

Cttee: 07/10/2015 Item No. 1

Application no: 15/01225/OUT
[For Details and Plans Click Here](#)

Site Address	Land West Of Ganderdown Copse Winchester Road Dummer Hampshire
Proposal	Hybrid application for Full planning permission for the erection of a critical treatment hospital, cancer treatment, centre additional development including energy centre, service yard, link building and underground link. Helicopter landing strip and pad, associated internal roads, car parking and landscaping together with the means of access via a new roundabout on the A30. Outline planning permission for the details of siting and means of access to the site for proposed ambulance station and pathology laboratory with all other matters reserved.

Registered:	20 April 2015	Expiry Date:	16 October 2015
Type of Application:	Outline Planning Application (Hybrid)	Case Officer:	Katherine Fitzherbert-Green 01256 845716
Applicant:	Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	Agent:	Mr Mike Harris
Ward:	Oakley And North Waltham	Ward Member(s):	Cllr Diane Taylor Cllr Rob Golding Cllr Stuart Frost
Parish:	DEANE CP	OS Grid Reference:	458167 147452

Recommendation:	<p>The applicant be invited to enter into a legal agreement (in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and Policies C1, C2, C9 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011) between the applicant and the Borough and County Councils to secure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a bonded Full Travel Plan;• an Access, Drop-off/Pick-up and Parking Servicing Management Plan;• a Routeing and Directional Signage Strategy;• completion of highway works as required by Hampshire County Council; and• a landscape management plan. <p>Should the requirements set out above not be satisfactorily secured, then the Planning and Development Manager be delegated to REFUSE permission for appropriate reasons.</p> <p>On completion of the legal agreement(s) the Planning and Development Manager be delegated to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:</p>
------------------------	--

It is **RECOMMENDED** that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions listed at the end of the report.

Reasons for Approval

1. The proposal would provide for a community facility in a countryside location, and of a scale which would bring a significant change to the character of the surrounding

landscape. The development therefore represents a departure from Saved Policies C7, D5 and D8 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 but is deemed acceptable having regard to other overriding material considerations.

2. The proposed development would have an impact on the landscape character and scenic quality of the area however this impact is not considered to be of significant overriding demonstrable harm when having regard to the provision of mitigation and other material considerations in the public interest. The proposal therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Saved Policies E1 and E6 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
3. The proposed development would provide additional traffic generation which can be safely accommodated on the highway network with the site also provided with safe access in accordance with highway requirements. The proposal would therefore accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and with Saved Policies E1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
4. The proposal would both conserve the biodiversity value and nature conservation interests of the site and deliver extensive biodiversity enhancements. The proposal would therefore comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Saved Policy E7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
5. The proposal would preserve the setting of special architectural or historic interest of historic buildings and conservation areas in the locality as well as known and potential archaeological interests in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance and Saved Policy E2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
6. The proposed development would not increase the number of people or properties at a high risk of flooding, nor would increase the risk or severity of flooding elsewhere. The proposal incorporates provision for suitable drainage mitigation measures and complies with the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance and Saved Policy A7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
7. Adequate drainage (foul and surface water) can be provided for the development or can be adequately controlled through other legislation so as to ensure that there would be no adverse risk to property or the environment. The proposal would accord with Saved Policy A7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
8. The proposal would not increase the risk of contamination at the site and would therefore accord with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).
9. The proposal would not give rise to any overriding significant or demonstrable impact on residential amenity and complies with the National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance, and Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
10. Through the provision of a Section 106 agreement the development will provide for landscape management and highway and transport measures to mitigate the impact of the development. The development therefore complies with Saved Policies C1, E1 and E6 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996 - 2011, the Community Infrastructure Levy regulation 2010 and Hampshire County Council 's adopted Transport Contributions Policy (September 2007).

General comments

This application is brought to the Development Control Committee due the number of objections received and the Officer's recommendation for approval in accordance with the Council's scheme of delegation.

Planning Policy

The site lies outside any defined Settlement Policy Boundary of Basingstoke and in a countryside location.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012)

Achieving Sustainable Development
Section 4 (Promoting sustainable transport)
Section 7 (Requiring good design)
Section 8 (Promoting Healthy Communities)
Section 10 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change)
Section 11 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment)
Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment)
Annex 1 (Implementation)

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996 - 2011 (Saved Policies)

Policy D8 (Rural Exceptions)
Policy E1 (Development Control)
Policy E2 (Buildings of Historic or Architectural Interest)
Policy E3 (Areas of Architectural or Historical Interest)
Policy E6 (Landscape Character)
Policy E7 (Nature/Biodiversity Conservation)
Policy C1 (Section 106 Agreements)
Policy C7 (The protection, enhancement and replacement of existing leisure and community facilities or open spaces)
Policy C8 (Protection of Essential Services)
Policy A1 (Car Parking)
Policy A2 (Encouraging Walking, Cycling and the Use of Public Transport)
Policy A3 (Infrastructure Improvements)
Policy A6 (Renewable Energy)
Policy A7 (Water and Sewerage Infrastructure)

Submission Local Plan

The Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029) was submitted to the Secretary of State via the Planning Inspectorate for formal examination on 9 October 2014. Following an Exploratory Meeting held on the 11 December 2014, some revisions have been made to the Plan with Consultation on these changes undertaken prior to Examination hearings programmed for Autumn 2015 with adoption anticipated during Spring 2016. At present the document, and its content, represents a direction of travel for the Council. The weight afforded to it, and the individual policies contained therein at this stage would need to be considered against the tests included in paragraph 216 of the NPPF.

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance (SPD's and SPG's)

Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2012)

- Appendix 5 - Construction Statements
- Appendix 6 – Storage and collection of waste and recycling
- Appendix 14 - Countryside Design Summary

Parking Standards SPG

Landscape and Biodiversity SPD (2008)

Landscape Character Assessment SPG

Other material documents/legislation

National Planning Practice Guidance

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)

Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006)

The Hedgerow Regulations 1997
The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (Revised 2015).
Basingstoke Environment Strategy for Transport (BEST) (1999)
Basingstoke Biodiversity Action Plan;
Guidance note for developers and consultants – Noise assessments and reports for planning applications (2010)
S106 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Interim Planning Guidance Note (2015)
Hampshire County Council - Transport Contributions Policy (September 2007);
Conservation Appraisals - North Waltham, Dummer, Church Oakley;
Village Design Statements – Dummer, Oakley and Deane.

Description of site

The application site comprises a broadly rectangular parcel of land extending across 21.6ha sitting to the north of the A30 Stockbridge Road which links the site with the wider highway network. The site extends in width to approximately 400m east to west and between 300m – 500m north to south. The north-eastern boundary is demarcated by Trenchard Lane, a country road, which is narrow and rural in character and enclosed by established hedgerows and trees and to the northwest, the site extends to abut an agricultural track. This track serves the site as well as similar sized adjoining agricultural fields.

The site is set within undulating countryside with the land sloping downwards from north to south with a difference in ground levels of approximately 25m and is currently in agricultural (arable) use. Enclosure to the site is provided by a variety of native mixed hedges, thickets and trees to include Ganderdown Copse, an area of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland with a further wooded copse sitting to the northwest corner which provides a rural context. Beyond the site sits open countryside in predominately agricultural use interrupted by isolated farmsteads, residential properties and the highway network, particularly the trunk routes of the M3, A303 and A30. The M3 motorway sits approximately 0.3km to the south with connection provided at junction 7.

A number of public footpaths also sit within the locality which mainly extend north/south and are offset from the site boundary, to include a public right of way to the south of the site and the Wayfarers Walk to the north of Trenchard Lane. A short part of the Wayfarers Walk utilises Trenchard Lane. A Grade II listed milestone sits to the southern boundary of the site and to the north east within the local proximity is Southwood Farmhouse, also Grade II listed.

The site is detached from the nearest settlements of Basingstoke which has its settlement boundary approximately 1.5km northeast, with the villages of Dummer and North Waltham positioned approximately 1km south east and 1.5km west respectively. Oakley sits approximately 1.5km north.

Proposal

The application for land to the north of Stockbridge Road and west of Ganderdown Copse has been made in 'hybrid' form, in which both outline and full planning permission is sought simultaneously. The differing forms of development are however set within an overall master plan to ensure a comprehensive approach to the site.

Full planning application

Full planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of the site which will bring a change of use of the land from agriculture to Use Class C2 (Non Residential Institution) with ancillary support services. The development seeks to create a new healthcare facility containing a new Critical Treatment Hospital (CTH) providing emergency and critical care together with obstetric provision, which sits alongside a Cancer Treatment Centre (CTC). Access is to be taken from the A30 to the south and Trenchard Lane to the east. The development is to be set within an extensively landscaped site in order to create a 'Hospital Copse'.

- Critical Treatment Hospital

The Critical Treatment Hospital (CTH) comprises a single building extending to six storeys (30m) at its maximum and providing 41,178m² of internal space, positioned centrally within the site. The CTH would provide a purpose built, state of the art hospital to provide for the most seriously ill or those persons who have complex medical requirements which necessitate specialist assessment, as well as maternity care within a consultant led delivery unit and specialist children's services. The building itself would have a broadly rectangular form extending northwest to a depth of approximately 228m and at its widest point extending to 185m with some variations in dimensions according to the floor level. The building has a stepped approach to its form which also sees the ground floor incorporated into the topography to minimise the uppermost height above ground level.

- Cancer Treatment Centre

To the west of the CTH would sit the Cancer Treatment Centre (CTC) as a standalone building to provide a comprehensive cancer service to include all forms of treatment and therapies together with supportive care. The intention is to provide patients with a more intimate experience as opposed to a traditional hospital with increased contact to the natural environment through the adopted architectural form. By being positioned adjacent to the CTH, this would provide for effective transfer should urgent unplanned medical care is required, with this access occurring via a dedicated underground link. Similarly patients at the CTH requiring radiotherapy can be transferred to the CTC for treatment.

