

# **BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL**

## **Minutes of a Meeting of the Bishopstoke Parish Council held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 31 July 2018**

**Present:** Councillor Sue Toher (Chair)  
Councillor Anne Dean (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Andrew Daly  
Councillor Chris Greenwood  
Councillor Geoff Harris  
Councillor Trevor Mignot (from 68.5 to 73.2)  
Councillor Louise Parker-Jones  
Councillor Mike Thornton  
Councillor Gin Tidridge  
Councillor Anne Winstanley

**In Attendance:** Mrs Cheryl Taylor (Assistant Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

**Public Session** 2 members of the public were present.

**FULL\_1819\_M05/**

**Public Session**

### **66 Apologies for Absence**

66.1 Apologies had been received and were accepted from Cllrs Brown, Francis, Roling. Cllr Moore not present.

### **67 To decide the Parish Council response to the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan consultation**

67.1 Cllr Toher stated that the decisions by the Parish Council for the response to the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan consultation would be decided by majority response from councillors present, but that individual councillors can put in their own individual response to the plan should they wish to do so, which may differ from the response of the Council. The intention was for content of the minutes to be uploaded electronically to the consultation on the Eastleigh Borough Council website.

67.2 Cllr Toher agreed with councillors that the proposed format of the meeting would be to review the list of proposed policies for the Local Plan in order to give the opportunity to take a vote and comment on each individual policy. Each policy was then considered in order.

67.3 Strategic policy S1, Delivering sustainable development  
All councillors voted to support the principle of policy S1.

67.4 Strategic policy S2, Approach to new development  
All councillors voted to support policy S2.

67.5 Strategic policy S3, Location of new housing  
Votes were taken as Support 4, Oppose 5

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Comment to be included: The proposed locations that Eastleigh Borough Council have chosen are unsustainable and other options have not been fully appraised.

67.6 Strategic policy S4, Employment provision

Councillors discussed the need for the plan to have sufficient employment provision and for the ratio of additional employment to additional housing to be improved. There is also the need for consideration of the quality and variety of the additional jobs created.

All councillors voted to support policy S4.

Comment to be included: There needs to be a full variety of different types of employment, and the level of additional employment needs to be related to the level of additional housing and be more proportionate.

67.7 Strategic policy S5, New Communities, land north of Bishopstoke and land north and east of Fair Oak

Councillors discussed the following issues on this policy, including comments received before the meeting from members of the public and the robustness of the plan, and a vote was then taken. Cllr Mignot arrived partway through the discussion and before the vote.

67.8 It was agreed that all comments which were intended to be uploaded to the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan consultation, would be included in the minutes. Minutes to be drafted by the Assistant Clerk and Cllr Toher and to be sent to all councillors prior to submission, and to show a variety of views. Councillors noted the tight timescale to review the draft.

Discussion of the issues relating to the plan included the following:

67.9 An example of where the plan is unsound due to lack of supporting evidence is the Habitat Regulations Assessment June 2018 page 52 5.3.1, where the term “any other measures required” is too vague and implies lack of sufficient exploration of the issue.

68.0 For the air quality data, page 59, 6.2.2, concerning the impact of the dwellings on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation - this implies that because the air quality is assumed to be at an acceptable level by 2036 that this is sufficient, however, the impact of the air quality needs to be modelled all the way through the plan period, as poor air quality during the plan period will cause environmental damage to occur. The issue of air quality should also require a baseline to be taken now and before work starts.

68.1 A view was expressed that air quality on Bishopstoke Road was thought to be acceptable at present, but could worsen if the relief road does not go ahead.

68.2 A view was expressed that there was too much high density housing near the district and local centres and that there was sufficient high-density housing already. A further view was expressed that the same number of houses at a lower density could cover a greater amount of countryside.

68.3 Views were expressed that the projected housing total increase is too high compared to the level of houses actually required, and that this may affect whether the preferred option was the correct choice, leading to a need for review. It was noted that the previous Local Plan was rejected by the inspector for insufficient housing.

