



## **Crookham Village Parish Council OBJECTS to**

**17/00264/REM** Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout & scale  
No Environmental Impact Assessment submitted at Land At Watery Lane Church Crookham  
Fleet Hampshire

on the following grounds:

- 1. Objections from Natural England, Sport England and Thames Water suggest that the application in its present form is not a candidate for approval. Further objections from CVPC and others reinforce this point.**

### **Documentation**

2. The documentation provided lacks important detail. As such it fails to provide a sound basis on which to judge the acceptability of the proposals and, equally importantly, fails to give a clear basis on which to judge compliance with any permission that might result.
3. There is confusion between Redfields Lane and Redlands Lane (which is on the other side of the A287). All references to Redlands Lane are in error – including that in the application form. There are other mistakes in naming roads, which further decreases confidence in the care with which this application has been prepared.
4. Judging from objections from key statutory consultees, proposals put forward for drainage, sports provision, SANG and protection of the Canal SSSI require further consultation and changes to the application.

### **Building Design**

5. Many of the proposed buildings are significantly taller than properties within the adjacent Zebon Copse estate and are out of character with the rural setting of the application site.
6. The square blocks of flats proposed for area A<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-STREET\_ELEVATIONS\_SHEET\_1]</sup> are in a prominent position adjacent to Redfields Lane and are completely inappropriate for this setting. Suggestions that they would match adjacent retail and health facilities imply that the developer has equally inappropriate industrial/urban designs in mind for these buildings as well, should they ever be built.
7. The street scene on the spine road<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT\_PART\_2 para 4.2]</sup> would be dominated by serried ranks of taller buildings giving a constrained, town-centre effect in this rural setting similar to that seen on the Hitches Lane frontage of Edenbrook and within the Elvetham Heath development.

## Site Layout

8. Residents of Farriers Close are concerned at the proximity of proposed dwellings to their present boundary and the lack of detail of boundary enhancements to the site.
9. No detail is provided of links into and out of the site, other than via the spine road, mentioned in the Design and Access Statement.
10. Residents in the adjacent settlement expressed concern that there was only one normal access to the development and that there seemed to be potential for unofficial access from the site into Watery Lane and the Farriers Close area.

## Roads

11. Without explanation, the proposed adopted section of the spine road does not extend to Redfields Lane<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-PROPOSED\_LIMIT\_OF\_HIGHWAY\_ADOPTION]</sup>.
12. The sections of unadopted roads within the development raises questions about long-term maintenance arrangements for both surface (including retention of permeable areas), lighting, drainage and supporting infrastructure in these areas.
13. *“Where no dwellings are located adjacent to the road, a suitable planted strip is provided appropriate to its relationship with the woodland edge.”*<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT\_PART\_2 para 4.3]</sup>. Similarly designed areas on Zebon Copse estate have proved to be unsuitable for pedestrian traffic in wet weather and encourage people to walk in the roadway. Both sides of all estate roads should have paved footways where there is likely to be pedestrian traffic.
14. The objection of the Joint Waste Client Team<sup>[1207755-17\_00264\_REM-. \_JOINT\_WASTE\_CLIENT\_TEAM]</sup> suggests that changes are required to the proposed road layout in some areas.

## Street Lighting

15. No detailed lighting plan has been seen by CVPC. Full details are required before a judgement can be made.
16. Bollard lighting installed by Martin Grant on the Zebon Copse estate lasted only a short time before accident/vandalism rendered them inoperable. Adequately-robust lighting is required on this new development.
17. Maintenance and provision of power to lighting in unadopted areas need to be addressed by condition.

## Parking

18. The only count of parking spaces is that for visitor parking. No overall figure is given for domestic parking so it is not possible to calculate the basis on which domestic parking has been determined to ensure that it adequately reflects the rural location of this development.
19. This site is in a rural setting and is no longer served by a bus service. Car ownership is therefore likely to be greater than assumed for Hart’s Zone 2 parking standards. Notwithstanding the reported acceptance by Highways<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT para 4.6]</sup> that parking standards between Zones 2 and 3 would be acceptable on the understanding that there would be no three-in-a-row parking spaces, CVPC strongly contends that the minimum standard should be Zone 3 with a possible requirement for even more spaces due to the complete lack of local bus services.