The CTC would provide 5,690m² of space arranged over 3 floors with the building also of a rectangular form with internal central courtyards. The building would extend to a depth of 96m and width of 48m and would again be set into the topography to provide a lower ground floor with adjacent remodelling of the land. As such only two storeys would be visible rising to an above ground level of 8.6m (total height inc. lower ground floor 13.5m). The CTC would be provided with car parking to the north (rear) of the building and would be serviced from an area to the south west which provides for deliveries and waste handling.

- Energy Centre

The application also seeks full planning permission for the erection of an Energy Centre positioned to the east of the CTH of three storeys in height to provide for the energy and servicing requirements of the site as a whole. This element of the development would comprise a building of rectangular form orientated north to south and extend to a maximum of 54.5m by 26.6m rising to 14.4m to sit under a flat roof. There is also a functional need for the energy centre to have a chimney which will extend to a maximum height of 32.5m.

The Energy Centre would provide the electrical distribution, heating and cooling and water supply all from a single location generated by Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems, in the form of biomass and gas fired boilers to provide sustainable forms of energy. Sitting alongside the energy systems would be the essential clinical support services (i.e. 'back of house') such as goods receipt/linen and waste management, which again would serve the whole site. The building would be set to the north of an enclosed service yard which would accommodate all delivery vehicle movements and waste storage, to include secure clinical storage through to general waste and recyclables.

- Masterplan

The CTH, CTC and Energy Centre would be set within extensively landscaped hospital grounds which form part of the overall masterplan of the site to generate a 'Hospital Copse'. This approach is advocated by the Hampshire Hospital Foundation Trust (HHFT) to connect the site with the natural environment following recognition of associated positive health benefits, notwithstanding biodiversity improvements. In addressing the site from north to south, the uppermost area is to be planted with new woodland, wildflower meadow and scrub to reinforce the northern site boundary and to provide a new landscape zone. Central to the site would sit the proposed buildings with land to the south additionally landscaped with the siting of a

Helipad within the wildflower meadow. Each of the areas through the site would contain their own landscape and management strategies from woodland to meadow together with formal planting within in a public plaza that connects the CTH and CTC as well as within the car parking areas and internal courtyards.

- Access

The site would be primarily accessed from the southern boundary via a roundabout junction from the A30 which sits separate from a pedestrian/cycle link. Within the site, the development provides a single spine road set within a tree lined avenue extending north, which in turn connects via internal link roads to the various elements of the site. This includes a connection to Trenchard Lane to the east for emergency access only. Forward of the CTH and its link road would sit a helipad for emergency responses. The masterplan for the site intends to provide for a legible development with clear distinctions for visitors and staff with associated parking areas and pedestrian links to provide for high levels of activity and connectivity.

Supplementary to the development would be works intended to upgrade the junction of Trenchard Lane to the A30 together with the provision of a footway/cycleway link along the A30 to connect the site to the A30/Beggarwood Lane junction.

- Phasing

It is intended that the development would come forward in a single continuous construction phase given the unencumbered site for both construction and operation. Whilst the scale of the differing buildings would generate differing construction periods, the links between the buildings means that the uses are all required to become operational at about the same time.

Outline planning

Outline planning permission is sought for a Central Pathology Laboratory of circa 3,000m² with an Ambulance Station of circa 5,000m² within buildings of two storeys in height. This application considers the principle of these facilities together with their siting and means of access only. Details of the final external appearance would be reserved for later consideration and therefore have not been provided.

The Pathology Building would respond to both the CTH and CTC and provide a connection between the on-site functions together with external pathology services. This building would be positioned towards the east of the site and would contain its own staff entrance, service yard and parking. The site would also be enclosed with soft landscaping to visually separate the premises from the CTH. The Ambulance Station would also sit within its own curtilage which would also provide its own parking for staff and vehicles in an area set to the north of Ganderdown Copse.

Amendments

The application was subject to the submission of amended and additional information received during August 2015 with the details subject to renotification to all consultees, the local Parish Councils as well as all interested third parties. The submitted details principally provided further information addressing highway matters, the site selection and outstanding ecological requirements but also sought to amend the application by withdrawing the widening of Trenchard Lane with works limited to the junctions both with the site and to the A30.

Consultations – Final comments provided (in summary)

Eastleigh Borough Council:

- Appreciate the difficulties with the site at Winchester;
- Significant concerns about the sustainability of the proposal due to the distance and travel time for residents of Eastleigh Borough and their families and friends who would wish to visit patients in the proposed CTH;
- The distance would be more than double that already endured by the Eastleigh population to Winchester;

- With the M3 already congested at certain times, there needs to be compelling evidence that clinical and wellbeing outcomes would not be adversely affected by this extra travel distance/time;
- For Eastleigh residents visiting or attending the CTH without their own transport, the public transport offer is currently unacceptable (a train to Basingstoke and then a bus journey) and has not been addressed in the application documents;
- A fully funded proposal needs to come forward to work with local community transport providers to address this issue.

Hart District Council: No comment.

Test Valley Borough Council: No response received.

Winchester City Council: No response received.

Dummer Parish Council:

Initial response –

“Dummer Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this application

UNLESS mitigation measures are implemented to prevent traffic avoiding the new CTH access roundabout being displaced to a route through the centre of Dummer.

The narrow streets of the village (Dummer Down Lane, Up Street and Down Street) could become a dangerous ‘rat run’ for traffic displaced from the A30 during staff shift change periods when delays on the A30 would increase due to cars queuing to enter the site or to gain access to the motorway via Southwood Junction, where capacity limits will be approached due to traffic from developments in the Basingstoke Local Plan. Increased traffic volumes through the village are likely to result in increased incidents at the brow of Tower hill and at the junction of Dummer Down Lane and Tower Hill (The “Seven Sisters” triangle). In the event that this application is granted the applicant must contribute to provision of measures to mitigate the increased danger from the effects of rat running.

And due to the loss of amenity of neighbouring properties

The amenity of the homes of the residents of Ganderdown Cottages will be severely degraded by both the construction of the CTH and CTC and by the continuing disturbance from the helicopter pad and increased traffic on the A30.

In addition the parish council makes the following comments:

Greenfield site

The proposed development is on a greenfield site outside the Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary and is not included in the land allocations identified in the Local Plan nor in the Pre-submission Local Plan. Nor does it meet the Local Plan policy cited by the applicant (Policy D8 – Rural Exceptions). This exception policy is only applicable to small scale development, not a major development such as this.

This development would create a precedent for other similar major development schemes in the countryside, contrary to Policy E6 Landscape Character of the Local Plan and EM1 Landscape of the Emerging Local Plan, and result in potential for coalescence with the existing Basingstoke Settlement Policy Boundary and unchecked development along the A30.

Loss of agricultural land

The development will result in the loss of high grade agricultural land (grade3a).

The Dummer Conservation Area and landscape

The development would have significant detrimental landscape and visual impact, both day and night, on the surrounding communities and particularly the Dummer Conservation Area. It will be prominent in the views from Dummer footpath No2 and from the Dummer Cemetery. Both

these views are highlighted in the Dummer Conservation Appraisal and Dummer Village Design Statement.

The development will be detrimental to setting and views from the Wayfarers Walk, which is a nationally designated long distance footpath.

It will also increase the hazards to walkers at the point where the route crosses the A30 close to the Southwood traffic lights and along the proposed widened section of Trenchard Lane running north from its junction with the A30, which will result in increased traffic speed and volume. Measures to mitigate the increased danger for pedestrians must be implemented. Returning the Wayfarers Walk to its previous route along the access to Southwood Farm direct from the A30 continuing on to South Wood would be a potential solution to reduce the hazards in this section of the footpath (See *The Wayfarers's Walk – An invitation to explore Hampshire* – published by HCC 1982 – ISBN 0 905 392 16 7 – page 46).

Environment

The proposed development will result in the direct loss of 600m of hedgerow, of which 198m are of sufficient importance that they qualify for protection under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Hedgerows are a Priority UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitat that is included on the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006), therefore Local Authorities have a duty to protect this important habitat. Retention of 1500m of boundary hedgerow, is an ecological benefit and that this hedgerow should be further enhanced with supplementary planting to mitigate the lost hedgerows.

Light pollution

The planning application has failed to fully assess and recognise the impact of light pollution from the development itself and the potential new street lighting required on the approach roads, cycle routes and footpaths many of which will be visible from Dummer. The lighting of car parks, cycle routes and footpaths must meet the highest European and International Standards to minimise light being directed or diffused into the wider environment. In addition the latest technology should be used to minimise the illumination levels and hours of operation of the lighting. To prevent light escaping from the buildings at night automatic blinds or glass whose opacity can be varied should be installed in all windows.

Traffic

The development will have an impact on the sub-standard and dangerous M3 motorway Junction 8 (See Refusal Notice for BDB/039350). Highways England should be required to provide a current assessment based on the aggregate traffic from the CTH, CTC, and CPL combined with the additional traffic generated by sites already with planning approval (Kempshott Industrial Estate – 57 dwellings; Beggarwood Area N - 96 dwellings; Kennel Farm – 310 dwellings plus the sites in the Local Plan SS3.11 Basingstoke Golf Club – 1,000 dwellings and SS3.12 Hounsome Fields – 750 dwellings).

This section of the M3 has been explicitly excluded from the Connect consultant's report for the CTH (Transport Assessment Section 2.8 Road Safety - Inset 2.5 Accident Study Area) while the same consultant report for the proposed New Cemetery, application 15/01528/BPA3, (Study Area Transport Assessment Section 2.6 - Inset 2.3 Accident Study Area) includes this area and lists fatal accidents in the last 10 years.

The Traffic Assessment has failed to adequately assess the traffic impact in the light of other planned developments detailed in the emerging Local Plan.

The development has potential for severe traffic impact on all the surrounding lanes: Trenchard Lane and the lane between North Waltham and Overton. These lanes will be attractive "rat runs" for vehicles approaching from the north wishing to avoid the Basingstoke ring-road, the A30 corridor or the A34/A303/A30 route.

There would be severe impacts on the local highway network with unacceptable harm to the character and amenity of the rural roads and lanes in Dummer and neighbouring parishes.

Transport

Because of its location, 7.5 kilometres from the centre of Basingstoke and beyond a ridge 168 metres high, 80 metres above the town centre, limited bus services and Hampshire wide staff and patient catchment areas, there is little real opportunity for access by means other than private car. The HHFT Transport Assessment fails to recognise this in its estimates about non-car travellers and therefore the necessary car park capacity.