68.4 The plan states only 3350 of the 5200 houses will be built by the end of the plan period to 2036, so is it realistic to assume developers contributions from only 3350 houses will be sufficient to fund all of the deliverable infrastructure.  
(Cllr Mignot arrived at this point)

68.5 The possibility was discussed of Eastleigh Borough Council, ensuring that infrastructure was put in place before any housing is built. It was felt that the road infrastructure should be put in place

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

before any housing is built, particularly concerning any roads necessary for construction traffic. Comment to be included under strategic policy S6.

68.6 Concerns were expressed that the plan mentions in various sections that solving issues is “up to the developers”, and this was felt to be too vague and needed to be clearer. Concern was expressed that the plan has a lack of clarity and vagueness which should be highlighted to the inspector, and which could be highlighted with examples from the above issues raised for the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

68.7 Concern was expressed that the general vagueness associated with the Strategic Growth Option meant that there was a fundamental problem with assessing its impact. It is unclear from the transport assessment which roads would be open, and which would be closed, and whether there will be a link from Bishopstoke via The Chase development. This is fundamental to assessment of the option, as it could have a beneficial effect in terms of existing residents being able to access the new facilities, all new residents being able to access existing facilities such as the Parish Office. If a link is planned from Bishopstoke via the Chase development, the transport assessment would need to assess the impact of the additional traffic passing through existing roads, including construction traffic.

68.8 Concern was expressed that it is unclear what route lorries will take where they are currently too large to pass under the railway bridge at Allbrook. If the new link is not completed this could result in excess travel through the village of Bishopstoke, and the transport assessment has not looked sufficiently at this, and the reasons behind people travelling different routes. Comment to be included: Transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively. It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke. Comment was made that the map of the highway infrastructure does not show any new roads linking to Bishopstoke.

68.9 Concern was expressed that the two new communities are referred to as distinct and separate to existing communities, however, at least part of the land falls within the current parish boundary, which may mean that the boundary has to be redrawn. One of the strategic policies is to integrate communities, which should mean that the new communities should be integrated with the existing Bishopstoke community, such that new facilities and existing businesses can be used by all, and the current plan shows the new communities as distinct and separate, thus keeping them isolated. As a separate community it may not be sustainable. However, any integration would need to avoid excessive traffic on Bishopstoke roads and might need road improvements to achieve this. However, it was felt that the new school could relieve pressure on existing schools, which would require access between Bishopstoke and the new development.

69.0 The view was expressed that the concerns expressed by current residents in the recent Neighbourhood Plan Survey should be considered. Residents are particularly concerned by congestion and parking, and concerned about the rivers, green spaces and environmental issues. There is concern that the plan may cause damage to sites of ancient woodland because the development is too close, or through the planned road infrastructure.

69.1 Concern was expressed over the risk of flooding from these developments to houses, woodland and countryside, and the effect on the River Itchen. The Council would like reassurance that the risk of flooding has been properly assessed with the latest hydrological methodology, taking into account recent experiences at the developments The Chase and Crowdhill Green, and consideration of advice on future climate changes, such as an increase in extreme weather events.

69.2 Concern was expressed as to whether the new ruling on the wholly exceptional protection of ancient woodland and ancient trees had been taken into account and complied with. If plan is based on previous National Planning Policy Framework guidance, then when planning applications, as proposed by the plan, are submitted, they may be undeliverable if they are judged against new NPPF

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

guidance, thus making the plan unsound. If the plan does not allow for the most recent NPPF guidance, then it may be unsound.

69.3 Votes were taken as Support 4, Oppose 5, Neutral 1.  
Comments to go into the online consultation on the Local Plan will be summarised by the Assistant Clerk and Cllr Toher, and passed to councillors for review.

69.4 Strategic policy S6, New Allbrook Hill, Bishopstoke and Fair Oak link road  
Repeat comment made in S5 concerning the lack of granularity of the transport assessment, which means that it is difficult to assess if link road will be beneficial.

