

<p>Clerk:</p> <p>Ms Wendy Simson 3 Farriers Close, Preston Candover, RG25 2EZ</p> <p>01256 389457 clerk@prestoncandoverandnutleyipc.co.uk</p>	<p>Preston</p> <p>Candover &</p> <p>Nutley Parish</p> <p>Council</p>	<p>Chairman:</p> <p>Mr Robin Human Cherrytree Cottage, Preston Candover, RG25 2EQ</p> <p>01256 389457 intelligentmetals@gmail.com</p>
---	--	--

Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
London Road
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4AH

22nd January 2026

Dear Sirs,

Local Plan Draft Spatial Strategy Regulation 18 Consultation November 2025 Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council Response

1. Draft Spatial Strategy Regulation 18 Consultation

Draft Policy SPS5.9: Upper Swallick

The Parish Council objects to the inclusion of Upper Swallick within the Draft Regulation 18 Spatial Strategy Local Plan (2024–2042). We believe its inclusion is inconsistent with both the adopted National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the draft revised NPPF currently out for consultation, particularly in relation to principles governing development in the countryside and sustainable patterns of development.

National Policy Context – Adopted NPPF: Paragraph 187(b) of the adopted NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This principle applies to plan-making and requires local plans to protect ordinary countryside, not merely designated landscapes. We are concerned that the inclusion of Upper Swallick is not “sound” for the purposes of adopted NPPF paragraph 33 - because it does not meet the paragraph (b) justified requirement or paragraph (d) consistent with national planning policy requirement.

Draft NPPF (December 2025): Section 4 of the draft revised NPPF sets out the objective that development needs should be met through sustainable patterns of development. That the potential for growth on suitable land *within settlements* should be maximised and development away from settlements should be limited to help safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. While not yet adopted, this draft policy represents a clear national direction that is relevant to an assessment of the Upper Swallick proposal.

Conflict with Countryside Protection: Development at Upper Swallick would result in the loss of open countryside. It would erode and undermine the landscape character, rural character and settlement identity of Cliddesden (and potentially Ellisfield) and conflict with both adopted and emerging national policy requirements to safeguard countryside character. The introduction of a built environment on the scale contemplated would have a significant detrimental effect on the dark skies that currently exist and support wildlife in this location. The strategic gap proposed between Upper Swallick and Cliddesden would amount

Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council

Continued (Page 2 of 11) ...

to a single field, which given the dominant size of Upper Swallick, would be wholly insufficient. In our opinion, the principle that development in rural areas should be exceptional, justified and landscape led is not satisfied by Upper Swallick.

Unsustainable Development Pattern: The attachment of the label “garden village” to this proposal is misleading. It is not credible to believe that Upper Swallick will provide sufficient employment, shopping or services within it for it to be self sustaining. The proposal is inconsistent with the NPPF’s emphasis on development in locations that can support day to day needs locally. Notwithstanding any aspirational desire to do so, this location will never have the level of public transport options needed to avoid private vehicle use and inevitably future residents would be heavily reliant on private vehicles. This is inconsistent with NPPF objectives on reduction in the need to travel and promoting sustainable development.

Lack of Strategic Justification: The Draft Spatial Strategy does not demonstrate that sustainable alternatives within or adjacent to Basingstoke have been exhausted. In the absence of such evidence, the inclusion of Upper Swallick represents an irreversible loss of open countryside without justification.

Conclusion: For the reasons set out above, we believe Upper Swallick should be removed from the Draft Spatial Strategy.

Policy SPS6: Neighbourhood Planning and Settlement Plan re: Preston Candover

Parish Council’s Position in Summary:

- We challenge the fairness of a doubling of our housing target and request it is reversed.
- We support the change of approach to counting within the Settlement Policy Boundary.
- We suggest the same approach to counting be taken in the countryside too.
- We would like additional information to be included in the Settlement Study section on Preston Candover.
- We do not regard the conclusion in the Settlement Study to be accurate and would like it to be amended in line with our suggested wording.

Explanation/Detail:

New Neighbourhood Allocation: The Parish Council does not support the doubling of its housing requirement from 10 to 20 as set out in Policy SPS6.

We believe the neighbourhood planning target has not been met due to a combination of:

- (a) the constraints of our location; and
- (b) the current counting methodology.

In these circumstances we think it would be unfair to double our housing requirement.