Noise

The south west elevation of the proposed CTH building has a large area that faces towards the Dummer Conservation Area. This face will reflect noise from M3 traffic. The Noise Assessment should provide maps indicating the level of noise that is predicted on the northern boundary of the Dummer Conservation Area - a) with the current surface of the M3 and b) with a "low-noise" resurfacing of the M3.

Alternative Sites

The applicant provides no evidence for the reasons for rejection of alternative sites.

Second response –

"Dummer Parish Council Objects to Application 15/01225/OUT. The reasons for objection to the new documents are:

1. BDBC Comment 2

1.1 General Dummer Parish Council agrees with paragraphs 9 to 13 and considers that the Connect Consultants response is totally inadequate. The Routing and Signage Strategy options must be specified before this application is submitted to the Development Control Committee.

CTH, CTC and CPL employees and visitors will add to any existing agricultural vehicles and traffic accessing the M3 travelling via Trechard Lane. Substitution of existing traffic travelling to Southampton or Winchester is likely to be minimal as other routes (e.g. via B3400 to Overton and Winchester St) are likely to be preferred for those journeys.

1.2. Tower Hill, Dummer Down Lane and Farleigh Lane, Dummer, should be added to the routes specified in **paragraph 13**. These roads may be selected by Satellite Navigation devices. The Routing and Signage Strategy must specify alternative routes via principal roads.

Note 1. The width restrictions on Duxford Lane may result in navigation systems avoiding this route.

Note 2. Closure of Beggarwood Lane resulted in a very significant increase in traffic from the B3046 travelling to and from the M3 Junction 7 via Farleigh Lane. CTH traffic would also use this route in the absence of a Routing and Signage Strategy.

1.3. Employees "rat running" through Trenchard Lane

We propose that the following changes should be made to the Trenchard Lane/A30 junction to reduce the attraction of the rat running that BDBC and HCC have already identified as a significant risk.

Closure of the central reservation at the junction of Trenchard Lane and the A30 to prevent a right turn from Trenchard Lane to the CTH main access. Where necessary access would be possible via the Junction 7 roundabout. Traffic travelling south west on the A30 wishing to travel north via Trenchard Lane could achieve this via the CTH roundabout. See Fig 1. below [omitted from report].

2. BDBC Comment 3

2.1 General The Parish Council considers that since the proposed ambulance station is located close the Trenchard Lane secondary access that it is unlikely that ambulances on emergency calls will use the primary access when responding to emergencies in Oakley or in housing areas in Kempshott, Hatch Warren or Beggarwood. The route of the nationally recognised cross Hampshire footpath, the Wayfarers Walk, should be rerouted either within the field to the north east of the hedge or to use the historic access road direct from the A30 to Southwood Farmhouse.

The Parish Council supports the BDBC proposal that the secondary access is designed to

prevent a left turn into Trenchard Lane.

2.2 Traffic displaced from the A30

Dummer Parish Council contend that commuter traffic travelling from or to the A30 (south) to/from the M3 at Junction 7 is extremely likely to opt to route through the centre of Dummer to avoid the new roundabout at the CTH access and the increased congestion at Southwood Junction. To prevent traffic travelling to the M3 through Dummer village the central reservation of the A30 at its junction with Tower Hill shall be modified to prevent a right turn into Tower Hill.

Note. The area south west of this junction was the construction compound for the M3 southern extension from Junction 7 to Junction 9. The form of the present central reservation was not modified to meet its current use when the compound was closed after the construction was completed. This has resulted in drivers misjudging the turn. Preventing this turn would make this junction safer especially at night [illustration omitted from report].

3. BDBC Comment 4

3.1 Car Park Accumulation Assessment

The CTH and CTC are remote from the residential areas of the catchment area: Basingstoke and particularly Winchester, Eastleigh, Andover and Alton. It is likely that majority of visitors will travel by car. Similarly employees whose roles are relocated at the existing hospital will travel by car. The Hospital Trust has conceded that there is a potential for 1,350 employees working at the site. There is no indication of any financial incentive to use other forms of transport.

In his email to the Parish Council (11/05/2015) the Project Director has stated there will be no charge for parking.

There is no intention to charge for car parking and there is therefore unlikely to be any requirement for barriers at the car parks. The only physical access control barriers will be at the secondary access point on Trenchard Lane to prevent it from being used other than in emergency. All ambulances, patient, staff and visitor access will be from the proposed roundabout on the A30.

Hope this helps,

Best regards,

Arnie

Arnie Lustman

A M Lustman

Programme Director - Clinical Re-provision

Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Aldermaston Road, Basingstoke, RG24 9NA

In addition in the questionnaire used at the public consultation meeting at the Basingstoke Golf Club one question offered the opportunity for the public to use the CTH grounds for leisure purposes.

Parish Council Objections

1. There is no provision for parking by leisure users in the step by step calculation and therefore it does not reflect the implied intentions of the applicant at the public consultation.
2. Any barrier for payment similar to the present arrangements at the Basingstoke Hospital Car Park could result in queuing back to the A30. In the event of this application being approved a condition should prevent installation of barriers on the car parks.

4. BDBC Comment 5

Local Bus Services

The Hatch Warren and Beggarwood Development is served by two bus services:

No 8 journey time from Sainsburys to the Basingstoke Train Station is currently 33 mins and the No 12 From the Hatch Warren Community Centre to Basingstoke Train Station 46 mins.

An extension of the No. 8 service to the CTH is likely to add 15 minutes to the journey time, i.e.

48 minutes from Sainsburys to the train station and 32 minutes from the train station to the CTH. It is unlikely that these journey times would be acceptable to the residents of Hatch Warren and Beggarwood or to the users from the CTH who are likely to require an onward journey by bus or train to their final destination.

The No 8 service follows a clockwise one-way route through Hatch Warren and Beggarwood. The extension of this section of the route to the CTH would make local journeys to Hatch Warren Retail Centre unattractive.

5.1 HCC Comment 1 and CCL response - Accessibility

The Parish Council have stated on many occasions that access to Dummer Garden Centre, TT Tents and TT Tents Storage Facility and the Sun Inn are dangerous because the brow of the ridge 400 metres south west of the proposed access limits visibility. The 50mph speed limit should be extended south west to a point beyond the junction of the A30 and Tower Hill. Ideally the limit should extend to the division of the A30 and A33.

5.2 HCC Comment 2 and CCL response

The 50mph limit should be extended. See Comment 1

5.3 HCC Comment 4 and CCL response

The parish council propose that the central reservation at this junction should be closed to prevent Trenchard Lane being used as a "rat run"

5.4 HCC Comment 5 and CCL response

No mention is made of lorries delivering fuel using the secondary access. Will fuel be delivered by the main access or the secondary access?

In an email on 12/3/2015 the Project Director informed the Parish Council there would be three deliveries a week.

"The proposed design for the CTH's heating has energy provided by a combination of technologies. This will include dual fuel gas and oil boilers, combined heat and power (CHP) units and a biomass boiler. It is the biomass boiler which uses wood chips as fuel.

We would envisage a delivery of wood chips every three days.

The wood chips are preloaded into containers and delivered in vehicles similar in size to a skip delivery lorry.

The lorries would use the FM access lane rather than the main entrance.

Arnie Lustman

A M Lustman

Programme Director - Clinical Re-provision

Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Aldermaston Road, Basingstoke, RG24 9NA"

HCC Comment 6 and CCL response

The proposed site is remote from Basingstoke and a very considerable distance from the rest of the catchment area. Cycling to this location requires a journey of a considerable distance crossing the ridge close to Basingstoke Golf Club entrance at 168 metres. The town centre is 85 metres and the North Hampshire Hospital 115 metres above sea level.

The journey to the North Hampshire Hospital with a rise of 30 metres was practicable for cyclists. The journey to the CTH with a rise of 83 metres to the ridge before the descent of 30 metres to the Hospital site is not practicable for most cyclists on a daily basis.

The number of daily cycle journeys is unrealistic.

5.5 HCC Comment 8 and CCL response - Funding for the No 8 Bus route extension

The CCL response is inadequate *"The applicant has therefore committed to secure the provision of the service for a period of three years"*. The Parish Council would like a clear timetable for the phasing of the opening of the various facilities on the CTH site:

and the date of from which the funded service will start. Experience of the Beggarwood bus service developer funding was that it was not introduced early in the development and therefore the early residents became habituated to private car transport. When the service was introduced it was underused and the funding ran out before a critical mass of customers could be acquired.

How will the CTH ensure that the introduction of this service is timely and what incentives will they provide for staff to use it, i.e. bus passes?

5.6 HCC Comment 9 and CCL response - NHS operated shuttle bus

The response to this question is inadequate. It does not provide sufficient detail of the staff who will be transferred to the CTH departments. The mission creep that has occurred in the CTH proposals has resulted in far more elective surgery being transferred to the site. We require a clearer explanation of how this will be staffed to assess the validity of the assertion that the shuttlebus service is adequate.

5.7 HCC Comment 11 and CCL response - Journeys from the NE

The CCL response fails to address the comment adequately. Why does it only consider the population within 10-15km drive of the site when the catchment area is much larger? This does not appear to be consistent with the distribution shown in the map in Insert 1 and the wider role for Hampshire and Berkshire the CTH is proposed to perform.

The NHS Trust has still not addressed concerns raised by the Parish Council over the sub-standard distance between M3 Junction 7 and the bifurcation of the M3 and A303. As previously stated this area was excluded from their accident statistics. Given the number of recent accidents these statistics should be updated and cover the section of the M3 between Junction 7 and Junction 8.

The Parish Council urges you to see clarification of these points before submission to Development control.

5.8 Site Selection and Greenfield vs Brownfield Site

Paragraph 2.2.4

Concedes that “the NHS model is currently not one of centralisation of critical treatment facilities”. It is not sufficient to state that because the Northumbria Specialist Emergency Care Hospital was located on a greenfield site that the North Hampshire facilities should also be located on a greenfield site “for the same reasons”. That site was adjacent to development on two of its boundaries. The Trust has not followed the sequential procedure for site selection.

