



# Horndean Parish Council

## NOTICE OF MEETING

**A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE WILL BE HELD AT JUBILEE HALL ON MONDAY 26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2024 AT 7.15 PM**

Members are summoned to attend: Cllrs P. Beck (Chairman), D Prosser, Teresa Attlee, Keith Jenkins, Bob Sowden

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Carla Baverstock-Jones', is written over a horizontal line.

Carla Baverstock-Jones, GCILEx, FSLCC, MCMI  
Chief Officer,

20 February 2024

### AGENDA

1. To receive apologies for absence.
2. Declaration of interest: Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest which they may have in any item of business on the agenda no later than when that item is reached. Unless dispensation has been granted, you may not participate in any discussion of, or vote on, or discharge any function related to any matter in which you have a pecuniary interest as defined by regulations made by the Secretary of State under the Localism Act 2011. You must withdraw from the room or chamber when the meeting discusses and votes on the matter.
3. To receive and approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 5th February 2024
4. To discuss and agree the EHDC Draft Local Plan final draft.
5. To open the meeting to members of the public to enable them to address questions to Parish Councillors. *Public questions will be permitted for each application as it arises, subject to there being a limit of 3 minutes for any member of the public. A question asked by a member of public during public participation session at a meeting shall not require a response or debate.*
6. To discuss and note any planning appeals.
7. To consider planning applications and note decisions as per attached schedule. *Public questions will be permitted for each application as it arises, subject to there being a limit of 3 minutes for any member of the public.*
8. To discuss representation of Horndean Parish Council at forthcoming EHDC's Planning Committee meetings on a date to be confirmed.
9. To note the date of the next meeting as Monday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2024.



HORNDEAN PARISH COUNCIL  
PLANNING AND PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE

Item 3

THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE  
MEETING HELD AT JUBILEE HALL ON  
Monday 5th February, 2024 AT 7.00PM.

**PRESENT:** Cllr D Prosser (Vice Chairman), T Attlee, K Jenkins, R Sowden

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Eve Maple – Administrative Assistant (Minute Taker)

**PUBLIC:** 4 members of the public

**P 188 23/24** **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Carla Baverstock Jones (Chief Officer)  
Cllr Paul Beck (Chairman)

**P 189 23/24** **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None Received

**P 190 23/24** **TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 18.12.2023**

It was RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on the 15<sup>th</sup> January 2024 were duly signed as a true record of the meeting.

**P 191 23/24** **TO OPEN THE MEETING TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

None

**P 192 23/24** **TO DISCUSS AND NOTE ANY PLANNING APPEALS**

None received

**P 193 23/24** **TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND NOTE DECISION LIST**

**P 194 23/24** **55625/001** Land North of Woodcroft Farm, James Copse Road, Lovedean, Waterlooville

Request for Screening Opinion - Proposed Development comprising of up to 200 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure, open space and means of access

**Ward;** Catherington

**Observations:** - This is effectively the Catherington Park Phase 3 development. We were visited by the developer recently at the Council Meeting. This application is for an opinion as to whether an Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) for the development is necessary. The documents consist of some maps and a survey the developer has completed which will indicate the need or otherwise. It is worth noting that a similar request was made to EHDC in 2014 and it was decided that no EIA was necessary nor

has there been an EIA made via Havant Borough Council for Catherington Park Phases 1 and 2. HPC observations are therefore purely about our view of the validity of the developers' responses to the questionnaire

**Conclusions:** - Our comments on the responses to the EIA survey given by the developer are as follows:

Are there any water resources including surface waters, e.g., rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk? We have a concern that the slope of the land from North to South will result increase run off to Catherington Park Phase 1 and 2 but also on the surrounding land towards the Anmore road which already floods regularly.

Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, e.g., for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project? We believe that the developer response given with regard to the large

Badger sett not being disturbed is false. It is difficult to see how surrounding the sett with houses and dog walkers will not result in some disturbance.

Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? (If so, from where, what direction, and what distance?) Driving around the Phase 1 and 2 site, there are 3+ storey blocks of apartments. If these were to be at the higher end of the site then they would be highly visible to the surroundings.

Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project? The overall site is accessed via Eagle Avenue/Milton Road/Lovedean Lane which is busy at peak times (school times). Given that this new site is only accessible via that route this is bound to add to this. Residents of Phases 1 and 2 have complained that the roads on the site are in a poor condition and unadopted. Merrit Way in both directions will be a through route for the new houses.

Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project? The cumulative effect of the Lovedean Lane developments and Catherington Park developments on the roads above is being ignored. The local shops here are convenience stores not "weekly shopping trips", walking/cycling from this site would be for leisure only and not to get anywhere important, therefore traffic will continue to increase.

It is also worth noting that there is further development called Woodcroft Copse, which is at the junction of Powell Drive and Eagle Avenue, will also be starting shortly (this is obviously in Havant Borough) but the same site exit roads.

P 195 23/24

**55593/002 FUL 26 Downhouse Road, Catherington, Waterlooville, PO8 0TX**

Construction of a one-bedroom bungalow in the front garden of No 26 Downhouse Road

**Ward;** Catherington

**Conclusions:** - CP-29 - The bungalow is small and low and will not dominate the street scene and at this size does not constitute over-development. I would suggest that exterior lighting is handled sensitively due to the proximity to the SDNP in accordance with CP27 – light pollution. **I would also suggest conditions prohibiting further**



**expansion** as there is not much space for anything bigger, parking and highway safety would become an issue. Also, expansion to a two-storey dwelling would bring into play overlooking and privacy loss for the neighbours.

**RECOMMENDATION:** - NO OBJECTION

**P 196 23/24**

**HSE The Coach House, Shrover Cottage, Anmore Lane, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO7 6HN**

Single storey and two storey side extension

**Ward;** Catherington

**Conclusions:** - As H16 has been disapplied in January 2023, there are no specific restrictions on the increase in floorspace of countryside dwellings, this fact and taking into account there is no overlooking of Shrover Cottage and the sympathetic nature of materials of the extensions there are no grounds to object.

**RECOMMENDATION:** - NO OBJECTION

**P 197 23/24**

**60287 HSE 34 Eskdale Close, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 0DJ**

Garage conversion to include revised fenestration to front elevation and revised driveway with dwarf wall.

**Ward;** Downs and Murray

**Conclusions;** Old garage fitted with lift to give access to 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

**RECOMMENDATION;** NO OBJECTION

**P 198 23/24**

**59483/001 13 Southdown Road, Horndean, Hants PO8 0ET**

Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 2No. detached dwellings with detached car port for plot No.1

**Ward;** Downs and Murray

**Conclusions:** These new properties appear to fit into the rural setting. The building of two properties within the grounds of what did hold one property may be slightly unusual and may give the case officer concerns (outside the remit of HPC as statutory consultee) but for the reasons stated they do not give rise to any immediate concerns under the policies mentioned above.

**RECOMMENDATION:** - NO OBJECTION

**P 199 23/24**

**25705/013 TPO Land north of Block B, Rosecott, Havant Road, Horndean, Waterlooville**

**Proposal:** T1 + T2 Ash - Reduce lower laterals encroaching on building by 2 meters. Finishing length 3 meters.

**Ward;** Kings and Blendworth

**Conclusions:** The trees are quite large and some limbs are encroaching on the adjacent property. This application seems to be one of simple tree management. No other work is to be carried out on the trees. My recommendation is that No Objection be raised regarding this application, subject only to the Tree Officer's agreement that the work is appropriate and will not be detrimental to the trees, and the work is carried out by qualified personnel.

**RECOMMENDATION:** NO OBJECTION

P 200 23/24

23293/016/23293/017 FUL 11 London Road, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 0BN

Installation of a Medpoint prescription collection machine to the existing pharmacy shopfront window

**Conclusions:** The proposal is simply to allow prescriptions to be collected at all hours. As such it is like to reduce congestion in the car park and possibly encourage more people to walk to collect prescriptions

**RECOMMENDATION:** NO OBJECTION

**To discuss representation of Horndean Parish Council at forthcoming EHDC's Planning Committee meetings on a date to be confirmed.**

To be decided once the agenda items are known.

**DECISION LIST**

The decision list was duly noted.

**TO NOTE THE DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING AS MONDAY  
26th February 2024.**

Meeting ended: 8.00 pm

.....  
Chairman  
.....  
Date

## LOCAL PLAN 2021 2040 CONSULATION

### Horndean Parish Council Comments

#### Introduction

We welcome the opportunity to make comments on this latest iteration of the Local Plan. Our comments are generic, using the chapter headings of the Local Plan as the structure but we also specifically make more specific comments at the section on Site Allocations within the Horndean Parish area.