20. In contrast to the above, “without a large amount of three-in-a-row driveway spaces”<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT]</sup> seems to suggest that some three-in-a-row parking would be acceptable.

## Waste Water

21. Thames Water, despite the new pumping station on Hitches Lane and assurance at the time that this would cater for future developments, now states that their infrastructure cannot cope with this proposed development<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-WASTE\_COMMENT]</sup>. Adequate provision for waste water disposal must be guaranteed before this development proceeds.
22. Current proposals for connection to the sewage system require piping across the end of Danvers Drive, which would impede vehicular access to Zebon Community Centre during installation. Vehicular access to the Centre must be maintained throughout construction, which must be addressed by condition.

## Storm Water

23. Significant concerns remain about proposals for dealing with storm water.
24. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) require that flood risk to land and property is not increased because of developments.
25. The approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was undertaken by WSP Group in February 2014, which identified two significant watercourses on site. The River Hart (designated a main river) flows south to north within the western region of the site, and an ordinary watercourse flows east to west within the northern region of part of the site.
26. The refinement of the proposed site layout has changed some of the proposed surface water drainage catchments within this report such that an amended report should be resubmitted for approval as there are some glaring deficiencies in the present proposals. For example: it is proposed<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-SITE\_DRAINAGE\_PLAN]</sup> that the parcel will drain to a detention basin (Pond A&B) located within the public open space to the north of the parcel. This basin will discharge via a vortex flow control into the adjacent watercourse. This point of discharge is not to a watercourse but to a plain ditch which is inadequate for the receipt of this degree of discharge. This must be reconsidered so that discharge is made to a suitable watercourse. The closest suitable watercourse is not adjacent to the site but is located between the edge of Zebon Copse and Stables Cottage/Meadow View Cottage.
27. There are existing surface run off issues that also require resolving. For example: the field entrance located opposite Abury House and Velmead Cottage at present acts as a conduit to significant egress of surface water from this site onto Watery Lane. Closure of this with the reinstatement of the ditch to enable contiguous water management must be considered. The increase in runoff with development will result in increased risk to adjacent land and properties unless action is taken at this location.
28. The water table is very high on the housing site and the underlying clay impermeable. It is not at all clear how effective permeable surfaces will be, especially in the longer term. If approved, conditions should be imposed to ensure that these surfaces are properly maintained and kept in a good state of repair.
29. The points made by Mr Lawrenson<sup>[17\_00264\_REM-MR\_TIM\_LAWRENSON-OBJECTS\_FULL]</sup> deserve expert appraisal and due consideration.

## Internet

30. No details have been given about internet facilities for the development.

## Sports

31. The s106 agreement signed with 14/00504/OUT for this site states: *“Open Space Specification: The specification or specifications detailing the method of laying out and completing the Sports Pitches and Play Areas and the Informal Open Space Green Infrastructure and SUDS such specification to be approved as part of the reserved matters approval for the relevant Phase of the Development or otherwise approved pursuant to relevant conditions attached to the Planning Permission.”* CVPC has yet to see a detailed specification for the sports element.
32. This application <sup>[17\_00264\_REM-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT\_PART\_2 para 7.1]</sup> states that *“The site contains an area of sports pitches and facilities as set out within the Outline Approval”*. It should be emphasised that the outline approval did not address the internal layout of the site and therefore does not specify the location or layout of sports facilities, which remain to be determined under Reserved Matters.
33. The CVPC submission to the appeal for 14/00504/OUT is at Annex A and gives detailed sports area considerations at points 13 to 25 inclusive which were raised at the time which should be considered in addition to the comments below. Detailed sports parking calculations are at Annex B.