Paragraph 2.2.5

Asserts that “a CTH facility provides better outcomes for those patients” this is as yet unproven. It also provides no clear justification for co-locating the CTC on the same site. Much of the care provided at the CTC should be delivered in “a more supportive and less stressful environment”. This appears to contradict the environment that can be expected in a trauma hospital with a helicopter pad.

Paragraph 2.2.7

Addresses the location of the CRH with reference to the “Trust services using the current referral patterns”. What does this mean in the context of trauma, cardiac arrest and stroke cases where cases of trauma may occur on the principal road network and involve patients from outside the catchment?

Paragraph 2.2.9

This “plan” requires more explanation. What do the various circles represent?

Paragraph 2.2.11

This paragraph refers to the increase in population of Basingstoke but does not address the other centres of population.

5.9 National Policy

Paragraph 2.2.14

This paragraph appears to be a misreading of NPPF paragraph 17. It is likely that its negative impact on the landscape, green infrastructure and adjacent Wayfarers Walk will be damaging to health lifestyles. The NPPF requires reuse of brownfield sites, also “contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value.” and “take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural services to meet local needs”. These are measure to improve health not to treat the results of failed policy. The proposed site is largely agricultural land class 3a.

Paragraph 2.2.16

Reference to NPPF paragraph 7 is inappropriate as it refers to local services not regional services proposed for the CTH.

5.10 Local Plan

Paragraphs 2.2.20, 2.2.22 and 2.2.41

The Trust should not speculate on the proximity of the development boundary and give this lesser weight in their proposal. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF discourages over-reliance on emerging un-tested planning policies in the development management process.

5.11 Brownfield Sites

Paragraph 2.2.8 (also para 2.2.33 Emergency Response Times)

There was no clear justification for co-location of the CTH and CTC and therefore use of the argument that together they would be too large for a brownfield site is not valid.
Travel to out of catchment locations

Paragraph 2.2.37

The figures in this table include anomalies which give rise to questions whether the optimum routes have been selected.

5.12 Conclusions

These conclusions are flawed. They give insufficient weight to the search for a brownfield site and too great weight to speculation on the benefits of a centralised solution and to affordability of the site. Clearly the costs of development on greenfield site are lower than on brownfield site. However little consideration has been given to the cost of providing a new sewer.

The Parish Council Objects to this application.”

North Waltham Parish Council:

Initial response:-

“Objection on the grounds that it would be contrary to policy ‘in principle’ and because it would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the character of the area and on local amenity and in particular, for the following crucially important reasons:

- 1) This is a greenfield site outside the settlement policy boundary and is not included in the land allocations identified in the local plan nor in the pre-submission local plan.
- 2) There would be severe impacts on the local highway network with unacceptable harm to the character and amenity of the rural roads and lanes in our parish and neighbouring parishes.
- 3) The proposed development by virtue of its scale, both vertical and land coverage and location in the countryside would be incongruous in the landscape and would therefore have an unacceptably harmful impact on the rural amenity of the area.

4) The unacceptably harmful impact to the heritage of the local area including the important rural setting in which the Roman road, Grade Two listed building, ancient woodland including the milestone marker are located and which planning policy requires to be preserved and protected for the public benefit long-term.

5) The development would represent a dangerous precedent for other similar major development schemes in the area and create the potential for coalescence with the existing settlement policy boundary of Basingstoke, ie unchecked urban sprawl in to the countryside'.

6) The accumulative impact on infrastructure in the area particular when taking in to account proposals for large scale housing development on land at Kennel Farm and other sites being proposed in BDBC's draft local plan.

The Parish Council will communicate again in the near future on more specific material points including specific national and Development Plan policies that should be taken into consideration in relation to our grounds for objection.

The council also agreed for the working group to continue working on the objection, mainly by determining the policies (national and local) that relate to our objections.

The council also agreed to take the following actions with regards communications with the residents of the village:

- Post notice of our formal decision to object to the planning application.
- Produce a more comprehensive explanation of the details behind the Council's objection (primarily explanation of the policies behind our decision).
- Issue in full our formal objection letter to BDBC."

NOTE: The response from North Waltham Parish Council was supported by a document entitled "Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust CTU – North Waltham Parish Council Planning Comments" which due to the level of detail is not replicated here but is attached in full at Appendix A.

Second response –

"Objection. We object to this set of revisions to the application because the fundamental objections we had to the location chosen have not been addressed. Therefore a flawed application has only been marginally improved and is still not the best solution to the express need. These amendments represent significant changes and should be part of a revised consultation that allows local residents to fully assess them and have adequate time to comment. As knowledgeable residents of the local environment NWPC feels the junction at Peat Copse traffic lights would be unable to cope with increased traffic on the A30 especially when ambulances are trying to bypass queues that exist at peak times. The new roundabout that is being proposed, consideration should be taken on how to maintain the flow of traffic onto the site to prevent backing up onto the A30. Additional consideration should take place to prevent all off-site parking on the rural A30 road.

Oakley and Deane Parish Council:

"The Planning Committee of the Oakley and Deane Parish Council discussed this application at length at its meeting yesterday evening.

The council is concerned that no account has been taken of increased traffic flows on Trenchard's Lane. This lane is a single width, rural route, with passing places and represents the most direct route for resident's of Oakley to access junction 7 of the M3, the A30 to Winchester and the A303. As such it is currently heavily used. Giving access to the proposed hospital site will unacceptably increase traffic from the west of Basingstoke along this route and increase danger considerably. The proposed developments at Manydown, Oakley, Overton and Whitchurch will only make this situation worse. Similar concerns for the traffic flows around North Waltham also exist. In discussions with experts at the public consultations days members of the Parish Council were all told this is not the concern of the architects or developers. The committee disagrees strongly.

The committee is concerned that the visual impact, particularly from the east alongside

Trenchard's Lane, as portrayed in the artist's impressions is unacceptable.

Further the committee believes there will be an unacceptable increase in noise and light pollution in the area.

It would comment that it believes that the location of the helicopter landing area at the front of the site represents a unwarranted distraction to drivers on the A30 and M3.

Finally there is concern that the current plans do not represent those shown at the public consultation. There is wide spread belief that this was to be a two storey development rather than up to seven storeys now proposed.

The committee has no objection to this site being used for the hospital subject to these concerns being resolved”.

Overton Parish Council:

“There was concern about the location of this facility. It was thought that routes through Basingstoke were difficult at rush hour and that traffic problems would act as a deterrent to motorists accessing the hospital which could lead to inappropriate use of single track roads; Traffic Regulation Orders might be required to cope with this situation. It seemed that the recent allocation of two large housing sites in close proximity to the facility has not been taken into account when the application had been compiled and the resulting traffic as a result of the development could cause further issues.”

Policy: Objection

- Initial consultation raised concerns regarding the location being contrary to the development plan despite support for health care provision within the NPPF and the Submission Local Plan; the status of the NHS Trust’s strategy and the need for the development;
- Comments regarding the principle of development, the assessment of alternative sites and the cumulative impact assessment still stand;
- The application has however been submitted by a NHS Hospital Trust as a public body to deliver public services;
- The update provides little additional specific information to demonstrate that centralisation is the most appropriate model of health care provision, although cites a similar facility having opened in North-East England;
- Additional information on alternative sites only addresses site selection at a very high level and doesn’t identify any specific alternative sites;
- Explanation is required as to why certain types of locations may not be so appropriate (e.g. adequately sized or sufficiently accessible brownfield sites);
- Additional information refers to the benefits of the M3 (Junction 7) ‘cluster’ but does not refer to how clusters have been identified, where these are and how these were assessed or of alternative sites within this cluster;
- The application should be considered on its own merits but a consideration of alternative sites (and whether this is the best site) has some bearing on the merits of the proposal;
- Cumulative effects - technical consultees are able to better advise.

Highways England: No objection - Have reviewed the amended plans, content the changes will not impact on the strategic road network.

Highway Authority (HCC): No objection subject to conditions and securing obligations via a Section 106 Legal Agreement. Comments in summary:-

Primary Vehicular Access

- the applicant has demonstrated that appropriate visibility can be achieved at the proposed roundabout;
- tracking diagrams demonstrate that the roundabout can safely accommodate vehicles wishing to access and egress the site;
- the Highway Authority agree to the principle of the A30 access roundabout with its delivery subject to a Section 268 agreement.

Secondary Vehicular Access

- the proposed widening to Trenchard Lane has been removed from the scheme and includes alterations to the previously proposed improvement works at the Trenchard Lane/A30 junction;
- these alterations are due to changes in requirements by the applicant. The Highway Authority agrees the principle of the revised arrangement;
- it is stated that the secondary access will not be used by any vehicles during the day-to-day operation of the site. This access will only be used if the main roundabout becomes blocked as to restrict ambulances/emergency vehicles travelling to/from the hospital;
- the secondary access will be controlled via a barrier at the proposed junction off Trenchard Lane. A Management Plan for use of this access would be appropriate to manage access and such provision needs to be secured via a S106 agreement;
- further capacity modelling demonstrates that the A30 roundabout has capacity to accommodate all vehicular traffic accessing/egressing the site;
- modelling demonstrates that the roundabout will operate within capacity during AM, PM and Saturday peak periods which is accepted by the Highway Authority;
- revised information shows a shortening/relocation of the A30 deceleration lane and sight stopping distance from the revised A30/Trenchard Lane junction and is accepted in principle by the Highways Authority.

Walking and Cycling

- there is currently no formal walking or cycling link between the site and local services and residential areas due to the current use of the site as a managed arable field;
- indicative pedestrian and cycle trip numbers expected to utilise the shared use facility have been provided using survey data from two comparative existing sites in the UK and by applying rates to the site suggests demand is significant;
- the Highway Authority can agree to the principle of providing a shared use facility between the Beggarwood Lane Signal Junction along the northern/eastern side of the A30/Winchester Road to be secured through a Section 278 agreement. Further agreement is required at the detailed design stage to set the new pedestrian/cycle facility back from the carriageway to present a more attractive facility to potential users.