We are not aware of any development proposals that have been brought forward for planning permission which would have met our previous requirement, notwithstanding the existence of two substantial SHELAA sites since 2019. The reality is that none of the sites that have been promoted by landowners in the last six years have been deemed economically viable by developers, none are in line with the current planning framework and all have site specific constraints. The Parish is neither landowner nor developer and the constraints that have prevented development to date are outside the control of the Parish.

Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council

Continued (Page 3 of 11) ...

The January 2024 Settlement Study – in contrast to the current version – recognised Preston Candover’s “low level of sustainability” as a justification not to impose an additional requirement. This sustainability issue has not been resolved; the difference between the 2024 consultation and this one is the increased housing need figure that has been generated by the new methodology in the 2024 NPPF. However, the fact that there has been this uplift does not alter the fact that constraints exist in this Parish. If it has not been possible to meet the existing allocation it seems illogical to expect a doubling will somehow solve the constraints that have prevented development to date.

The current counting methodology has, in effect, meant that our Parish could never meet the allocation through development within the Settlement Policy Boundary – there is no space for 10 new dwellings within the Settlement Policy Boundary and outside it there are constraints in the SHELAA sites that have meant they have not proceeded to development. If the counting methodology had been different, the Parish would have been able to demonstrate some progress towards its target allocation. Our sense is that since 2011 there have been eight new homes in our Parish – one of which is a new build inside the Settlement Policy Boundary. Of the others, all of which are in the countryside, it has been a combination of change of use, demolition and replacement and a subdivision rather than new builds. This, of course, is a reflection of, and consistent with, the more restrictive policies that rightly apply to building in the countryside. The current counting methodology means that none of these eight new homes (against a current allocation of ten) have been applied against our allocation.

In these circumstances the doubling of our requirement seems unreasonable.

Change in counting methodology: We support the new approach to counting set out in paragraph 5.246 within Settlement Policy Boundaries. However, the justification for a continuation of existing policy for developments outside Settlement Policy Boundaries is less clear. We would support an alignment of approach in terms of counting for development within and outside the Settlement Policy Boundary – ie all new dwellings should be counted wherever they are located.

We understand, and agree, that housing in the countryside should be subject to different rules in terms of permissions and would not support any relaxation in this regard. However, if permission is given to build in the countryside then we believe all buildings should count, not only those in a grouping of five or more.

The counting of a new home in the countryside towards a neighbourhood target would not amount to an endorsement of new isolated homes in the countryside or cut across the minimum requirements applied in calls for sites, if the provision and guidance to it is properly drafted. Rather, it would be a pragmatic response to the difficulties that rural Parishes such as ours have in meeting allocation targets.

As we have stated, in our Parish, there is very limited scope for development within the Settlement Policy Boundary and there are constraints in the areas adjacent to it. Many of these constraints are included in the Appendix 5 Settlement Study. However, for accuracy, there are a number of additions we would like to see included in that Study. They are:

- **Refer to Valued Landscape:** The description of the landscape understates the importance of our location, which is located within an important area of landscape – the Settlement Study refers to Ancient Woodland and SINCS. However, it does not – but should – mention that the Parish lies within the Valued Landscape designation (Policy ENV1). Any development proposal outside the Settlement Policy Boundary in Preston Candover, or the Parish more widely, would need to be considered in light of its potential to cause harm to our local landscape character and its appearance. This should be reflected in Appendix 5. Landscape once lost is irreplaceable and the character of a location is changed forever.

- **Refer to Flood Warning Systems:** The Settlement Study acknowledges that flooding is an issue. It does not mention that Axford and Preston Candover are covered by the Environment Agency's Flood Warning System. Both settlements have experienced serious flooding events which have had significant implications for homeowners, including lengthy periods of displacement and substantial financial costs. The Site Selection Report makes it clear that flooding is an issue for the three promoted sites within Preston Candover and that any potential developer would need to demonstrate that housing would not increase the risk of flooding in the village. It would be helpful to reference/sign post the Site Selection Report in the Appendix 5 Settlement Study.
- **Refer to sustainability constraints:** The Settlement Study does not acknowledge that outside the village core there are few, if any, sustainable locations for development. The absence of footpaths, streetlighting, public transport, poor quality of road edges and national speed limits close to the village are all impediments to sustainable transport and a transition to a low carbon future. Current and new residents are/will be heavily reliant on private motorised transport. As various planning appeals have demonstrated, developments that are not in sustainable locations for development are, correctly, refused.
- **Make the inaccurate conclusion accurate:** We object to the conclusion set out in the Settlement Study and would like it removed please. The statement "Although the village has a number of constraints that would impact on the suitability of certain sites, *these would not be a constraint to delivering this level of development*" is unsupported by anything in the previous parts of the Study or the empirical position, namely, the absence of any developer bringing forward any proposal for approval. It looks very much like a case of wishful thinking – which has no place in this document.

