

**EAST WOODHAY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**WOOLTON HILL CHURCH HALL**

**6.00 p.m. Tuesday, 28<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

**MINUTES**

1. **Attendance:** Cllr. Susan Cooper, Cllr. Martin Hainge, Cllr. Andrew Watson (Chair), John Mortimer.

2. **Apologies:** Cllr. Karen Titcomb, Cllr. Simon Bowden.

3. **Minutes of last meeting:** Agreed.

4. **Matters arising from Minutes of last meeting:** None.

5. **22/01556/HSE - 4 Wheelwrights, Woolton Hill, RG20 9QW.** Erection of a two storey rear extension and demolition of outbuilding.

Confirm the comments made in August, September and October 2021 in respect of application 21/02176/HSE; that application being almost exactly the same as the current application, although the new application appears to be for a marginally smaller extension in the same style.

The Committee has no inherent objection to the extension of the property, but it continues to be concerned regarding the proposed scale of the development; and that it may be out of keeping with surrounding properties and too large for its environment. The cul-de-sac was designed with small properties in mind.

6. **22/01578/HSE - 5 Knights Lea, Ball Hill, RG20 0PP.** Proposed single storey rear extension. Enclose existing open front porch.

No comments or objections.

7. **22/01603/ROC, Yews Farm, Hollington Lane, Woolton Hill RG20 9XU.**

Variation of condition 1 (plan numbers) of permission 20/02525/HSE to allow a reduction in footprint.

No comments or objections.

8. **22/01688/HSE - 3 Aird Close, Woolton Hill, RG20 9UH.** Single storey rear and side extension.

No comments or objections.

9. **22/01706/VLA - Harwood Paddock, Woolton Hill.** Variation of Section 106 agreement attached to 13/00898/OUT to allow insertion of mortgagee exemption clause.

No comments.

10. **22/00183/PIP - Land Adjacent to Woolton Hill Sports Club, Woolton Hill.**

Permission in Principle for residential development up to 3 dwellings.

To consider whether the Committee should make further representation to Basingstoke & Deane in respect of the site access options recently submitted.

To confirm that the Committee stands by the objections raised in the communication of the 15<sup>th</sup> February and to raise further information about highway safety and other pertinent issues which were not available at the time of our previous comments.

This new information has an even greater relevance to our objections given the developers' plans to move the original entrance to one of two alternative locations, both of which are even closer to the blind bend than was previously the case. We summarise below the adverse impact of this new information on both visibility splays and highways.

### **Visibility Splays**

In order to achieve the minimum visibility splay, it is likely that up to 86 metres of hedgerow would require to be removed, in addition to the felling of several mature trees. This would directly contravene policy EM1 of BDBC's Local Plan 2011-2029 "*which requires new development to respect, conserve and enhance the elements of landscape character and visual amenity that contribute to its many qualities*".

We would also question the visibility measurement of 43 metres on the Woolton Hill Road in the direction of Ball Hill (shown on PL-23), as this is achieved from a point on the road going up the hill towards Woolton Hill. This measurement is inaccurate because it fails to take account of the gradient. A more realistic measurement would likely reduce the visibility splay by at least 10 metres, to 33 metres.

### **Highways**

Speed has been monitored on the Woolton Hill Road opposite the tennis courts in both directions in two consecutive time periods, using a Speed Indicator Device (SID) which was positioned well within the 30mph limit.

The information in our objection of the 15<sup>th</sup> February 2022 only measured the traffic in the direction of Woolton Hill where the visibility splay appeared to be acceptable. However, the information that we now have in the direction of Ball Hill illustrates how potentially dangerous either of the two proposed entrances to the development would be.

**New SID Information measured 1<sup>st</sup> June – 16th June 2022 in the direction of Ball Hill.**

**85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed 31.6 mph**

“Indicative of the speed that the majority of the road users are travelling at. A speed at or below which 85 percent of the people drive at any given location under good weather and visibility conditions may be considered as the maximum safe speed for that location.”

**Top speed 45 mph on the 2<sup>nd</sup> June at 1.25am**

**Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) – 522 vehicles**

**Peak times: 7.00 – 8.00 am – 71 vehicles per hour**

**3.00 – 4.00 pm – 56 vehicles per hour**

**% vehicles exceeding the 30 mph limit:**

**30+ 18.5%**

**35+ 2.3%**

**40+ 0.6%**

Further, we have also verified the findings from our previous results which were reported in our objection letter dated the 15<sup>th</sup> February.