Public Transport

- the applicant proposes a new bus stop adjacent to the main CTH building entrance with bus shelters, seating, a bus lay-by and turning facility. This stop will also serve an existing hourly NHS staff shuttle bus operating between Basingstoke, Winchester and Andover;
- the Highway Authority is content that a diversion of the existing number 8 Stagecoach service would adequately serve the proposed development. The applicant has reaffirmed a commitment to securing this service for three years which is acceptable to the Highway Authority;
- provision is to be secured via a Section 106 agreement and the applicant will be required to review patronage in the Travel Plan monitoring process with a view to the service becoming self-funded after the initial 3 years;
- the bus has capacity to accommodate additional demand at this proposed site which is accepted by the Highway Authority subject to long term review.

Travel Demand

- the applicant has confirmed 1,350 employees at the site and the trip rates are agreed with the Highway Authority;
- the applicant has been required to further explain and provide information to support the traffic distribution which has been provided;
- the applicant has acknowledged that the exact number of staff to be transferred from existing facilities in Hampshire is not known therefore distribution assesses populations within 10-15km of the site. Populations to areas south of the site are minimal (i.e. using A33/M3 to access the site) so resultant proportion of trips applied to these routes is low;
- it is understood that there is an existing critical treatment facility in Southampton which is likely to curtail the catchment area of the proposed site;

- the Highway Authority is satisfied that the distribution assessment provides a robust assessment of the likely distribution/assignment of traffic;
- junctions assessed by the applicant continue to operate comfortably within capacity under future scenarios and would not result in a material impact on the highway network;
- the distribution and route assignment for the site is agreed.

Traffic Impact Assessment

- errors in compared surveys of modelled mean maximum queue lengths at the A30/Beggarwood Lane signal junction have been amended by the applicant.

Local Highway Authority: No objection subject to conditions and S106.

Ministry of Defence/RAF Odiham: No objection

- the proposed site is within a statutory aerodrome safeguarding zone surrounding RAF Odiham;
- the site lies under the approach to RAF Odiham and is approximately 14.91km to the west of the aerodrome. This area is used by military air traffic;
- The MOD maintains no safeguarding objection but advises that the helicopter operator sets up a management agreement with the Senior Air Traffic Control Officer at RAF Odiham to coordinate activities with on-going military low flying.

HCC Rights of Way: No objection

- Some concerns regarding the potential impact of the development on the Wayfarers Walk that passes along Trenchard Lane between Oakley Footpath no 728 and the A30;
- Welcome proposals to widen Trenchard Lane but ask the design to include a footway of suitable width (1.5m minimum) along the east side of the lane for pedestrians;
- The A30/Trenchard Lane is a crossing point for pedestrians on the Wayfarers Walk using the grassy central reservation as a refuge. This refuge should be retained and provision be made to ensure walkers can continue to cross the A30 safely;
- Proposal for a pedestrian/cycle link between the site and the A30/Beggarwood Lane junction is welcomed. Consideration should be given to other potential pedestrian and cycle links using the public rights of way network, such as to the villages of Oakley and North Waltham.

Urban Design: No objection subject to a condition controlling materials.

North East Hampshire Design Review Panel:-

- The design and presentation of the Cancer Treatment Centre is excellent. The scale of the proposal, the planning of the building and the limited and well assembled palette of materials worked well;
- The sophisticated planning and organisation of the Critical Treatment Hospital was very good and well considered and presented. The elevations of this building was of a mass that was unremittingly grey and austere;
- The roof line of the building [CTH] is troubling. It is not sufficiently articulated to take away a solid straight line within the landscape, and did not solve the desire to make the building a positive incursion into the landscape and relate to the tree lines;
- Suggested that the elements that made up the articulation of the forms were refined so that the plinth (that was likened to the character of the chalk lands) should be more animated in terms of its colour and materials;
- Suggest introduction of a more refined and possibly vertical entrance feature to unify the compositional elements;
- Due to the elevational treatments, the proportions of the blocks could be dominant and disturbing;
- The design should be cautious on the large areas of coloured courtyards, which could look dated and be unremitting in character. The same caution should be applied to the colours of the reveals on the main blocks;
- There could be an argument for ventilation chimneys to provide some relief to the roof landscape;

- Questioned how future expansion could be accommodated without encroachment of the overall site into surrounding landscape, and how the inevitable conglomeration of small buildings and additions could be successfully incorporated to avoid unsightly creep of the built form;
- The scheme had the potential to be ‘lifted’ considerably without too much change to the well considered and worked out plan and organisational arrangements, and that expressing these well could relieve the austerity of the current proposal considerably.

Conservation: No objection

- The site is in an elevated position located on land west of Ganderdown Copse. Southwood Farmhouse, a separately designated Milestone (Grade II) and the Sun Inn (non-designated Heritage Asset) are within the close environs of the site and its access;
- Dummer Conservation Area is located 1 km to the south;
- There is likely to be some direct intervisibility between the proposed development and the listed building of Southwold Farmhouse to the east of the site including distant views within the Dummer CA;
- The listed milestone immediately to the south-east of the site could additionally be vulnerable to associated highway improvement works therefore the impacts both during construction and upon completion will need to be considered and controlled by condition with an assumption given to preservation in-situ;
- Although there appears to be a degree of harm which perhaps amounts to less than substantial, NPPF Section 12 (p133) outlines that substantial harm can be justified on the grounds that the harm is necessary to deliver public benefits that outweigh that harm (i.e. in this case the provision of CTC).

Historic England: No comment - the plans are not considered likely to lead to an application which would need to be notified to Historic England.

HCC Archaeology:

- Broadly endorse the archaeological report although would weigh the balance of archaeological potential slightly differently;
- Concur with the conclusions set out and suggested mitigation;
- A number of potential archaeological sites have been identified that require some clarification, and a general archaeological potential has been described;
- A Written Scheme of Investigation is recommended and further archaeological mitigation is likely to be needed to ensure that archaeological remains identified by the evaluation and impacted by the development are properly recorded before damage or destruction.

Landscape: Further information required:

- could be acceptable with amendments to proposed landscape structure and further clarification on site selection;
- previous comments in relation to the landscape masterplan and other landscape proposals apply [see below for completeness];
- the removal of 120m of existing hedgerow for the main access will need to be responded to within the landscape proposals;
- replacement hedgerow should be provided behind the visibility splays for the access in order to sympathise with local landscape character;
- internal pedestrian footpaths and connection to the road and wider network is welcomed and doesn’t present any landscape issues;
- lane improvements drawing highlights impacts on existing landscape structure that will need to be addressed within the landscape proposals with replacement planting to sympathise with local landscape character;
- amendments in relation to the secondary access are welcomed in landscape terms as overall there will be less impacts on the lane on the edge of the site and less harm to local landscape character and visual amenity.

Initial comments

- it is highly likely that the site will be visible from the A30 and public rights of way in the area which includes part of the Wayfarers Walk;
- the development will inevitably result in a significant and adverse change to the landscape character of the site on what is currently an open agricultural field;
- the impact is identified by the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment;
- mitigation includes siting the building into the landscape, a muted materials palette and a lighting strategy designed to minimise adverse impacts on night skies through light spill;
- a landscape strategy includes new native woodland parcels around the perimeters of the site, with areas of scrub and wildflower meadow between these and the buildings;
- the measures will not fully mitigate the impacts on the character of the site but reduce their significance;
- hospital sites are typically found to the edges of conurbations. The proposed site accords with this common characteristic in the context of the emerging Local Plan which proposes significantly sized allocated sites (Basingstoke Golf Club, Kennel Farm and Hounsome Fields) between the existing edge of Basingstoke and the application site;
- whilst not yet adopted, the sites would bring the edge of Basingstoke even closer to the application site;
- improvements to the landscape design would further improve the relationship of the proposed scheme with the landscape character of the locality;
- the proposals show a series of curving landscape elements (woodland parcels, meadows and footpaths) which look overly 'designed' in the context of the wider agricultural landscape. More detailed reference should be made to the more angular and rectilinear shapes and edges of the adjacent agricultural landscape and the landscape masterplan for amended accordingly;
- due to vegetation cover, visual impacts are mainly limited to public vantage points in close proximity to the site, such as the A30 and public footpaths closest to the site, to the east and west;
- mitigation planting will soften and screen large parts of the built development, however the highest parts of the buildings will remain visible from some locations. Where visible, the buildings will be faced in muted materials which will allow the buildings to somewhat recess into the landscape;
- from some vantage points the buildings will protrude above vegetation into the skyline, which will have greater adverse visual impacts;
- from locations further away from the site, a combination of landform and vegetation cover will successfully screen views of the development. From these further locations, there are considered to be no adverse impacts;
- impacts on visual amenity could be improved through the timing of mitigation planting. Some (if not all) mitigation planting be undertaken before building work commences given the positive impact that the structural planting will have on the visual impacts of the site in the landscape;
- amendments should be made to the phasing of planting or justification made as to why this is not possible.

Alternative sites

- it would be advantageous to understand which alternative sites were considered for the development and why they were rejected in landscape terms. It is impossible to come to a conclusion about any advantages or disadvantages of this site in comparison to any alternatives.

Detailed design considerations

- submitted information illustrating the detailed design of spaces in and around the proposed buildings is welcomed;
- would advise that a greater proportion of planting species should be native or ornamental varieties of native species;
- recommend that wider areas of the internal parts of the site have references to the wider landscape context through naturalistic planting design and materials;
- query the concept of the footpath through the meadow adjacent to the proposed helipad;

- this footpath doesn't connect to a circulatory route around the site and is assumed to be for the purpose of providing a pedestrian route to the hospital from outside the site. Could this be clarified, as well as where precisely it meets the A30, and whether crossing points are proposed outside the site?
- advise conditions.

Trees: No objection subject to conditions.

- Previously proposed losses of hedgerow and linear woodland are now shown to be retained and the amended tree removal and protection plan are noted as positive outcomes.