More appropriate wording would be: "The village has a number of constraints that would impact upon the suitability of certain sites *and these constraints are likely to impede the delivery of this level of development.*" After all, this reflects the position to date.

2. Draft Policies Map 2025

The Parish Council supports the Valued Landscape designation through the Parish. We made comments on the extent of that designation in the previous Regulation 18 consultation and those comments continue to apply.

3. Site Selection Report, including Sequential test for flood risk, November 2025

Table 3.2 Other Settlements for which no housing allocations in the Local Plan ...

We note that the report does not include any information regarding PCAN004. This site is in an area at high risk of surface water flooding (see SRFA map E). We would appreciate being informed once the flood risk assessment work is completed for this site.

Given the various constraints that affect all four of the Parish sites identified in Appendix 5 to SHELAA, the Parish Council supports the conclusion that further site assessment work would be needed before there is any site allocation in relation to any of these sites.

Our strong view is that any assessment work should be undertaken or informed by independent statutory bodies with proven relevant expert technical knowledge of the area. Undue reliance should not be placed on assessments by professional advisers acting on the instructions of, and paid for by, developers. Implicit

bias is inevitable in such reports. The consequences of reliance on, without rigorous expert interrogation of, developer financed reports can be dangerous. Flood risk affects large parts of this community and extends far beyond the liability of developers or professional liability of their paid advisers. Some of our residents have needed to pump-out their properties in four of the last five years, sometimes for months on end, right through to the early Summer. Life in a flood risk area during periods of heavy rainfall requires hyper vigilance and causes significant stress and anxiety for those at risk. It seems inevitable that climate change will lead to increased flooding issues and so it is vital that any development project is properly and independently scrutinised as to its potential flooding impact so as to not make the existing position worse.

4. Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2025 (SHELAA)

Appendix 5: Sites identified outside Settlement Boundaries PCAN001, 002, 003 and 004.

Sites PCAN003 and PCAN004 are newly promoted and the Parish Council has the following comments:

PCAN003 Land Adjoining Paul's Field and Stenbury Drive

The report on this site does not contain any reference to flood risk – though we note this issue is covered in the Site Selection Report – a cross reference at the very least would be helpful.

This site has, with the consent of the landowner, been a valuable resource for the village when cellars have flooded – water has been pumped into the Paul's Field site via Adam's Horse Field and thus allowed residents to pump out their properties without affecting the public highway. It would be accurate to reflect this drainage function in the report.

The public footpath referred to is valued and well used by residents. From it, residents often witness foxes, bird of prey, ground nesting birds, deer and other animals/insects.

The report does not contain an assessment of access to a public highway, this is unhelpful. The site promoter states that access will be via Stenbury Drive, which the Parish Council believes would be problematic and give rise to potential safety issues. Stenbury Drive is a narrow road. Due to residents' reliance on private vehicles and limited parking, vehicles are often parked along the sides of the road, making it, in effect, a single lane road. Stenbury Drive is used for access by a wide range of users in addition to residents of the Drive. It is used to access the village allotments by allotment holders and those wishing to access the adjoining meadow called Dicker's Field (which is well used by residents, particularly those with mobility limitations). Stenbury Drive is used to access the village's children's play area and for school drop offs and collections. It is used for access to five garages that are rented out by Preston Farms to a range of individuals – some, though not all, residents of Stenbury Drive. Stenbury Drive is also used to access the electricity substation and sewerage treatment plant (which requires large lorry access). All of this means that Stenbury Drive is a route already well used by pedestrians and drivers and already under pressure. Additional vehicles using Stenbury Drive from Paul's Field would worsen an already strained infrastructure and give rise to safety concerns.

PCAN004 Straight Furlong Site

The Parish Council's previous submission about this site is attached at Appendix 1. We are aware that a number of Axford residents made submissions about this site before this current consultation – these remain relevant and should be taken into account in this consultation.

We understand the promoter states that the "developable area" of this site is assessed as 0.2ha not 0.25ha as stated in Appendix 5.

Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council

Continued (Page 6 of 11) ...

This site lies in an area assessed as being at high risk of surface water flooding – see Level 1 SFRA Map E Risk of Flooding from Surface Water dated September 2025. This information is not included in the report and no sequential test for flood risk appears to have been completed.