#### Future Guidance - Core Policies and Supplementary Planning Documents

The Local Plan is "one size fits all" for new developments and extensions/alterations. In due course will there be tailored guidance to assist Parish Councils when considering alterations/extensions and developments below 10 new homes eg through CPs and SPDs? We have in mind the Residential Extensions and Householder Developments SPD as well as the Vehicle Parking Standards SPD, as both seem to be out of date and causing some growing divergence from our comments as statutory consultee and those of EHDC at its planning meeting.

#### Chapter 1 Introduction and Background

1. To what extent has the SDNP Local Plan been relevant in this Local Plan?
2. Is it possible to consider the employment, access to retail and connectivity without mentioning the impact of the proximity to Petersfield (even in a broader context)?
3. How many SDNP residents travel to work or shop in Horndean for example?

#### Chapter 2 Vision and Objectives

4. Objective A1 and Policy H2 Housing Mix and Type (page 225).
5. With an ageing population it is a pity that stamp duty adds 5%-10% into the equation when someone wishes to downsize.
6. How much thinking will be going into the design of smaller houses in recognition of the 35% increase in the ageing population wishing to downsize? Bungalows are not carbon efficient, but not every ageing person wishes to live in a retirement apartment or move into a home that suits first time buyers.
7. Objective A3 mentions "defined town and village centres" but in fact Horndean and Clanfield, for example, are not that well defined.
8. Objective B3 aims to reduce the reliance on the private car. As the purpose of the consultation is to collect evidence, would it be possible to carry out a high level stocktake to show the location of schools and surgeries in each settlement (and maybe add in the supermarkets) as these drive many of the behaviours that the Plan is hoping to address and might help to give a more realistic view of the viability of walking or cycling to them when smaller developments come forward.
9. There is a lot more awareness around walking and cycling but it is not that pleasant to carry a small bag of shopping over half a mile (and more) especially for mothers with children and the elderly.
10. It is unlikely that people will stop using their cars but perhaps it should be mentioned that more people will be buying electric cars/hybrid cars so the car itself may not be responsible for pollution as much as it is now.
11. Where infrastructure constraints are identified, developers are required to set out what appropriate improvements are necessary. But how do they do they ensure

these will be delivered when the parties involved could be HCC with their own priorities, timescales, and budgets?

### **Chapter 3 Managing Future Development**

12. Can the significance of the unmet needs of 12,000 homes in the sub southern area be expanded on further, as this would appear to have a potentially significant impact on the Southern Parishes.
13. Objective A2 aims to identify and maintain a flexible and varied supply of land and buildings for business. The Local Plan at paragraph 3.15 states that there are limited amounts of vacant employment floorspace and that most businesses are SMEs (98% of businesses in 2021 had less than 50 employees page 250 Our Changing Economy).
14. Anecdotal evidence supports this in that it is exceedingly difficult for a new entrant in the Horndean area to purchase a small industrial unit for light engineering in class B2 under 12000<sup>2</sup> feet.
15. However, the analysis at page 252 suggests the gross need of 28ha of land over the plan period (to support economic growth and diversification) will be met “through existing commitment and allocations” and that existing premises should renew and refurbish.
16. Hopefully, the light engineering sector will respond to this Local Plan consultation.
17. It is not clear how many extant planning permissions relate to new industrial units. At Parish level we rarely see such applications.
18. The skills and training agreements for developments set out at page 255 in relation to Employment Policies are to be welcomed, but how will they only apply when both residential and non-residential come forward together?

### **Chapter 4- Responding to the Climate Emergency**

19. Objective B3 mentions the achievement of net zero carbon emissions, as a top issue is climate emergency.
20. The goal is to eliminate energy demand or else reduce it as much as possible through the energy efficient heating systems such as air source heat pumps to help achieve the “Be Clean” part of the energy hierarchy.
21. Could there be a clearer position on the policy on heat pumps in new dwellings (especially when there are blocks of apartments and terraces) due to their size, noise levels and maintenance concerns for residents?
22. Generally, could we have more clarity on the policy for energy renewable schemes (Policy Clim4) e.g. battery storage farms and on shore wind farms? The constraints set out at 4.58-4.59 relating to wind energy developments would seem to rule out significant swathes of land in the southern parishes.
23. It is mentioned that the Council may prepare supplementary planning documents to identify ways for meeting renewable energy requirements off-site. Could the plans behind this be elaborated on?