Biodiversity: No objection subject to conditions

- The proposals have been amended to avoid the widening of Trenchard Lane by introducing dynamic management of gated access for emergencies only. This minimises disturbance to boundary hedgerows and woodlands;
- Some 120m of hedgerow will be lost by the main access but the loss can be mitigated by replanting hedgerow behind visibility splays. This, and similar mitigation on Trenchard Lane, would be satisfactory for biodiversity;
- Biodiversity benefits are significant. Some 13ha of new habitat is a huge improvement on the current regime;
- Not every plant grouping is native but invasive non-natives have been avoided;
- The new pond is welcomed in an otherwise dry landscape.

Protected Species

- the presence of hazel dormouse (i.e. a nest) has been confirmed at Trenchard Lane. Works in this area are confined to around 15m loss of hedgerow and bank. A European Protected Species Licence will be required;
- the hedgerow to be removed at Trenchard Lane was historically heavily managed and utilisation of the proposed gateway to focus new hedgerow connections with Ganderdown Copse would be positive and practical mitigation;
- bats are known to commute and forage along the woodland belt to the east of Trenchard Lane which is important to maintain as a link to Ganderdown Copse;
- assured protection of this habitat combined with appropriate lighting constraints will avoid the need for a European Protected Species licence for bats;
- actions for the site are necessary to fulfil the first requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 derogation tests which can be met;
- the production of a Construction Environmental Management Plan is advocated within the Ecology and Nature Conservation Report in order to protect additional species such as reptiles and badgers;
- a Habitat Management Plan is necessary to ensure that the ecological mitigation and enhancements are managed and resourced into the future.

Natural England: No objection.

Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust:

- share local concerns regarding the loss of important hedgerow to widen the entrance road to facilitate the proposals;
- further consideration to be given to the loss of those hedgerows and the proposed mitigation to offset those losses;
- supplementary planting is welcomed as the development will result in the direct loss of 600m of hedgerow, of which 198m are of sufficient importance to qualify for protection under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Hedgerows are a Priority UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitat and Local Authorities have a duty to protect this important habitat;
- supplementary planting to thicken up retained hedgerows is not considered to offset the loss of this important habitat;
- there appears to be no scope to create new hedgerows on the site and request that further offsite hedgerow planting should be considered to mitigate for the loss of the habitat.

Environmental Health: No objection subject to conditions.

- Following the submission of the amended information the content has been reviewed, specifically with reference to noise and lighting.

Environment Agency: The application is deemed to have a low environmental risk.

BDBC Local Land Drainage Authority: No objection

HCC Lead Local Flood Authority: No objection.

Thames Water: No objection subject to conditions

- Initial investigation identifies an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application;
- The closest Thames Water maintained public sewer network is 1.3km to the east of the development site. If connection to this network is required, a developer funded Sewerage Impact Study will be required. This area contains mainly small diameter sewers; some local upgrades are likely to be required.

Southern Gas: No gas mains within the area of enquiry.

Scottish and Southern Energy: No objection - the proposed development does not appear to directly impact upon cabling owned by SSE.

Public Observations

One hundred and nine letters received of objection on the following grounds (in summary):

Planning Policy

- the NPPF requires development to 'be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. The application is contrary to the Development Plan;
- the NPPF supports sustainable development – normally associated with re-using brownfield land or sites close to existing centres with good public transport links. This is not a sustainable development;
- the NPPF encourages use of brownfield land and promotes the vitality of main urban areas, seeks to protect the character and beauty of the countryside and valued landscapes, reuse land of low environmental value, and seeks to make fullest use of public transport, walking or cycling;
- the land is actively farmed and should not be used for development in accordance with the NPPF;
- site is not included within the adopted Local Plan or Emerging Local Plan as an area for development as would be expected for a strategic development of this size and importance;
- contrary to Saved Policy D8 (Rural Exceptions) which applies to small scale development, protects the countryside and prevents the coalescence of villages. It is not for major proposals of 500,00sq ft serving over 500,000 people;
- the Settlement Policy Boundary should not be broken in order to protect the pressures on the countryside;
- contrary to EC2 which requires major employers to be on strategic employment sites or within defined settlement boundaries;
- contrary to Saved Policy EC7 as not being a "small scale agricultural diversification";
- contrary to policies EP2, EP4, CN9, EM1 and EM2 of the Emerging Local Plan.

Location of proposal

- site is outside the settlement boundary for Basingstoke on greenfield/agricultural land in active agricultural use;
- Basingstoke will become an unusual conurbation with little centre and ever expanding suburb;

- the proposal extends westwards into open countryside from the southwest edge of the town and does not represent a natural extension to the town;
- the allocated site of Basingstoke Golf Course (1000 houses) enjoys better screening and Hounsome Field (750 houses), Kennel Farm (310 houses) would concentrate provision of new housing to the west and south west of Basingstoke. Most local employment is located to the east of the town;
- what is the Council's Planning Vision for the South West of Basingstoke?
- where are the defensible boundaries normally expected to be found in the Local Plan?
- building beyond Trenchard Lane would extend development further into open countryside beyond the scenario envisaged for the Local Plan;
- development should be located centrally on cleared/vacant/derelict/under-utilised /brownfield land;
- location is flawed with it ethically wrong to build a hospital in the countryside;
- countryside is irreplaceable, is a limited commodity and should be protected;
- location is too far from Andover and the area south of Winchester;
- the development should be located at Aldermaston which is easily accessible across the catchment area and on a brownfield site that would benefit from regeneration;
- no detailed consideration given to the pros and cons of alternative sites in terms of impact upon the local environment which should form part of the assessment process;
- absence of justification behind a major exception to planning;
- no evidence of a sequential test approach having been followed, by initially seeking sites closer to the town centre;
- little evidence/justification of a structured selection process behind the Trusts preference for this site which focuses only upon ambulance travel times and lower costs of a greenfield/Green Belt site;
- response time data is flawed as ambulances will have to travel to the next junction, turn around before coming back when there is an incident on the M3;
- lack of effort shown in identifying alternative/brownfield sites or other sites within the boundaries of Basingstoke or other Hampshire towns as an alternative;
- no evidence that land around the existing hospital could not be developed. Sufficient land is available. Road works at M3(J6) of the M3 make the existing hospital site more viable;
- the proposed facilities could be more sustainably accommodated on existing hospital sites with existing public transport links;
- it would be better to put the cancer unit next to the newly built radiotherapy unit at Basingstoke hospital;
- a smaller ICU could be built at Peak Copse with outpatient, cancer and maternity services remaining or centralised at existing hospitals;
- research by the Kings Fund challenged the approach of centralising critical care as not providing adequate evidence that this will result in better patient recovery. The report criticises isolated sites and advocates extending existing hospitals allowing co-location with existing consultant care;
- a proposed Critical Care Hospital to be built in Gwent, South Wales is located on an existing brownfield hospital site, rather than open countryside;
- the hospital should be in a far less prominent position and architected subtly;
- lack of regard for local communities;
- no need to relocate the Cancer Centre other than the availability of cheap land;
- coalescence of North Waltham, Oakley and Basingstoke creating Walthamstoke;
- the gap to North Waltham would be reduced to below 1000m;
- the countryside should be retained as to prevent the joining up of Basingstoke with nearby villages;
- the additional request for an ambulance station and pathology unit will lead to further infill and expansion towards Dummer and North Waltham with increases in staff from 800 to 1200;
- the isochromes used for selecting this site giving best travel connections for emergency vehicles is seriously inaccurate and based on false assumptions. The isochromes are misleading and should be disregarded;
- the development is to serve a catchment from Newbury to Eastleigh, Winchester to Alton

- but is very Basingstoke centric with little regard to customers from the wider area;
- a new site analysis should be undertaken and all information relevant to that analysis should be supplied as part of a proper consultation exercise;
- the Trust has only released incomplete information reluctantly and after Freedom of Information requests. Poor information was received and it appears the site selected was not the best, even from those around J7, but based on cost rather than planning regulations;
- the Trust claimed that scoping and tendering documents relating to site selection had been 'lost';
- understand that 12 sites were considered, including land at Bullington Cross (Sutton Scotney) – why were these rejected?
- the location appears to have been selected on the basis of a landowner willing to sell rather than finding an ideal site and paying appropriate fees for obtaining that land;
- should be located at Peak Copse on the redundant traveller site;
- location conflicts with the crematorium and planned cemetery with respect to fast moving traffic;
- lack of information has implications of a 'rushed-job' which a lack of consideration.

Character of the area

- contrary to Saved Policy D8 (Rural Exceptions) in which the proposal would not "complement the character of the rural settlement and the character of the surrounding landscape";
- the impact would be dramatic, irreversible, large scale, and have an inappropriate impact on the surrounding open countryside due to the scale and massing of the proposal;
- proposal is a major, industrial development visible from miles around;
- incongruous to the unspoilt, undeveloped rural landscape character of this location;
- significant detrimental landscape and visual impact both day and night on the surrounding villages and communities, Conservation Areas and the Wayfarers's Walk, a nationally designated long distance footpath;
- Dummer has an adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and a Village Design Statement. Both refer to the landscape setting of Dummer and should be referred to when considering the application;
- the site when planted with rape looks stunning in early mornings/late evenings;
- not possible to satisfactorily screen with landscaping a six storey building complex of the proposed massing, located towards the top of the slope;
- the Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA) does not demonstrate how the height can be successfully integrated into the rural landscape contrary to policy E6 (Landscape Character);
- a six storey building is contrary to the Landscape Character Area Study 2008 and Landscape Capacity Study carried out by the Council;
- development should be restricted to three storeys by a planning condition to minimise landscape impact and allow for tree screening;
- site is located on the crest of a hill. Detrimental impact on views from Tower Hill and Dummer cemetery;
- loss of rural character to North Waltham;
- the site is close to the skyline. The height of the development will bridge the skyline;
- the application states it will form a prominent and highly contrasting element on the site.
- the duration of change would be permanent and development would alter the site directly;
- creation of an extremely tall, intrusive and industrial presence;
- boundary of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is only 3.5km from the proposed site;
- the DAS refers to a significant effect upon properties within the northern extent of Dummer from rear upper storey views from properties. How is this known?
- significant landscape and visual residual effects will remain even after landscaping;
- loss of uninterrupted views across open countryside from Dummer to Hannington with no signs of development except for a few isolated buildings.