This site is located inside the draft Candover Valley Floor and Lower Valley sides Valued Landscape designation. That information is missing from the report and should be included.

The report does not, but should, make any reference to the absence of sustainability in terms of transport and facilities at this location – this constraint is relevant to whether or not permission to develop could be given. Information on these issues is set out in Appendix 1 hereto.

We note the report includes standard language that has been applied to other sites “this location is likely to be attractive to developers” we would like to challenge the accuracy of this statement – particularly given the two properties adjacent to the site which have been unoccupied since November 2024 and March 2025 and another Axford property that has been on the market for more than a year.

We would also like to understand the basis of the language “there is a reasonable prospect that the site could be delivered within the next 5 years”. This statement is again without foundation – the site lies in a location that is not sustainable, is prone to surface water flooding, in an area of important landscape and very much outside any Settlement Policy Boundary. Those facts should be reflected in the report – either in the Achievability or Conclusion sections.

Appendix 1

Local Plan Update: Call for Sites (January 2025)

PCAN004 Straight Furlong Site, Berrydown Lane, Axford RG25 2HG

The application form does not give sufficient information for a proper assessment of this site’s suitability for development. The following information is provided to give a more accurate picture.

Following the application form layout:

1. Reason for suggested development

The application form suggests the site is needed to provide additional rural housing.

No evidence of this need is provided. There is no locally agreed need for housing in Axford and two of the six bungalows owned by Sovereign Housing at Kenwards, which is along from the proposed site, are currently unoccupied (Number 4 has been empty since November 2024 and Number 3 since March 2025). A long standing local resident’s experience is that these properties have long been difficult to let.

2. Environmental constraints

The application form states: “No known constraints.”

This is misleading.

Flood Risk

The proposed sites falls within the highest risk category of surface water flooding according to the flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk. This risk runs the length of Berrydown Lane from Ellisfield along to Axford. There were significant flood events in Axford on 27 November 2024, 5 January 2025 and 25

Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council

Continued (Page 7 of 11) ...

February 2025. Just last weekend (7 June 2025) there was a significant build-up of surface water at the junction of Berrydown Lane and B3046 following heavy rain.

The Parish Council and local residents are so concerned about surface water flooding in Axford that a local flood resilience plan is being drawn up. Local residents describe Berrydown Lane as being like a river in recent flooding and the Parish Council has sought the assistance of the Hampshire Flood Water Management team, Hampshire Highways and Ellisfield Parish Council in respect of surface water flooding in the area adjacent to the proposed site.

Chestnut and Apple Tree Cottages, diagonally across from the proposed site, have had to install flood defences, including flood gates and Axford House regularly deploys sandbags. Kenwards is set on higher ground, so the bungalows themselves are not flooded, however the parking area immediately outside floods which makes access difficult. The occupants of Lodge Farm are concerned that their Grade II Listed home is particularly at risk from flooding given its lack of foundations. Greater surface run off along this section of Berrydown Lane would inevitably increase the risk of this home being flooded.

After heavy rainfall water flows into the centre of Axford from three directions; along Berrydown Lane from Ellisfield (past the proposed site), along Dummer Lane from Green Lane and down the hill along the B3046 from the direction of Nutley. The water is trapped in the centre of the hamlet overwhelming the drains and ditches and leading, on occasion, to homes being flooded and cars being abandoned until the water recedes. The general consensus amongst Axford residents is that the flooding is happening more often in recent years than used to be the case.

The adoption of this proposed site for development would be contrary to the duty imposed by Paragraph 173 of the NPPF and would not meet the requirements set out in Policy EM7 of the Local Plan. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF states that when determining any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. The additional run off caused by a new built environment and loss of agricultural land, which currently helps mitigate surface water run off, would almost certainly increase the risk of flooding in Axford.

Policy EM7 of the Local Plan, Managing Flood Risk states “Development within areas of flood risk from any source of flooding will only be acceptable if it is clearly demonstrated that it is appropriate at that location and that there are no suitable alternative sites at lower flood risk.” Furthermore, paragraph (b) states that the benefits of a development to the community must outweigh the risk of flooding and paragraph (e) requires that the run off rate is no greater than the run off prior to development taking place. Neither of these requirements can be met by this proposed site.

Drainage

The proposed site has an important drainage ditch and multiple grips running its full length along Berrydown Lane. This ditch and grips are currently overgrown to such an extent that its existence is hidden (and its function is impeded – the Parish Council last cleared this section as part of its regular Parish wide ditch and grip clearance programme).