69.5 Concern was expressed if it has been properly assessed whether the motorway can take all of the extra traffic which would arise from Allbrook Way, which is currently very congested.

69.6 The view was expressed that without the new link road, the 1000 houses north of Bishopstoke cannot be delivered. Concern was also expressed that new residents would not use the link road and would instead go along existing roads to reach Eastleigh.

69.7 Concern was expressed over the impact of the new road on the Itchen SAC because of the angle of the cut and runoff into the Itchen, and whether this issue had been looked into sufficiently concerning possibility of contamination. Road cannot currently take large HGV's because of the railway bridge, where it also currently experiences flooding. If the solution to this problem is that the road is dug down at the railway bridge, this might increase the run off to the River Itchen. If proposed road cannot take large HGVs it cannot properly service the new communities. It is also unclear if any road runoff will be treated before going into the Itchen, and there may be issues caused by the location of the weir. More definitive answers are required for the runoff into the Itchen SAC at the location of the cutting for the new road. If the proposed solution is to lower the road and dig down under the railway bridge, the runoff should then be treated as dirty water, however, digging down is not a recommended solution.

69.8 Concern was expressed that the road should not have led the plan, but that there should have been more consideration given to sustainable alternatives to the car, and the lack of these alternatives mean that the plan is unsound.

69.9 Concern was expressed that the new road has the potential for bottlenecks at the railway bridge and any new traffic lights. If the motorway cannot take the additional traffic from the new road, existing roads will become even more congested.

70.0 There is a potential problem from the realignment of the road being on the flood zone and there are no supporting documents to point 4.3.8 that it will actually provide relief to current traffic congestion in Bishopstoke Road.

70.1 There is also a potential problem from point 4.3.9 concerning the uncertainty of the release of land to create this new road at Allbrook. There is also risk of whether the new road can be delivered as some land is not within the area covered by Eastleigh Borough Council. If the road is not able to be delivered it brings into question the sustainability of the plan.

70.2 Votes were taken as Support 1, Oppose 5, Neutral 4.

70.3 Strategic policy S7, New development in the countryside  
Concern was expressed that the plan will have a negative impact due to the fragmentation of ancient woodland and the impact on the Itchen SAC, and also due to the scale of the proposed development. This refers to the SGO, and there is concern that the plan itself contradicts strategic policy S7.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

70.3 Votes were taken as Support 9, Neutral 1.

Comment to be included: The Council support strategic policy S7 but consider the rest of the Local Plan is not congruent with this policy.

70.4 Strategic policy S8, Protection of countryside gaps

Concern was expressed that although there is a mention of a countryside gap between the new communities, there is no mention of a countryside gap between Bishopstoke and option B, and this makes it unclear what the relationship should be between Bishopstoke and the new communities. There is a lack of consistency and clarity on the definition and application of strategic gaps, and distances to services.

Votes were taken as Support 6, Neutral 4.

70.5 Strategic policy S9, The coast

Two members of the public left at this point. No comment requested by councillors.

70.6 Strategic policy S10, Green infrastructure

A view was expressed that this policy should be supported, due to the importance of close accessibility of green spaces.

All councillors supported this policy. No comment requested.

70.7 Strategic policy S11, Community facilities

Comment to be included: the plan needs to factor in access from Bishopstoke to the facilities in the new communities, with the relevant infrastructure in place to allow this.

Comment to be included: reference to “churches” should be replaced by reference to “faith groups”.

All councillors supported this policy, with comments.

70.8 Strategic policy S12, Transport infrastructure

Repeat comments on link road (S6).

Concern expressed that the strategic policy does not go far enough to consider sustainable transport, eg public transport, although it does consider route 2. Houses should include electric charging points in their specifications. High specification facilities should be included from the outset to avoid having to retrofit.

70.9 Concern was expressed that the proposed new traffic lights could worsen the road situation as traffic lights can impede movement of traffic. The use of smart lights should be considered to turn off traffic lights at non peak periods.