Design and layout

- object to the scale and massing of the proposed development;
- building will be of a multitude of colours which will not blend with the surrounding environment;
- the design is disappointing and looks like a 1960s industrial complex. The profile from the A30 looks like an incinerator;
- CTH is 6 storeys high and the chimney will be taller;
- if the proposal was for an office block of this design, it would be refused automatically;
- stock hospital design with no sympathy to the landscape;
- height /scale would be out of place in the local landscape;
- significant height with additional building on the roof and a chimney stack;
- the design is out of keeping with local properties;
- scale and footprint contrary to national planning guidance;
- a building sited lower down the site would not have its top stories breaching the crest of the hill;
- the water table is at least 15m below ground level, greater use should be made of the space below ground (i.e. two to three storeys);
- design does not reflect the scale, form, styles and building materials of traditional settlements;
- the height and land coverage of the development is out of proportion for the site;
- landscaping is not fit for purpose and will have little, if any mitigating effect.

Natural Environment

- the Local Plan has been re-pivoted to concentrate new housing to the south-west of Basingstoke without any assessment on consequences for wildlife, ecological networks and corridors;
- the layout is grossly deficient in areas for wildlife and community green space and omits serious green space and habitat provision to meet wildlife needs or proposals for ecological networks and corridors;
- the development could diminish the opportunity and viability for a much needed ecological corridor between the North Wessex AONB and South Downs to the west of Basingstoke and viable access to the countryside;
- the Basingstoke Biodiversity Action Plan in Sections 61 and 62 describe differing threats from development and that protection and enhancement of existing green infrastructure is a long term objective of the Council;
- the Council should have regard to the special landscape protection afforded to the North Wessex Downs of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- adverse impact upon ecology and habitats;
- where is the evidence that hospital users are unlikely to access adjacent habitats and not increase recreational pressure on Ganderdown Copse SINC?
- what measures are proposed to ensure this SINC is protected from hospital patrons and staff?
- require assurances that habitat mitigation areas cannot be developed upon or, if they are, that an equivalent areas to that lost is provided before new development destroys habitats together with additional land for any increase in footprint.

Hedgerows and woodland

- object to the removal of old woodland and hedgerows;
- Ganderdown Copse Ancient Woodland is protected by planning policy;
- the hedgerows to Trenchard Lane are deemed to be important under the Hedgerow Regulations Act (1997) and are historically unusual as these form parish boundaries;
- is such removal necessary or should the proposed second exit from the site be left purely for emergencies and thus require limited work on the lane?
- the entrance to the site requires the removal of 120m of hedgerow. To minimise damage, should consideration be given to another entrance design (e.g. traffic controlled T-junction);

- two Category A Oak trees bordering the A30 will have their crown reduced for flight path clearance. This will be an on-going process and will shorten their lifespan;
- some trees in the area are thousands of years old;
- risk of limb damage to trees from the down wash caused by the helicopters – no mitigation is in place to reduce/remove this risk;
- the area has Tree Protection Orders;
- proposed landscaping will be ineffectual for at least the next 20 years;
- tree planting will have no landscape impact.

Protected species

- negative impact upon birds and wildlife;
- harm to roe deer, dormice, and woodpeckers;
- copse to the north of the site has an occupied badger set which should be protected;
- a full bat survey has not been undertaken;
- Common and Soprano Pipestrelle bats have been recorded on Old Down. The development of Kennel Farm identified a third species. The site is therefore recognised as being used by bats;
- the impact of the hedgerow on bat species does not seem to have been fully assessed;
- light spill is likely to impact on bat foraging behaviour. Back light shields are suggested and should be considered on all boundaries and with use of motion sensitive lights;
- slow worms have been found at North Waltham but not found on Old Down or Beggardwood;
- a single common lizard was reported on Old Down in the last 5 years. Provision should be made for this species.

Historic Environment

- site is close to the Conservation Areas of Dummer and North Waltham, numerous Grade I and II listed buildings, a Roman Road, and a listed milestone and will blight important historical features;
- unacceptable to build over/near the route of an ancient Roman Road;
- adverse harm to the rural setting and historic value of the adjoining Grade II listed building at Southdown Farm;
- North Waltham contains historical buildings;
- adverse impact upon the setting of the Dummer Conservation Area from where the site will be visible, which contains listed buildings and a Grade 1 listed church;
- the application does not account for the historical nature of the area and would not support being a neighbour to a Conservation Area;
- contrary to the strict rules and regulations to protect heritage;
- living in a historic village should protect residents from developments such as this;
- if approved, the archaeological mitigation should be made into conditions of approval;
- the site itself was a decoy for Basingstoke railway station and bomb craters can be seen in the fields;
- loss of archaeological findings such as flints and primitive tools.

Highways and traffic generation

- proposal will result in significant increases in traffic volumes to an area with minimal public transport provision and beyond the reach of cyclists and walkers;
- generation of traffic from 1350 members of staff and 200 visitors a day is significant;
- severe traffic impact on surrounding roads (e.g. A30, A303, M3) and increase queuing at the A30/Winchester Road junction;
- the M3 (J8) is already dangerous with weaving traffic as roads merge.
- the road system around the M3 (J7-8) and the A303 are substandard;
- roads have a dangerous entry way at both J7 of the M3 and at Bullington Cross from the A303/A30/A34;
- increase in dangers on the road and accident risks;
- road usage in the area is unsustainable with community safety concerns;

- major review of the existing road network with major reconstruction and widening or duelling of roads is needed. The whole area will become grid-locked;
- total/ partial closure of the M3 diverts traffic to the A30/A303 bringing total chaos;
- the M3 is a single point of failure in the traffic network, is frequently blocked or slow moving;
- extra traffic at J7 will impact upon other roads which are inadequate;
- a scheme to create motorway services opposite the proposed hospital site was rejected due to dangers relating to the motorway and junction layout;
- contrary to Policy 17 of the adopted Oakley & Deane Neighbourhood Plan.

Transport Assessment

- Traffic Impact Assessment is inaccurate;
- application does not take account traffic increases of other planned/proposed developments (e.g. housing) detailed in the Emerging Local Plan and should be revisited;
- the assessment requires more detail, particularly with anticipated additional fast moving vehicles such as ambulances;
- comparable hospitals quoted are based in suburban/edge of town locations, not 6km from the town centre;
- the traffic generated by the maternity hospital will be far greater than suggested as most mothers will prefer consultant led care no longer available at existing local hospitals;
- accident data from Junction 7/8 of the M3/A303 is excluded giving an artificial assessment of accident risk;
- ambulances coming from Andover will not use the M3 but the A303/A30 as the quickest route;
- the Transport Assessment does not compare the effects on people coming from Andover, Newbury and Winchester to compare with Basingstoke;
- 65% of staff will travel by car. The catchment is expected to include transfers from Andover and Winchester;
- no consideration given to slow moving funeral corteges along the A30 to the Basingstoke Crematorium and the current applications to enlarge the site;
- no reference to Dummer, Maidenthorn Lane and the Wayfarers Walk at Junction 7;
- the scope should be widened to cover the area covered by the HHTF, not just 10-15km to the site;
- para 2.75 refers to reducing average distances to the site and increasing population within 8km to the site which is irrelevant with the site covering a wider area than Basingstoke;
- a closer site (e.g. Golf Club) will result in more patients within the 6 minute ambulance travel zone, the reason why Junction 7 was chosen;
- inadequate assessment on the effect of the M3 and the additional traffic at Junction 7 and the interaction with the very close junction 8.

Rural roads

- harm to the character and amenity of rural roads and lanes through North Waltham, Dummer and Oakley which are narrow (wide enough for one car), unlit, have limited passing places and do not have pavements and are unsuitable for significant increases in traffic flow;
- the widened Trenchard Lane will be a rat run between the North Hampshire Hospital and this site, as well as to Winklebury, Oakley, Dummer, nearby villages and the proposed Manydown development by staff and to access the M3/A30;
- rural roads will form the most direct route from Kingsclere, Newbury and Alton;
- drivers hurrying to an ICU or maternity unit are unlikely to be fully focused on driving single track roads with blind corners. Accidents will happen;
- no satisfactory plan in place for addressing rat-running;
- rural roads are mainly country lanes, not wide, not lit and dangerous in the dark;
- widening Trenchard Lane to the A30 as an alternative access for ambulances does not alleviate the problems of increased traffic flows (i.e. staff and visitors) from Oakley;
- added pressure to Trenchard Lane at the pinch point at the railway bridge;

- increased risk of danger to joggers running along country lanes, to children walking to the Dummer play park as well as horse riders and farm traffic;
- greater use of public footpaths which may increase fly-tipping;
- severe traffic impact on Duxford Road bypassing the A339 and cutting through Axford to the A30, with increases in traffic from Alton. Right hand turns onto the A30 from Duxford Road will lead to delays at this junction not used to high volumes.

Site Access and parking

- more realistic solutions required to reduce the number of cars entering the facility;
- the new access road to the east is considered as representing a low mortality risk due to limited night usage which is a bold assertion. What steps will be taken to reduce such use? A manually operated barrier is unlikely to offer long term protection;
- the roundabout access will constrict traffic flow along the A30 towards J7;
- access should be via a traffic light system to reduce the extent of hedgerow lost;
- car parking must be within the construction footprint (i.e. under or above the centre);
- unsustainable to waste land solely for car parking;
- what measures are proposed to handle overflow parking in the surrounding lanes?
- the volume of traffic will overload the car parking allocated on site;
- inconsistencies within the documents as to the level of parking;
- possible insufficient car parking spaces on site for staff and visitors;
- there is no on street parking around the site so parking could become a major problem and could potentially see the site expanding or compromising the landscaping plans.