There can be little doubt that the removal of this section of agricultural land and its replacement with buildings and driveways would exacerbate an already problematic area for flooding in contravention of Policy EM7 (b) and (e).

3. Policy Constraints

The application form states “No known constraints”. Again, this is misleading.

Heritage

The proposed site is adjacent to two important Grade II Listed Buildings, namely Upper Axford Farmhouse List entry 1092855 (known locally as Lodge Farm) and Lower Axford Cottage listed entry number 1092851 (known locally as Axford House). The impact on the siting of these two properties of five new homes on a small site is likely to be detrimental.

Setting

Any development on this site would be new housing in the countryside for the purposes of Policy SS6 of the Local Plan. It is not clear on what basis development would be permissible under this policy. It is also difficult to see how a development of five dwellings on this proposed site could comply with the requirements set out in Policy EM1 Landscape. It would not be appropriate to approve a site for development when there are clear policy reasons why development of that site would not be permitted under the Local Plan.

The development of this land as outlined in this application would be an insensitive use of land and would diminish the historic character and setting of Axford. The fields and mature trees between groups of houses within Axford help integrate the built form into the landscape. The loss of this section of field and consequent enlargement of Axford would negatively affect that integration and the current sense of place.

According to the Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Character Assessment 2021, the Candover Valley enjoys a “peaceful and rural character.” Its key characteristics include “typically quiet, unspoilt rural character, with a sense of remoteness and limited intrusion.” The “villages are traditional in character with limited modern extensions”.

The Guidance notes on Built Development in that 2021 Assessment state that new development should:

- be in keeping with the scale and settlement pattern of villages and hamlets;
- conserve the rural character of the area avoiding adverse effects of expansion of settlement;
- conserve the rural roads and lanes...minimising small scale incremental change...which could change their character.

The development of this land would cut across this guidance. The outline of Axford has not changed in generations. There are approximately 36 homes in Axford. The addition of 5 additional homes on a relatively small plot would alter the density of the existing settlement (primarily detached and some semi detached homes all sitting on large plots) and extend the extent of the hamlet in a way that has not been done since the 19th century (ie Kimbers Cottages at the end of Dummer Road which dates back to 1878). The layout and access points needed to allow five new dwellings to access Berrydown Lane would represent a suburbanisation and consequent alteration to the character of this section of rural lane.

According to the Basingstoke and Deane Valued Landscape Study February 2023, the proposed site falls within an area that has been determined to be suitable for designation as a “Valued Landscape.” It falls inside Parcel I1 Candover Valley Floor and Lower Valley Sides. The landscape in this parcel is “judged to have exemplary natural heritage, cultural heritage and distinctiveness.” The site is also adjacent to Parcel J1 Ellisfield Valleys, which is described as a “highly distinctive landscape with intact landscape structure, largely unspoilt and distant from any significant development...it is judged to have exemplary natural heritage, landscape condition, distinctiveness and perceptual qualities and is considered to be suitable for designation as Valued Landscape.”

The draft new Local Plan states that development proposals in areas of Valued Landscape should protect and enhance the features that contribute to the character, quality and interpretation of those landscapes. It is not clear how five new dwellings in this location would satisfy that requirement.

Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council

Continued (Page 9 of 11) ...

Nature/Conservation designations

A resident of Kenwards has set up a nature hide in the woodland between Kenwards and the proposed site. From this hide he has seen and photographed deer, hares, stoats, badgers, owls and many other species of birds as well as many slow worms (which are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981). The application form refers to a site which is “relatively sterile in a biodiversity sense”.

4. Physical and Infrastructure constraints

The application form states “No known constraints” which is misleading.

Suitable access to a public highway

The form states that access to the road network will be “alongside other housing.” All existing housing in the area has designated parking areas or driveways, so the proposal, presumably, would be for the plot to include adequate parking space for each dwelling, with a series of drives leading directly onto Berrydown Lane.

Local Plan Policy CN9 Transport requires proposals to provide safe, suitable and convenient access for all potential users with appropriate parking and servicing provision. The Parking Supplementary Planning Document dated July 2018 sets out requirements as to size and provision. It also requires consideration be given to surface run off issues and requires the location of parking to respond positively to the character and appearance of the street scene and ensure that parked vehicles do not dominate street frontages. The proposed site is unlikely to meet these requirements for the reasons set out below.