## Sports Pitches

34. CVPC agrees with Sport England that the two small pitches adjacent to the canal are inappropriately sited from both ecological, safeguarding and practical considerations. The loss of these pitches would mean that this reserved matters application would fail to satisfy both Hart Draft Policy LOS1<sup>[Developer Contributions - Leisure\_and\_Open\_Space\_Facilities\_July\_2012]</sup> as well as PPG17.
35. CVPC notes and supports Sport England’s reservations about the number and type of pitches and lack of floodlighting proposed. It would appear that the developer has failed adequately to research these aspects and that a rethink is required.
36. CVPC has concerns at the potential for noise intrusion from the MUGA being sited so close to existing properties on Zebon Copse estate and that people using the MUGA will be tempted to park in Zebon Community Centre car parks rather than on the proposed sports parking within the development site. The MUGA should be relocated further from existing housing and Zebon Community Centre.
37. No dimensions are given for the proposed pitches, which precludes their assessment against current Sport England criteria.
38. Drainage plans for the sports pitches have not been submitted and therefore cannot be assessed. The majority of the pitches are situated in a notably boggy area and so adequate drainage is essential to ensure that the playing surfaces are available for the whole season.
39. No mention is made of measures to protect parked cars from balls escaping from adjacent pitches and to reduce the risk of young players running into vehicle areas.
40. No specifications are given for surfaces of MUGA or ATP, which again prevents assessment against established criteria.
41. New and existing sports pitches would best be managed by a single entity. Given ownership by CVPC of the existing pitches, it will clearly be logical for CVPC to take over all of the new sports and leisure facilities, subject to acceptable terms and financial arrangements. However, the para 20.11 of the s106 agreement from 14/00504/OUT states: *“Within 28 days of the Provision of the Sports Pitches and Play Areas the Owners shall serve written notice on the Council and Parish Council confirming whether the Owners elect to: 20.11.1 maintain the Sports Pitches and Play Areas (either itself or through a Management Entity); or alternatively 20.11.2 offer the Sports Pitches and Play Areas to the Parish Council.”* CVPC proposes that this sequence be changed by Deed of Variation so that the Owners first offer to the Parish Council rather to themselves. Furthermore, 28 days is an unreasonably-short time in which to fully assess the financial aspects of a transfer, which should also be addressed by Deed of Variation after due consultation with the parish. Otherwise, CVPC risks being left without changing facilities to support the existing pitches.

## Sports Lighting

42. The signed s106 agreement for the outline application 14/005004/OUT for this site states: *“ATP: An artificial turf pitch to be provided on the Site in the location shown indicatively within FSI on Plan I in accordance with the relevant Reserved Matters Application with appropriate lighting to be subject to approval under the relevant planning conditions such pitch being an artificial turf football pitch Youth U 11/U 12 (Type 9 v 9) as set out in the FA Guide to 3G Football Turf Pitch Design Principles and Layouts 2013 or such other equivalent size and standard as may be proposed by the Owners and agreed by the Council.”* and *“MUGA: A multi-use games area to be provided on the Site in the location shown indicatively as within FS I on Plan I in accordance with any Reserved Matters Application and the guidance in Sport England - A Guide to the Design Specification and Construction of Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) or such other equivalent or updated standard as may be proposed by the Owners and agreed by the Council with appropriate lighting to be subject to approval under relevant planning conditions.”*
43. No details of pitch lighting have been submitted with this application, neither have the locations of these pitches been finalised in advance.

## Sports Parking

44. The signed s106 document for 14/00504/OUT states: *“Sports Pitches Car Park: A car park to be provided on the Site in the location shown as FSCP on Plan I such car park to be capable of providing car parking for not less than 30 cars with the final number of car parking spaces to be determined through the approval of the relevant Reserved Matters Application.”* It is clear, therefore, that details of car parking remain to be defined under this Reserved Matters application and are not constrained by the appeal outcome.
45. Sport England suggests that parking provision is inadequate, but may not have been aware that the new parking will need to cater not only for the new pitches, but also for the existing pitches since all players and spectators will expect to park near to the new sports pavilion.
46. Overspill parking elsewhere will result from failure to provide adequate sports parking and would threaten the financial viability of Zebon Community Centre. CVPC calculates that 96 dedicated sports parking spaces would be needed on this new development plus an allowance for spectators for important league matches together with a space for the sports office manager. Some spaces would also need to be reserved for disabled players and spectators.
47. Removal of all bus services anywhere near the site means that adequate sports parking has become even more critical than was the case at the time of the appeal into the outline application.
48. It should be noted that the 14 extra spaces scheduled to be added to Zebon Community Centre parking under the existing s106 agreement are to cater for the extra hall space also included, not to provide extra parking for sports activity.