### **Chapter 5 – Safeguarding Our Natural Environment**

24. A key concern for HPC in this chapter is ensuring that development proposals do not lead to coalescence especially between Horndean and Clanfield and Horndean and Lovedean and Catherington (see specific comments on development sites submitted by Cllr D Prosser).
25. It is noted that the Blue and Green Infrastructure Strategic Opportunity Areas at Figure 5.4 include in the Key at 7 “Rowlands Castle Allotments”. If these relate to the planned allotments within the LEOH development, they will be offered firstly to

Horndean Parish Council under the s106 Agreement and only after that to Rowlands Castle Parish Council

### **Chapter 6 – Creating Desirable Places**

26. The comprehensive policies (DES1-4) set out in this chapter will underpin much of what we as a Parish Council will be using as guidance in our role of statutory consultee.
27. Our comments on the LEOH Design Code have included that high steep roofs are avoided and designing them instead to be more consistent with the traditional architectural vernacular associated with the local buildings in Horndean in the late 1800s and early 1900s.
28. In addition, it is important that materials used must feature a major use of flint to reflect the character of dwellings in Horndean.

### **Chapter 7- Enabling Communities to Live Well**

29. In the diagram at page 174 “access to care and quality of care” forms 20% of the overall determinants of health.
30. The policies at HWC1a) -d) are the holy grail of a local community. Could policy HWC 1 d) include access to clinical care for greater peace of mind?
31. At paragraph 7.4 it is stated that “there are two aspects in supporting the health and wellbeing of our communities.” However, the second one at paragraph 7.5 is expressed vaguely “... and secondly that the facilities needed to support the health and care system are provided.”
32. A recurring theme to be addressed is to plan for doctor’s surgeries and local hospitals to meet the growing demand from an increased population.
33. How are “major developments” defined in paragraph 7.7 in the context of carrying out a Health Impact Assessment (HIA). It is presumed it takes account of the impact on the capacity of a local surgery to handle increased demand?
34. Walking is encouraged across the board, but how safe are the walking routes in rural areas winter?
35. The Local Plan actively promotes safe routes “free from crime” (Table 7.1) but the truth is that there is evidence of increased crime in the area. We have witnessed broken windows, damaged play areas and drug taking. Should the Local Plan include how safe routes will be free from crime.”
36. It is acknowledged that the resources of the local policing Neighbourhood Teams are stretched but have the Hampshire Police and Local Fire Services had any input into the Local Plan?

### **Chapter 8 -Delivering Green Connections**

37. Infrastructure (social infrastructure, transportation, and utilities) are vital to the wellbeing and economic success of a community and Appendix H (page 525-533) sets out the approach to the generic infrastructure requirements including flood protection and water management.
38. In this consultation we can only note that:
  - a) the infrastructure requirements are in the hands of the EHDC planning team through a combination of planning conditions, the drafting of s106 agreements and in how the CIL monies are allocated; and
  - b) the delivery of those assets is in the hands of third parties (including neighbouring local planning authorities) with their own timelines, priorities, and budgets.



39. In addition to larger developments, we ask that infrastructure for medium and small sites is also considered so local areas feel that improvements are happening in existing communities too.
40. For example, if two (or more) smaller developments (of less than 10 dwellings) come forward within a mile or two of each below ten dwellings, how joined up is the thinking on how this impacts the provision of land or school buildings or doctors' surgeries to serve the new developments?
41. What do the plans look like from the collaboration that is mentioned at paragraph 8.6 to "update the evidence of needs and plan for infrastructure provision."
42. It would be helpful to have more information about the extent that the evidence takes account of the planned site allocations (at section 12) in connection with future primary care facilities and schools, for example.
43. At paragraph 8.9 what is the timescale for deciding whether the Local Plan "may allocate specific sites for infrastructure, either on its own or as part of a wider development"?
44. Partnership working with HCC and others also underpins the sustainable transport policy. Collaboration like this is key but who takes responsibility and is accountable for the progress on delivery?
45. There is a potential clash between designing a community building for multi-use (as envisaged at paragraph 8.46- New and Improved Community Facilities) and at the same time siting a sports pitch adjacent to it (Policy DGC5 page 203).
46. Ideally sports pitches should have dedicated changing facilities (the old-style pavilion) relevant to the sport e.g. football, cricket rather than pretend at the same time that they can be satisfactorily accommodated in a building being used for music, films, art etc. Safeguarding concerns can also be an issue.
47. Open spaces and sports and recreational facilities are vital for young people not only for fitness well-being etc, but also for helping to distract from boredom and crime.
48. We may have missed it but are there plans for youth centre facilities?