Berrydown Lane is often in a poor state of repair due to surface run off debris and flooding. This means vehicles often drive along the centre of the lane to avoid risk of damage from pot holes along the edges. It is a well used route. The lane is not wide enough to allow parking along it – cars, vans and agricultural vehicles would all be impeded if there was parking along the Berrydown Lane. Residents of this site would need to reverse, in or out, directly onto the lane. This would be dangerous for residents and other road users, including cyclists and pedestrians – there is no pavement along Berrydown Lane. There is also a bend coming from the Ellisfield direction which would impede sight lines.

The residents of Kenwards have made representations to the Parish Council and their landlord Sovereign Housing concerning parking outside their properties. Non residents often occupy parking bays intended for residents. There is no alternative space to park in Axford (which is the reason for inappropriate parking at Kenwards). Given the need for cars in a rural location, this proposal could lead to perhaps two cars per dwelling (ie 10 additional vehicles). This would require designated parking bays within the site – there is no scope for parking elsewhere in Axford. This would lead to a streetscene dominated by parked vehicles, which would be completely out of character for this area. It would be extremely unlikely that there would be space for visitors or delivery vehicles to safely park.

Any new homes in this location would be likely to worsen the current parking situation for existing Axford residents and cause obstacles and risks for road users (including cyclists – the roads around Axford are extremely popular cycling routes).

Topography

The proposed site lies within a sloping field and has an important drainage ditch running along the whole of its frontage along the lane. Both of these features are relevant in the context of surface water run off. Neither of these matters are disclosed on the form.

Utilities infrastructure

Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council

Continued (Page 10 of 11) ...

Axford has no mains gas and no mains waste water drainage. A search against the postcode and Kenwards bungalows along from the proposed site suggests Full Fibre Broadband is not available in this part of Axford. Mobile phone coverage is not consistently reliably available.

Overhead power cables run the length of the proposed site along Berrydown Lane, as does the drainage ditch mentioned above. These are not mentioned on the application.

Access to Facilities and Services, including public transport

There are no facilities or services in Axford. The bus service referred to in the application, route 41, operates twice a week (on Wednesdays and Fridays). The bus leaves Axford at 09.31 towards Basingstoke and arrives back at 12.48. There are facilities in Preston Candover, but in practice these would require a car journey (see below).

5. Site Achievability

Is there a demand for the preferred use in this location?

The application form says “yes” and refers to technology and lifestyle changes. This response is a generalised statement without supporting evidence which does not reflect site specific facts. The empty bungalows at 3 and 4 Kenwards and anecdotal evidence from long standing residents that these properties have always been difficult to let suggests a different conclusion. The lack of full fibre broadband and experience of Appletree Cottage residents suggests the technology implied to exist in this application is not actually available in this location.

Do you consider that the site is currently viable...?

The applicant’s evidence in support of their affirmative answer is:

- (a) The proposed site is “currently” outside the Settlement Policy Boundary. This is true. The nearest Settlement Policy Boundary is in Preston Candover at least 0.9 miles away. There is nothing to suggest this boundary is going to change. Because the proposed site is outside a Settlement Policy Boundary any development of this site would require any planning application to fall within one of the permitted categories in Policy SS6 New Housing in the Countryside and, as stated above, it is not clear on what grounds that would be permissible.
- (b) The proposed site “adjoins existing residential development”. In fact, the site is outside the long established settlement boundary of Axford which has remained unchanged since 1956 when Kenwards bungalows were built on the site of a large war memorial garden. There is an area of woodland between Kenwards and the proposed site, referred to in the application as a “wooden belt”. It is not owned by the applicant and in fact it provides a natural and long established limit on the settlement perimeter of Axford.
- (c) The proposed site is “close to Preston Candover and the amenities that offers.” However, there is no footpath along the B3046 between the two settlements, the National speed limit applies, pot holes regularly appear and there is no street lighting, which makes it particularly dark in the Winter afternoon/evenings. Each of these factors make the route between Axford and Preston Candover unsuitable for unsupervised child cyclists and potentially dangerous for pedestrians. In practice people choose to drive to Preston Candover from Axford and walk elsewhere.
- (d) The proposed site is “on a public transport route (bus)”. There are two buses a week.
- (e) The proposed site “would add to the supply of rural housing which would otherwise remain stagnant”. See the comments regarding unoccupied homes at Kenwards and the absence of a locally agreed need.

Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council

Continued (Page 11 of 11) ...

Yours Sincerely

Wendy Simson
Clerk to Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council
01256 389457