing stock of properties in Sherfield-on-Loddon.	Detailed design of the scheme would be secured at reserved matters application stage.
- Concern about the proposed density of the site.	- The Council considers that the proposed density of 24 dwellings per hectare is acceptable in relation to the surrounding development.
Impact on existing residents	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours by reasons of noise, disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy and the proposed new houses would over-shadow their homes. - Existing residents will lose their view of green fields. - The majority of the buildings would be of the high "townhouse", they would be built in an area where much of the neighbouring accommodation is either a bungalow nature or located on lower lying land. The proposed development will therefore overshadow existing homes and reduce the privacy of existing residents. - Traffic noise would increase enormously with the construction of these homes and, inevitably once they are occupied as well. Those living in Bow Drive would suffer and others further afield would be affected as well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Officers have raised no objection to the application at outline stage with regard to residential amenity. Details of site layout will be determined at the Reserved Matters stage. - The loss of a view is not a material planning consideration. - While it is accepted that there will be additional background noise generated by virtue of increasing the number of dwellings within this part of the village, this is however not considered by the Case Officer to be at such a level as to result in significant adverse harm to occupiers of existing properties or the natural environment. As such, the Council have not raised this as a reason for refusal.
Planning policy	Response
- This development would fall outside the recently agreed Neighbourhood Plan for Sherfield-on-Loddon.	- The limited protections conferred to neighbourhood plans in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF are not engaged in this instance.
- The previous application relating to this land was rejected on appeal. All the arguments against it still apply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning applications should be considered on their own merits. - The Appellant has made a number of changes since the previous applications to address the previous concerns raised by the Council, these include a reduction to the number of dwellings, and changes to the development framework to address the heritage and landscape concerns.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application does not comply with the Local Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan and is outside the settlement boundary. - Manydown has also been selected as a large site for development and BDBC should stick to this plan rather than affecting small villages like Sherfield-on-Loddon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is acknowledged that the site falls outside the defined settlement boundary however the Appellant does not consider that the Council can currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and as such new sites for development need to be identified outside of settlement boundaries.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposals are against the protection offered by the Strategic Gap. The entire point of including strategic gaps in the Neighbourhood Plan was to prevent development that would lead to the separate settlements of Sherfield-on-Loddon, Bramley and Sherfield Park from joining up into one conurbation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The purpose of the strategic gap is to prevent the coalescence of settlements. Due to the distance between Sherfield and Bramley, the proposed development would not lead to the coalescence of these settlements. This has been acknowledged by the Council, who have not raised it as a reason for refusal. The Case Officer also states that the proposal accords with Policy EM2 of the Local Plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development is believed to be isolated from the existing community and is located furthest away from the existing centre of the village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The appeal site is located to immediately adjacent to the existing residential development. Officers do not consider that the proposals would represent isolated development.
Other matters	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no local need for any more affordable housing in Sherfield. - Sherfield village is a very nice place to live and 'affordable' houses rarely come onto the market. I'm sure that people who live in the village have children and grandchildren who would like to be able to stay in within the village, so affordable housing is extremely important. The village needs new blood to revitalise it. People don't like change, but the fact is that things have to move on. New houses will bring new life and our village will reap the benefits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development will provide 40% affordable housing to comply with policy CN1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One point that would need to be considered is that of noise and disturbance from Bramley military training camp. The training ground is used for significant periods of the year and generated very loud gunfire and is overflown by heavy lift Chinook helicopters from RAF Odiham. It is believed that this would be unacceptable to potential residents and like more substantial airports, be considered as a point of objection and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council have not raised an objection to this. Noise screening has been carried out by the Appellant which has not identified noise from the military training camp as a potential issue.

subject to independent noise assessment investigations.	
---	--