### **Site Allocations**

49. In this section we have used our local knowledge to make comments on the issues that may need to be addressed in considering future development on the relevant allocated sites within our Parish. We would comment, in due course, on the relevant applicable policies in the normal way in our role as a statutory consultee when or if these come forward to the Parish Council planning committee.
50. As we have mentioned in our comments in the earlier sections of this paper, we believe that care is needed to ensure that smaller developments are not viewed in isolation when considering infrastructure requirements (whether social, utilities of transport). Instead, they should be viewed in the round, with other planned developments in neighbouring areas that, cumulatively, are more likely to have an impact on infrastructure requirements.
51. It is important to note that site allocations are done by whichever settlement is nearest and not on Parish Boundaries. Therefore, for example, one of the Clanfield sites is actually in Horndean Parish. Also, Catherington and Lovedean are mentioned separately. Taking this into account these comments pertain to following developments within Horndean Parish
52. Horndean 320
53. Clanfield drift road/white dirt lane 80
54. Catherington 13
55. Lovedean 30
56. Total 443 potential new homes in Horndean Parish

### 57. Major Concerns

58. In addition to the general loss of countryside and biodiversity and the narrowing of gaps between the settlements above our primary concern is infrastructure, not only shops, doctors, schools etc, but also transport, road use and utilities.
59. The roads and infrastructure such as sewers in the Horndean area were designed for countryside traffic and habitation levels. We were assured at the Councillor's briefing that infrastructure would be looked at in parallel with the Local Plan over the next 18 months.
60. What if the infrastructure upgrades are not forthcoming? An example was given of the difficulties encountered whereby the EHDC team and the Local Health Authority could not agree to share funding to expand the doctors' surgery at Clanfield. EHDC were willing to use CIL funds, but the Local Health Authority (who needed to fund 1/3 of the bill) had no funds or priority for this – the result no expansion.
61. How will these infrastructure dependencies will be managed? We realise that these projects are often outside EHDC's control but the impact of delayed or missing infrastructure will reflect on whether the Local Plan is considered a success. Will there be more visibility about how the thinking can be joined up – effectively an Infrastructure Plan?
62. When large developments like Land East of Horndean (LEOH) are considered with over 700 houses in one place, the s106 agreement ensures that specific types of infrastructure will be provided e.g. Sports Pitch, Junior School, Community Building and Skate Park.
63. The developments outlined in the new Local Plan will add 443 houses, in builds between 6-160 houses across 6 or 7 sites, the cumulative effect on infrastructure needs to be sufficiently considered. It is also important to look at the activity in the bordering Parishes/Boroughs – Havant/Rowlands Castle/Clanfield etc because we then soon get to well over 1000 homes into an area of 10sqkm excluding LEOH.

### Land at Woodcroft Farm - 160 dwellings

64. This is effectively an extension of Havant Borough's Catherington Park development, which is itself being also extended by the Woodcroft Copse development. The early planning submission we have seen is for 200 dwellings, not 160, with many dwellings in flats or apartments. The site is only accessible via Eagle Avenue/Milton Road.
65. The "local shops" are convenience stores, the nearest supermarkets for the weekly shop being Sainsburys/Lidl/ASDA at Waterloooville or Morrisons on the A3M, increasing traffic on Lovedean Lane and Milton Road.
66. The proposed development on Lovedean Lane is close by and two other developments are underway on Lovedean lane (Havant Borough side).
67. The Land in the winter is wet, run off is high, and flooding on the smaller roads (e.g. Anmore Road) and in Lovedean Lane residents' gardens on the west side is frequent. There are significant wildlife issues such as a large badger population in the centre of the proposed site. The developer proposes to surround the badgers!
68. There is Woodcroft Junior School on site, but the nearest senior schools are at Cowplain and Horndean Technology College, again a drive not a walk. Buses run to Cowplain but not to Horndean.
69. These drainage and traffic issues need to be understood and mitigation planned. The existing issues with the access roads on to the Catherington Park site need to be resolved (currently the roads are unfinished and not adopted).