71.0 Votes were taken as Support 6, Oppose 3, Neutral 1.

71.1 Strategic policy S13, Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links

Item 9 pathway - not realistic to use it daily and if this means any improvement works in the woodland it needs to be carried out very sensitively, and consideration given to the impact of runoff. Concern was expressed that the path leading through the Planny (woodland north of Edward Avenue) is too small a path to be part of the bridleway route. Those on the route will also have to go through an area with 3 road junctions at the same point (Jockey Lane, Sewall Drive, a new 9 house development).

71.2 Existing routes have been highlighted which are not fit for purpose instead of a complete re-evaluation of new routes.

71.3 Concern was expressed over the Number 5 footpath running parallel to railway line, which is either going to be very dark, or there will need to be lights in the fields.

(Cllr Parker-Jones left at this point. No further comments needing minuting were made before Cllr Parker-Jones returned).

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

71.4 Comment – Support the principle of the policy, but very concerned about pathway no. 9 concerning the environmental impact on woodland habitat as it runs through Stoke Park Woods, and that this route is not currently in a sufficient state for a strategic route, and the concern that it also involves a dangerous junction at the Planny (Jockey Lane, Sewall Drive, a new 9 house development), with an impact on the strip of woodland north of Edward Avenue.

71.5 Concern expressed that some of footpaths have now become pavements.

71.6 All councillors supported this policy.

(Cllr Dean left at this point)

71.7 Policies DM1 to DM32  
No comments requested by councillors.

71.8 Policy DM33, Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople  
Concern was expressed that the policy is limited to known travellers and is not catering for all other types of travellers who may need temporary accommodation eg mobile vehicles.

(Cllr Dean returned)

71.9 All councillors supported this policy, with comment.

72.0 Policy DM34, Protection of recreation and open space facilities  
Comment to be included: there is too much focus on sports making use of sports grounds. There should be more emphasis on activities in the countryside ie activities that do not require recreation grounds.  
All councillors supported this policy, with comment.

72.1 Policies DM35 to DM40  
No comments requested by councillors.

72.2 Policy Bi1, South of Stokewood Surgery, Bishopstoke  
Comment to be included: the Council strongly support the extension of health facilities.  
All councillors supported this policy.

72.3 Policies, F01 to F09, BU1 to BU9, HA1 to HA3, H01, CF1 to CF3, E1 to E12, AL1 to AL2, HE1 to HE7, WE1 to WE4, B01 to B07  
No comments requested by councillors.

72.4 Cllr Toher read out the wording on the section ‘overall assessment of the local plan’ and requested councillors to vote on legal compliance and soundness.

72.5 For the question ‘with regards to the above information, do you consider the local plan to be legally compliant?’ All councillors voted to complete as ‘Unsure’.

72.6 For the question ‘with regards to the above information do you consider the local plan to be sound?’ Votes were taken as No 5, Yes 4, Unsure 1.

72.7 Councillors requested that the comments from previous sections be included to support the ‘No’ vote concerning the soundness of the local plan.

72.8 It was agreed that draft minutes to include responses and comments to go into the local plan, would be produced as soon as possible and distributed to councillors for review, following which the

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

formal response would be made to the Local Plan consultation on Eastleigh Borough Council's website.

**Action: Assistant Clerk and Cllr Toher**

**73 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

73.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 25 September 2018, at 7:30pm in the Parish Office.

73.2 Agenda items for September's Full Council meeting to the Clerk by Monday 17 September 2018 please.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 9.23pm*

Clerk's Note

The issue of taking part in the oral examination was part of the consultation but not included in the meeting. This was subsequently discussed by email, with the majority email vote to be taken as the Parish Council's response. Votes received by the deadline of Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> August 12pm No 2 Yes 1, and so the Parish Council decision is to not take part in the oral examination.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix A**

### **Summary of comments under each policy uploaded to the Eastleigh Borough Council website:**

#### **Strategic policy S3, Location of new housing**

The proposed locations that Eastleigh Borough Council have chosen are unsustainable and other options have not been fully appraised.