## Sports Pavilion, Equipment and Storage

49. Sport England requires separate changing rooms for male and female officials separated from those for players. The current layout does not meet this requirement.
50. Six changing rooms are proposed for 8 pitches (5 new plus 3 existing), which does not allow for separate rooms for each team nor is there provision for officials.
51. It is not clear whether showers will be provided in all changing rooms.

52. The proposal states <sup>[17\_00264\_REM-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT\_PART\_2 para 7.1]</sup> “1no. Sport Pavilion including 6no. changing rooms, storage for sports equipment, a kitchen, meeting room, office, male/ female and disabled toilets.” The only storage within the proposed sports pavilion is a small cupboard adjacent to the office, which may cater for cleaning materials, but little else. No provision of storage for sports equipment is shown on the plans in accordance with the s106 agreement.
53. The proposed kitchen only offers serving into the meeting room. An external serving hatch is also required to cater for half-time serving when plyers are wearing dirty football boots.
54. No mention is made of equipment such as corner flags ad goal posts, nor of maintenance equipment such as a crumbing machine for the ATP together with equipment for the MUGA and pitches, all of which adds up to a significant requirement for storage since removable items need to be put away after every session, goalposts need to be stored securely during the off season and the crumbing machine will require secure garaging.
55. The pavilion includes an office, but no mention is made of provision of telephone and internet connections which would be essential for efficient management of the sports facilities.

## Play Areas

56. Play area management and maintenance needs to be addressed.
57. Based on experience at Zebon Community Centre, CVPC remains to be convinced that wooden play equipment is sufficiently robust or adequately amenable to structural assessment later in its life. Detail of equipment to be provided should be negotiated with CVPC.

## Construction Phase

58. Old properties in Farriers Close are vulnerable to ground vibration. Due consideration should be required by condition to restrain piling and other activities that might compromise existing properties adjacent to the site.
59. Condition should require construction traffic to access the site only via A287/Redfields Lane and that access times should be restricted to avoid morning and afternoon peak traffic, including to St Nicholas School.
60. Condition to require construction traffic should not be allowed to use Watery Lane or to access the site through Zebon Copse estate.

## Zebon Copse Centre

61. Outline approval and associated developer contributions for conversion of the sports area of Zebon Community Centre into a community hall and office and for addition of 14 car parking spaces for the ZCC car park was included s106 agreement.

## Items to be resolved with CVPC

62. CVPC proposes that the following items should be agreed in advance of consideration of the application by the Hart Planning Committee and that CVPC should take part in any associated negotiations.
63. Management of sports facilities and financial aspects, including a Deed of Variation to the s106 as discussed in para 40 above.
64. Management of LEAPS and LAPs and financial aspects.
65. Management of open spaces and financial aspects.

- 65.1. Management of SANG and financial aspects.
- 65.2. Provision of supporting equipment for sports pitches.
- 65.3. Details of LEAP and LAP equipment.
- 65.4. Access to Zebon Community Centre during works.

CVPC  
13 March 2017

## **Annex A**

### **Extract from Appeal Submission on Sports Facilities 14/00504/OUT**

#### **Cascade Principle**

13. As the proposed site immediately adjoins our existing boundaries and we already have a structure in place to manage such facilities, we are of the view that we would be best placed to run the new facilities. We are also concerned that the new changing pavilion will represent a shared resource between the two sites which may lead to contention between users if the new facility is under separate management. CVPC requests that, at a suitable stage in the provision of the Sports Pitches and Play Areas, the Owners shall offer the Sports Pitches and Play Areas to the Parish Council as their first option.