### **Land South of Five Heads Road – 118 Dwellings**

70. Once again, we have had early sight of this development. Our major concerns here are traffic on Catherington Lane and the main sewer on Catherington Lane.
71. The developer traffic survey was done at the wrong time of the day, at a time of the year when two school years of HTC children were on exam timetable and work experience. Catherington Lane is busiest between 0800hrs and 1500/1600 hrs and is considered by the residents as a nightmare. It is busy at other times also, resulting in poor air quality for residents and children attending school particularly between Stonechat Road and London Road.
72. Those same residents experience significant issues with the main sewer, often resulting with sewage backing up into their houses and gardens. Many have had pumps installed because the main sewer is higher than the local pipework. An additional 118 dwellings plus those at Catherington will exacerbate this issue.
73. In addition, this development plus those at Catherington, effectively close the gap between Horndean and Catherington to a few yards on the west side of Catherington Lane
74. Horndean Junior School and Catherington Infant School are full (but walkable to if they weren't) and would require extension or a rebuild. We understand that Horndean Junior School has been on the rebuild list for some time, but no action has been taken.
75. The nearest weekly shop destination is Morrisons on the A3M (via Catherington Lane!)
76. Lastly the habitats of wildlife such as deer (which graze the land) and the overall biodiversity of the site, need specific actions not in the current developer plans.

### **Land North of Chalk Hill Road – 38 dwellings**

77. Biodiversity and traffic are the major concerns here. This development begins to close the gap with the eco-system of Catherington Lith.
78. There has been much development already at the top of Five Heads Road opposite the park. This will add more traffic making its way down Five Heads Road towards the London Road and the Junior School (where there is a particularly nasty blind corner near the old library). Five Heads Road near the park is not sufficiently wide for two vehicles to pass each other. The schools are full but at least within a walkable distance.

### **Land at Drift Road – 80 Dwellings**

79. This development is in Horndean Parish but is listed as Clanfield. The major concerns here are infrastructure (specifically strains on the Clanfield Surgery), road quality and water run-off. It is known by the EHDC planning team that Clanfield Surgery is at capacity and that attempts to expand it have so far failed. This development and the 100 dwellings at South Lane (within Clanfield Parish) will add to this pressure.
80. The land is currently farmland and is bordered by Drift Road and White Dirt Lane. During heavy rain, the run-off onto White Dirt Lane can cause flash flooding, this would need to be addressed.
81. White Dirt Lane to the south of the site is a narrow road with passing places and high hedgerows. It does get used as a rat-run between Catherington and Clanfield and is unsuitable for heavy vehicle traffic. The definition of the access roads to the site will be key and would probably need to use Godwin Crescent (which will not be popular with those residents).

### **Land at Parsonage Field – 6 Dwellings**

82. HPC has received 3 applications for development on this land, all have lacked sufficient detail on the building style/materials and the parking scheme or lack thereof.
83. We objected to the most recent application for this land for the following reasons:
84. This development combined with the Dairy (later) effectively closes the gap completely between the Horndean and Catherington settlements on the west side of Catherington Lane.
85. Being opposite Kingscourt School, and intending remove an existing lay-by, this represents a step backward in highway safety on Catherington Lane.
86. We understand that there are nitrates issues for both this site and the Dairy as the underground water drains ultimately into Langstone harbour.
87. It is true that the land is derelict. Our concern, however, is that landowners now only have to neglect their land so that they can later propose it as a development site (see later points on Creating Desirable Places). We would like to see some enforcement action against Landowners to stop this practice. There should be minimum standards of care for land.
88. Lastly, this land is adjacent to the Catherington Conservation (CCA) area where build style and materials need to respect the vernacular of the surrounding buildings.

### **Land at the Dairy – 7 Dwellings**

89. HPC has seen 3 or 4 attempts by the landowners to seek permission for this development. Their latest attempt is for 1 commercial unit (it is/was currently employment land) and 7 self-build dwellings.
90. At last, after many times of trying, HPC has achieved (for the commercial unit) materials in-keeping with the CCA. However, the intent this time is to use this land as self-build land for houses. In our view, land next to a conservation area is a particularly unsuitable location for people to design/build what they like.
91. The motive for the application seems aimed at moving a problem from the landowner to the individual plot owners, resulting in unnecessary and time-consuming work in planning. It is unlikely given the proximity to the CCA that self-builders will want to be constrained in the materials and style of the CCA guidelines resulting in lengthy planning delays.
92. For both of these developments, The Dairy and Parsonage field we also need to address the issues on Catherington Lane (namely traffic and sewers) raised in the previous comments on Land South of Five Heads Road.
93. The net effect of all of these developments on Catherington Lane is that Catherington ceases to be separate from Horndean. This seems to be at odds with the thrust of the emerging local plan to preserve individual settlements.