**17<sup>th</sup> May to the 1<sup>st</sup> June: Direction of the village of Woolton Hill.**

**85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed – 34.1 mph**

“Indicative of the speed that the majority of the road users are travelling at. A speed at or below which 85 percent of the people drive at any given location under good weather and visibility conditions may be considered as the maximum safe speed for that location.”

**Top speed 60 mph on the 19<sup>th</sup> May at 5.20 pm**

**Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) – 795 vehicles**

**Peak times: 7.00 – 8.00 am – 76 vehicles an hour**

**2.00 – 3.00 pm – 90 vehicles per hour**

**% vehicles exceeding the 30 mph limit:**

**30+ 34%**

**35+ 11%**

**40+ 2.8%**

**NB:** These figures are supported by the previous two periods in this position, 25<sup>th</sup> October – 29<sup>th</sup> October 2021 and the 24<sup>th</sup> February to the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2022 when the key figures were:

85<sup>th</sup> percentile 34.1 and 33.5 mph respectively.

**Conclusion with regard to the development:**

In these concluding remarks, we assume for the sake of argument that a 43 metre splay is achievable (even though we believe it is not, based on PL-13 and PL-23).

First and foremost, the two alternative entrances for the proposed development are positioned just below a blind bend off the brow of a hill, in the direction of Ball Hill. As indicated in the figures that we have obtained from our SID unit, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of the majority of road users is 34.1 mph in the direction of Woolton Hill and 31.6 mph in the direction of Ball Hill. This demonstrates that the speed limit is not being adhered to. We conclude from this that in the case of vehicles travelling in the direction of Ball Hill, even the removal of valuable hedgerows and the felling of trees to achieve the 43 metre splay, would be insufficient to avoid an accident. At a speed of 30 mph, in normal weather conditions, this means that the stopping distance would be a combination of thinking time at 9 metres plus a braking distance of 14 metres, a total of 23 metres. However, we have shown that around 20% of vehicles are exceeding the 30 mph speed limit, with some travelling at up to 40 mph in the direction of Ball Hill, which would increase the stopping distance to 36 metres in normal weather and road conditions.

Research shows that braking distance can be doubled in wet conditions, meaning that even at 30 mph, within the speed limit, there is a potential stopping distance of 46 metres. Added to which, this road is not in good condition; and a large number of vehicles using the road are vans and lorries, which can take up to 50% further to stop compared with a car. This means that even at 30 mph in dry conditions a van or lorry would take 36 metres to stop and in the wet the 43 metres available would be insufficient for them to stop in time to avoid cars exiting from the plot. Bear in mind also that the peak times for traffic in both directions is between 7am and 8am, when residents of the proposed development would be leaving for work and school.

The proposal by the developers to remove the trees and almost 100 metres of hedgerow along the roadside, in an AONB designated landscape, is surprising given their commitment to protect this natural environment. In the Council's opinion, this unnecessary destruction does not materially affect/improve the sighting of vehicles entering and leaving the development and, as we have stated, is contrary to EM 1 of BDBC's Local Plan.

We strongly recommend that a highway officer makes a site visit which we believe will verify these findings.

**11. Items for next Agenda:**

**22/01772/PIP - Land South West of Yewhurst, Heath End.** Permission in Principle for residential development of 1 no. dwelling.

Comment by 12<sup>th</sup> July.

**T/00236/22/TPO - 17 Greenacres, Woolton Hill, RG20 9TA.** Silver birch: prune.

Comment by 14<sup>th</sup> July.

**22/01784/HSE - Hollington Corner, Woolton Hill, RG20 9XJ.** Single storey ground floor extension and 5 no. dormer windows for conversion of existing loft, to include extension of existing hipped end to a gable end.

Comment by 18<sup>th</sup> July.

**22/01785/HSE - 5 Falcon Coppice, Woolton Hill, RG20 9UE.** Single-storey rear extension

Comment by 19<sup>th</sup> July.

**12. Date of next meeting:** 6pm, Monday 11<sup>th</sup> July, Woolton Hill Church Hall.