#### **Strategic policy S4, Employment provision**

There needs to be a full variety of different types of employment, and the level of additional employment needs to be related to the level of additional housing and be more proportionate.

#### **Strategic policy S5, New Communities, land north of Bishopstoke and land north and east of Fair Oak**

The plan has a lack of clarity and vagueness causing the plan to be unsound. An example of where the plan is unsound due to lack of supporting evidence is the Habitat Regulations Assessment June 2018 page 52 5.3.1, where the term “any other measures required” is too vague and implies lack of sufficient exploration of the issue. A further example is for the air quality data, page 59, 6.2.2, concerning the impact of the dwellings on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation - this implies that because the air quality is assumed to be at an acceptable level by 2036 that this is sufficient, however, the impact of the air quality needs to be modelled all the way through the plan period, as poor air quality during the plan period will cause environmental damage to occur. The issue of air quality should also require a baseline to be taken now and before work starts.

There is concern over there being too much high density housing near the district and local centres and that there is sufficient high-density housing already.

The projected housing total increase is too high compared to the level of houses actually required, and this may affect whether the preferred option was the correct choice, leading to a need for review. The plan states only 3350 of the 5200 houses will be built by the end of the plan period to 2036, so is it realistic to assume that developers contributions from only 3350 houses will be sufficient to fund all of the deliverable infrastructure.

It is unclear from the transport assessment which roads would be open, and which would be closed, and whether there will be a link from Bishopstoke via The Chase development. This is fundamental to assessment of the option, as it could have a beneficial effect in terms of existing residents being able to access the new facilities, all new residents being able to access existing facilities such as the Parish Office. If a link is planned from Bishopstoke via the Chase development, the transport assessment would need to assess the impact of the additional traffic passing through existing roads, including construction traffic. There is concern that it is unclear what route lorries will take where they are currently too large to pass under the railway bridge at Allbrook. If the new link is not completed this could result in excess travel through the village of Bishopstoke, and the transport assessment has not looked sufficiently at this, and the reasons behind people travelling different routes.

The transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively. It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke.

There is concern that the two new communities are referred to as distinct and separate to existing communities, however, at least part of the land falls within the current parish boundary, which may mean that the boundary has to be redrawn.

One of the strategic policies is to integrate communities, which should mean that the new communities should be integrated with the existing Bishopstoke community, such that new facilities and existing businesses can be used by all, and the current plan shows the new communities as distinct and separate, thus keeping them isolated. Any integration would need to avoid excessive traffic on Bishopstoke roads and might need road improvements to achieve this. However, it was felt that the new school could relieve pressure on existing schools, which would require access between Bishopstoke and the new development. There is concern that the plan may cause damage to sites of ancient woodland because the development is too close, or through the planned road infrastructure.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



The Council would like reassurance that the risk of flooding has been properly assessed with the latest hydrological methodology, taking into account recent experiences at the developments The Chase and Crowdhill Green, and consideration of advice on future climate changes, such as an increase in extreme weather events.

If the plan does not allow for the most recent NPPF guidance, then it may be unsound.

#### Strategic policy S6, New Allbrook Hill, Bishopstoke and Fair Oak link road

The road infrastructure should be put in place before any housing is built, particularly concerning any roads necessary for construction traffic.

The transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively.

It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke.

There is concern whether it has been properly assessed if the motorway can take all of the extra traffic which would arise from Allbrook Way, which is currently very congested. The new road has the potential for bottlenecks at the railway bridge and any new traffic lights - if the motorway cannot take the additional traffic from the new road, existing roads will become even more congested.

More definitive answers are required for the runoff into the Itchen SAC at the location of the cutting for the new road. If the proposed solution is to lower the road and dig down under the railway bridge, the runoff should then be treated as dirty water, however, digging down is not a recommended solution.