#### **Sports Facilities – grass pitches**

14. Irrespective of who finally manages the facility, the Parish's primary concern is to ensure that the new sports facilities are viable such that they provide a long term benefit to the Community and meet projected local demand within an acceptable financial framework. Following consultation with HDC Leisure Services, we understand that a recent survey into district sports needs revealed an overwhelming need for football pitches. There is no reason to believe that the proposed development will differ materially from the District statistics. For this reason, we believe that the new grass sports pitches should be configured as defined in the FA Guide to Pitch and Goal post Dimensions 2012. The S.106 agreement indicates that the sports pitches will be provided as set out in the Sport England Comparative Sizes of Sport Pitches and Courts (February 2009 update). It should be noted that we have been unable to locate a copy of this specification which was superseded by the April 2011 update. Additionally the new pitches must be levelled and provided with adequate drainage in accordance with the Sport England Grass Pitch Quality Performance Standard in view of the prevailing ground conditions at the site.

#### **ATP**

15. The S.106 agreement also stipulates that an artificial turf pitch (ATP) is to be provided which is defined as "...being an Astro turf football pitch (U13 – U14) as set out in the Sport England Comparative Sizes of Sport Pitches and Courts (February 2009 update)." CVPC believes that to comply with the current FA requirements, and to permit League games to be played on this surface, the ATP should be built in accordance with The FA Guide to 3G Football Turf Pitch Design Principles and Layouts, which includes the provision of floodlighting as an essential requirement to ensure viability.

#### **MUGA**

16. CVPC notes that the MUGA is specified in the S.106 agreement as being in accordance with the guidance in Sport England – A Guide to the Design and Specification and Construction of Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) and requests that this facility has a macadam surface and is a minimum of 37m by 18.5m so that it is useful for a range of sports, in particular tennis, as highlighted in the comments provided by Sports England in their letter dated 11 April 2014.

## Capital Costs

17. We note that the S.106 agreement as currently drafted does not contain any capital contribution towards the cost of fitting out the new sports pitches nor the maintenance equipment required to maintain both the ATP and MUGA. CVPC requests that the S.106 agreement is updated to ensure that all pitches are supplied fully equipped. This is particularly important in the case of the ATP and MUGA where expensive specialist equipment will be required for example a crumbing machine which currently retails at £10,000. As the precise configuration of each pitch will not be decided until reserved matters, it is difficult to supply an estimate of the likely total cost of other equipment that would be needed.

## Commuted Sums

18. The current draft of the S.106 agreement states that *“the Owners shall pay the Sports Pitches and Play Areas Maintenance Contribution to the Parish Council on the date of which such transfer is completed;”* There is no reference to either the amount of the maintenance contribution nor any indication as to how this is to be calculated. We appreciate that the detailed design of the sports pitches and play areas is to be left to reserved matters; nevertheless, in view of the very significant cost of maintaining the ATP, where the entire play surface has to be replaced every seven to ten years at a present day cost of £200,000, the S.106 agreement needs to specify the basis on which these sums will be calculated such that it is possible to assess whether the commuted sums will be sufficient to cover the costs of maintenance over an acceptable period of years.

## Parking for Sport Facility

19. Based on our current experience, the Parish is strongly of the view that the suggested 30 parking spaces for the new sports facilities is woefully inadequate.
20. We have monitored the ZCC car park throughout the season and have found that for the 3 ZCC pitches which consist of 1 full size and 2 mini-pitches, the number of cars in the car park typically varies from 63 to over 70 vehicles on weekends where matches are being played at home. Not only is the car park full, but overspill parking occurs regularly along the approach road to ZCC which is only 4.1 metres wide and means that emergency vehicles would have difficulty in accessing the site should they be needed (as is demonstrated by the photographs in Appendix III). This problem will be further exacerbated unless the new facilities have adequate parking and the location of the sports car park and sports pavilion discourage sports parking at ZCC.
21. The S.106 specifies a minimum of 30 spaces in the sports area with a further 20 spaces for the SANG. We have consistently expressed our concern that this is totally insufficient to support the number of pitches to be served, particularly in view of the fact that two of the pitches are an ATP and MUGA, both of which are very likely to prove very popular as they represent scarce resources in the District and will potentially be used during weekday evenings when space at ZCC is already at a premium for users of the halls. Inevitably all of the adjacent SANG parking will also be occupied at the times the pitches are in use which will be most evenings and much of the weekend. We are aware that these matters were raised by representatives of HDC at a meeting held on 15 May 2014 at which Adam Green of HDC was reported as having concerns

“...about changing room capacity and car parking. Match/training days apparently create a big car parking problem and more parking was seen as a priority. AG wanted to ensure that car park capacity did not result in SANG car park being occupied by football users...”.