### **Land Rear of 191-211 Lovedean Lane – 30 Dwellings**

94. Development here has already been approved, in principle, subject to reserved matters. The only comment to add here is that the impact of this development is that the infrastructure requirements should be looked at cumulatively together with Catherington Park, Woodcroft Farm, Woodcroft Copse and the “in-progress” Lovedean Lane in-fill developments. All of these are taking place within a mile stretch of Lovedean Lane/Milton Road. The net effect on population and traffic is huge, the



“main” roads are inadequate, and the convenience stores are not suitable for the weekly shop.

**Horndean Parish Council**

**Planning Committee**

**26 February 2024**

1.	55562/012	<p><b>Development Land East of Horndean, Rowlands Castle Road, Horndean, Waterlooville</b></p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Reserved matters application pursuant to Outline Planning Permission 55562/005 - Consent for the approval of appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale for 311 dwellings, associated and ancillary infrastructure, landscaping, and Sustainable Drainage Systems, and partial discharge of Conditions 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 27, and 28 of Outline Planning Permission 55562/005 (amended plans and amended description (22/01/24)).</p> <p><b>Ward:</b> Kings and Blendworth</p> <p><b>Cllr Reps:</b> Teresa Attlee</p> <p><b>Report:</b> Horndean Parish Council submitted comments on this application in February 2023. At that time, it related to 318 dwellings (when the site was referred to as Residential Phase A) whereas the revised proposals are for 311 dwellings (now referred to as residential Phase C). The site was It is an application for the approval of Reserved Matter on Residential Phase C of the LEOH site (originally submitted by Bloor in November 2022). Since that time Bloor's project team has worked extensively with the Case Officer and Urban Design Officer to deal with concerns raised. The issues we raised at that time concerned a paucity of dwellings with flint facades. This point was addressed by Bloor in comments we had also made on the Design Code to the extent that further analysis of the local context has been undertaken (and it is noted there are 26 references to flint in the latest version of the Design dated January 2024). Our second concern suggested the case officer look further at the visual and noise impact from installing air source heat pumps. We have not been able to find anything further about this but can only assume that the case officer has addressed this in the various meetings referred to above.</p> <p>No further comments to add.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Sent as Delegated Power</p>
2.	54168/004	<p><b>TPO 5 Kilderkin Drive, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 0FF</b></p> <p><b>Re: Proposal:</b> Removal of 2No. Beech Trees (T6) &amp; (T7) (E.H.494) (No. 5 Havant Road, Horndean) Tree Preservation Order 2002</p> <p><b>Ward:</b> Kings and Blendworth</p> <p><b>Cllr Reps:</b> Bob Sowden</p> <p><b>Report:</b> There is a of three beech trees all with TPO on them growing all very close together. The last two in the line are in the garden of No 5. Both trees are growing right tight to the old chainline fence bordering the EHDC property in Blendworth Lane. 90% of the trunk of one has grown through the fence towards the old EHDC building itself.</p> <p>The owner of No 5 wants to remove these two trees to erect a 108 m wooden frame to hide the old cars and rubbish behind the old EHDC building. The</p>

		<p>removal of these two trees would also improve the health of the other much larger tree giving it space to grow even larger.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> No objection</p>
--	--	---

DECISION LIST  
05.02.2024 – 26.02.2024

<b>Reference No:</b> 26982/016 PARISH: Horndean <b>Location:</b> Yew Tree Cottage, Eastland Gate, Lovedean, Waterlooville, PO8 0SR <b>Proposal:</b> Construction of an indoor riding school. <b>Decision:</b> REFUSAL Decision Date: 14 February, 2024
<b>Reference No:</b> 34085/005 PARISH: Horndean <b>Location:</b> 30 Cedar Crescent, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 9EX <b>Proposal:</b> T2 - Ash Fell and replant with Ash Tree. <b>Decision:</b> CONSENT Decision Date: 14 February, 2024
<b>Reference No:</b> 32683/002 PARISH: Horndean <b>Location:</b> Laureldene, 4 Bridle Path, Horndean, Waterlooville, PO8 9PA <b>Proposal:</b> Removal of lower roof replace with increased roof space to allow for additional bedroom, en-suite and dressing room, alterations to existing window openings <b>Decision:</b> PERMISSION Decision Date: 12 February, 2024