There is concern that there should have been more consideration given to sustainable alternatives to the car, and the lack of these alternatives mean that the plan is unsound.

There is a potential problem from the realignment of the road being on the flood zone and there are no supporting documents to point 4.3.8 that it will actually provide relief to current traffic congestion in Bishopstoke Road.

There is also a potential problem from point 4.3.9 concerning the uncertainty of the release of land to create the new road at Allbrook. There is also risk of whether the new road can be delivered as some land is not within the area covered by Eastleigh Borough Council. If the road is not able to be delivered it brings into question the sustainability of the plan.

#### Strategic policy S7, New development in the countryside

The Council support strategic policy S7 but consider the rest of the Local Plan is not congruent with this policy. There are concerns that the plan will have a negative impact due to the fragmentation of ancient woodland and the impact on the Itchen SAC, and also due to the scale of the proposed development.

#### Strategic policy S8, Protection of countryside gaps

There is concern that although there is a mention of a countryside gap between the new communities, there is no mention of a countryside gap between Bishopstoke and option B, and this makes it unclear what the relationship should be between Bishopstoke and the new communities. There is a lack of consistency and clarity on the definition and application of strategic gaps, and distances to services.

#### Strategic policy S11, Community facilities

The plan needs to factor in access from Bishopstoke to the facilities in the new communities, with the relevant infrastructure in place to allow this. Reference to “churches” should be replaced by reference to “faith groups”.

#### Strategic policy S12, Transport infrastructure

The road infrastructure should be put in place before any housing is built, particularly concerning any roads necessary for construction traffic.

The transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively.

It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke.

There is concern whether it has been properly assessed if the motorway can take all of the extra traffic which would arise from Allbrook Way, which is currently very congested. The new road has the potential for

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

bottlenecks at the railway bridge and any new traffic lights - if the motorway cannot take the additional traffic from the new road, existing roads will become even more congested.

More definitive answers are required for the runoff into the Itchen SAC at the location of the cutting for the new road. If the proposed solution is to lower the road and dig down under the railway bridge, the runoff should then be treated as dirty water, however, digging down is not a recommended solution.

There is concern that there should have been more consideration given to sustainable alternatives to the car, and the lack of these alternatives mean that the plan is unsound.

There is a potential problem from the realignment of the road being on the flood zone and there are no supporting documents to point 4.3.8 that it will actually provide relief to current traffic congestion in Bishopstoke Road.

There is also a potential problem from point 4.3.9 concerning the uncertainty of the release of land to create the new road at Allbrook. There is also risk of whether the new road can be delivered as some land is not within the area covered by Eastleigh Borough Council. If the road is not able to be delivered it brings into question the sustainability of the plan.

The specification for new houses should include electric charging points.

The use of smart lights should be considered to turn off traffic lights at non peak periods.

#### Strategic policy S13, Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links

There is concern over the Number 5 footpath running parallel to railway line, which is either going to be very dark, or there will need to be lights in the fields.

The Council support the principle of the policy, but very concerned about pathway no. 9 concerning the environmental impact on woodland habitat as it runs through Stoke Park Woods, that this route is not currently in a sufficient state for a strategic route, and that it also involves a dangerous junction at the Planny (Jockey Lane, Sewall Drive, a new 9 house development), with an environmental impact also on the strip of woodland north of Edward Avenue.

#### Policy DM33, Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople

The policy is limited to known travellers and is not catering for all other types of travellers who may need temporary accommodation eg mobile vehicles.

#### Policy DM34, Protection of recreation and open space facilities

There is too much focus on sports making use of sports grounds. There should be more emphasis on activities in the countryside ie activities that do not require recreation grounds.

#### Policy Bi1, South of Stokewood Surgery, Bishopstoke

The Council strongly support the extension of health facilities.

#### Overall Summary:

Councillors requested that the comments from previous sections be included to support the 'No' vote concerning the soundness of the local plan.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_