22. The lack of adequate parking is also very likely to threaten the viability of ZCC itself. The indicative plan shows the placement of the proposed sports pavilion immediately adjacent to the current ZCC car park, which means that it is very likely to be used as a car park for the sports area. Over the last few years, local clubs have used the pitches at ZCC in the evenings in the Spring term as a training facility and this has resulted in significant contention between sports users and hall users such that we had to police the use of the car park. Last year we attempted to resolve the problem by partitioning the car park and allocating parking spaces to each user. This year, the local clubs requested a significant increase in their parking allocation which could not be accommodated and as a result, we lost this booking. Inadequate sports parking for the new facilities would threaten the viability of ZCC and could result in the loss of this existing valued facility which would be contrary to NPPF Para 70.
23. We have sought the advice of HDC to calculate the number of car parking spaces that would be required to support the proposed ATP, MUGA and four grass pitches. Carl Westby, Head of HDC Leisure has advised that the normal practice at HDC is to use a formula based on the raw data from their similar sports facility at Frogmore. The calculation is provided in the email from Carl Westby dated 10 April 2015 at Appendix IV, as is the CVPC projected parking requirement based on this formula. As most of the league games occur at consecutive intervals on Saturday and Sunday mornings, we calculate that a minimum of 70 spaces would be required to service the new facility.
24. We have also sought the assistance of Sacha Nicholas of Hampshire FA to verify the basis of the HDC calculation. Mr Nicholas has responded that he has referred the issue nationally and:
- “... the FA would suggest that the Parish Council have been thorough & modest in their assessment of 70 'adequate' car parking spaces. 30 car parking spaces for a 4 pitch site and an AGP seems extremely low and should be challenged. As an example recently for a 9 v 9 3G FTP on a club site with a step 5 ground and the planners stipulated they must provide 73 parking spaces.”*
25. CVPC requests that the S106 agreement be amended to include a minimum of 70 car park spaces for the new sports pitches. We would also request that none of the new sports pitches be provided for use before the new sports pavilion has been built and all the sports parking provided to ensure that the parking problems at ZCC are not further exacerbated by the addition of new facilities without the supporting parking provision. CVPC requests that this is also reflected in the S.106 agreement.

## Annex B

### Watery Lane Sports Pitches Parking Requirement

#### New - Watery Lane Configuration for Junior Matches

Pitch	Number of Players	Cars at start and end of match	Cars on site during match	No Players	Cars at start and end of match	Cars on site during match	Officials
ATP (as 3 x 5v5)	15	7.5	3.75	15	7.5	7.5	3
MUGA (5v5)	5	2.5	1.25	5	2.5	2.5	1
Grass pitch 1 (5v5)	5	2.5	1.25	5	2.5	2.5	1
Grass pitch 2 (5v5)	5	2.5	1.25	5	2.5	2.5	1
Grass pitch 3 (5v5)	5	2.5	1.25	5	2.5	2.5	1
Grass pitch 4 (5v5)	5	2.5	1.25	5	2.5	2.5	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>

#### Parking Requirement Calculation

Cars on site at end of session	48
Cars on site at start of following session	48
	<hr/>
Total Parking spaces required when all pitches are in use	<b><u><u>96</u></u></b>

- Based on Car Parking Standards email from Carl Westby (HDC) dated 10 April 2015
- The figures are based on the ATP being configured as 3 x 5v5 pitches for junior league matches. This is based on discussions held between CVPV, Hart FC and HDC indicating that these pitches represent the greatest demand locally.