Alternative modes of transport

- the location does little to promote a green transport strategy;
- travel infrastructure in the area is inadequate to support a huge increase in traffic with no real public transport to speak of;
- patients, visitors and staff will need to drive;
- reference is made to cycle lanes/extended bus routes. In reality the vast majority of visitors and staff to the facility will be travelling by car;
- people who are ill or are visiting sick relatives will not go by bike, they will drive;
- the catchment area for patients is very large and there will be a need to travel by car as a more timely means of transport;
- with some patients required to visit regularly (e.g. on-going cancer treatment), it will be inconvenient (and possibly costly) to travel in any way other than by car;
- the Travel Plan is overly optimistic in its assumptions about the number of staff that will access the site by public transport (instead of by car, walking or cycle);
- the site is removed from any railway station and will only be effectively accessed by road transport;
- the DAS shows a bus route from Dummer to North Waltham which has not existed for many years;
- a hopper bus service is proposed but it will be difficult to achieve the target as staff will be faced with multi trips;
- a staff bus is provided but will be of little relevance to patients and visitors;
- the bus service Jazz 8 extension will only be funded for three years, is a convoluted route and at best would only serve some staff, some of the time;
- the existing hospital can be reached from the town centre by a regular bus service;
- rerouting the hourly 'hopper' bus between the HHFT sites is unlikely to be used;
- the bus route from Basingstoke has a roundabout and is a time consuming route;
- the route from Basingstoke centre to the site is predominately uphill therefore deterring people from using the cycle routes included in the applications;
- cycling to the site in the dark is dangerous (e.g. with 24/7 shifts);
- staff will not cycle to work given the rural location, long journeys to work combined with long shifts;
- cycle paths are insignificant to staff and visitors transferring from Andover and Winchester.

Air traffic

- the CAAi report suggests 4 flights per day (i.e. 100 per month) other references suggest one flight per month;
- no obvious case for a helipad to service one flight per month;
- the siting is dangerous in relation to Ganderdown Copse and south westerly winds;
- a footpath and cycle path meandering around the helipad is unwise;
- area is used by low flying aircraft either directly or in transit to other areas, such as Popham and Lasham aerodromes making emergency flights in and out a danger to the area and the aircraft;
- have been reluctantly accustomed to occasional helicopter flights from RAF Odiham over North Waltham. Any increase in air traffic caused by the air ambulance would be unacceptable;
- the helipad is at odds with making safe approaches within a no fly zone over the hospital;
- Ganderdown Copse precludes approaches from the east and north. Trees around the helipad will create an additional hazard for pilots to negotiate;
- the siting of the helipad at ground level is at odds with the Ecology Statement which envisages the site becoming a "Hospital Copse";
- preferred location is on the roof of the building allowing approaches from all directions reducing helicopter to Emergency Department patient transfer exposure time.

Residential amenity

- destruction of lifestyle from a development unacceptably close to Ganderdown Cottages;
- invasion of privacy.

Light Pollution

- the LIA has failed to properly clarify and assess the overall impact of the proposed development and is based on a three storey building;
- the Lighting Impact Assessment (LIA) states sources of lighting from street lighting from the roundabout, pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes, car parking and building entrances only;
- the LIA excludes consideration of the lighting from the buildings, including the full height glazed public areas and the central ward core; under canopy lighting of the CTH, and helipad lighting. This needs to be accounted for;
- section 7.2 of the Lighting Impact Assessment states the site will change from an E2 (rural) to E3 (urban) zone – why should this statement be accepted?
- the proposed lighting is consistent with a town centre/business area;
- the LIA assessment of having a 'barely perceptible' sky glow at viewpoint locations is inappropriate;
- the Lighting Assessment fails to acknowledge the 24 hour operation with 800 car parking spaces;
- the building would be conspicuously visible/stand out prominently at night;
- surveys by North Waltham Parish Council indicate that the majority of residents wish to keep the village unlit. This will be harmed by ambient lighting;
- impact of light pollution which will be intrusive at this site and visible from Dummer;
- North Waltham and Dummer do not have street lighting to protect their rural nature;
- the proposed site, including a large car park, will generate substantial light pollution;
- glare caused by traffic;
- mitigation is planned but the residue will pollute the sky and be a nuisance for astronomers in the area;
- operating lighting from dusk to dawn does not sit with the aim of "being lean, clean and green" and aiming for "low and zero carbon systems" (Design and Access Statement);
- greater mitigation should be in place (e.g. greater shielding of lighting and proximity sensors)
- why does the roundabout need lighting? Other major junctions in the area are not illuminated;
- lighting impacts could be reduced using configured motion sensors.

Air Quality

- no consideration has been made of air pollution when siting the proposed facility;
- the application does not explore what might be done to mitigate the inevitable pollution risks to sick people;
- the position of the site close to the A303 and M3 contrasts to the report issued by the Environmental Audit Committee (Dec 2014) which states that “air pollution is a public health crisis causing nearly as many deaths as smoking” and recommends that new schools, care homes and hospitals should be built far away from major roads because of the dangers of air pollution.

Noise pollution

- unacceptable noise generation from the arrival and departure of helicopters and blue light traffic at any time of day or night together with on-site activities and general traffic;
- ambulances are allowed to use sirens up to 11.30pm;
- people moved to villages for peace and quiet and not to hear sounds of inner cities like ambulance sirens;
- loss of, and disruption to, the enjoyment of a relatively quiet rural area;
- the ES states that to meet internal noise levels, windows will remain closed which does not meet recommended practices for infection control;
- the reports allude to the effects of noise on the M23 in Sussex;
- traffic noise from the M3 can be heard in North Waltham (mainly on wet days/when wind is in right direction);
- the noise survey was only carried out pertaining to the effects of traffic on the hospital rather than on the villages and only carried out on fine weather days;
- the survey should have been carried out on wet and windy days and would have shown that an inevitable decibel increase in noise from the M3 and A30 would occur with the hospital;
- the Noise Statement underestimates the levels of noise associated with the development by “averaging” noise levels over the periods of the day. This does not reflect the nuisance and annoyance felt by residents disturbed by frequent, irregular, loud (short lived) sirens and helicopter arrivals and departures.

Utilities

- cost to tax payers to upgrade the utility infrastructure;
- installing utilities will mean major upheaval to the entire area;
- the site is remote from the Thames Water Sewage works. What are the infrastructure costs compared to developing at Andover, Basingstoke and Winchester which appear to already be well provided for and closer to existing facilities;
- to link the development to the Kempshott system and beyond will create huge problems, be reliant on a pumped system which requires a power supply;
- greater use of green technologies (e.g. heat pumps and photovoltaics) should be used, with the design also making greater use of passive heating and cooling principles;
- disappointing reliance upon a large CHP system;
- use of photovoltaics and ground source coupling has been rejected as not making a large enough contribution to carbon reduction – surely every little helps!
- the design does not make great use of passive heating and cooling techniques;
- absence of any electricity, gas, sewage or road infrastructure to accommodate the proposal with the sewage treatment at North Waltham at maximum capacity.

Flood risk

- the Flood Risk Assessment takes no account of proposed developments at the Golf Course and Hounsome Fields on the mitigation (culverts) proposed under the access road to the site; and Kennel Farm;
- draining the helipad to a soakaway seems a bad plan;
- no assessment has been made of a nearby foul drain. Thames Water has not accepted its potential use;

- an assessment is required of the likely impact of additional housing on the culvert;
- the Trenchard Lane/A30 junction always floods after heavy rain.

Change to NHS services

- negative effect on existing hospitals and detracts from the vitality of surrounding areas;
- the benefits of the facilities on offer cannot be disputed but the facilities offered are already provided at Basingstoke and Winchester;
- a positive case has been made in respect of the medical case, but not the location;
- concern about the movements of NHS services from the current NHS resource, the possibility of scaling down essential services such as maternity in favour of obstetrics and the scaling down of maternity services at Winchester to a midwife led unit, resulting in transfer to Dummer if anything goes wrong. Medical services need to be based in Winchester close to home;
- where else has this type of centralised hospital been successful? The concept of the Critical Treatment Hospital is untested. There is no compelling evidence that the hospital is required;
- NHS ruling over planning policies;
- the centralisation of ICU treatment to gain better cover is false. Two heart surgeons in the centralised unit at Basingstoke cannot provide 24/7 cover, then they will not be able to do so in a new unit. No additional consultants are planned;
- existing hospitals will inevitably be scaled down over time with further centralisation. Is this what is needed for communities in other areas – Winchester, Andover and Newbury;
- given nationally acknowledged shortage of medical personnel, staffing the centre with the requisite number of medical professionals and ancillary staff will be problematical or will decimate current staff levels in the region's existing hospitals reducing them to cottage hospitals and inadequate for the needs of the local populations;
- the application is premature as necessary consultation and directive from the Clinical Commissioning Group has not yet been completed, with consultation only beginning in May on options for centralising or re-organising critical care services in Hampshire;
- there is every chance this proposed development is at risk of not being a preferred option over expanding existing hospital sites. No decision will be taken until Autumn;
- centrally delivered services will affect families wishing to visit loved ones who are ill and away from their local hospital;
- concern regarding the viability of local hospital services if this goes ahead.

Other matters

- lack of due process in determining that this type of development is required prior to any discussion of its location;
- why is money, time and effort being spent on bringing back Greenham Common, an enormous brown field location just 18km to the NNW of the proposed site?
- a funding commitment is yet to be secured for the project;
- understand that the Trust has taken an option to purchase additional land and assume this will be for a further extension of the hospital as an escalation of the original scheme;
- the NHS Trust have already spent £1.5million on this project despite being in debt for some £4.5million. This money could have been better spent elsewhere;
- with Government austerity, if planning were to be granted and the applicant's did not proceed, it is possible that either the site could be a private hospital or other change of use;
- affordable housing has been turned down in this area so a hospital cannot be acceptable;
- few socio-economic benefits;
- presume that once operational, assume that the NHS will have a list of preferred suppliers for products and services so any local benefit is questionable and unquantifiable;
- how many of the 800 jobs will be new and how many will be relocated from other sites where services are being run-down;
- likely that a national contractor will be appointed;

- site could become part of the NHS consolidation with more services added over the years;
- sets a precedent for similar major development schemes and non-associated in-fill in the area creating unchecked urban sprawl along the A30 into the countryside;
- risk of continual expansions of the site and/or transfer of other facilities from existing Hampshire Hospital sites leading to further development;
- pressure for further development along the A30 towards the Wheatsheaf public house and possibly beyond the Crematorium;
- inadequate compensating benefits in terms of providing rural employment and promoting the survival of rural village life;
- fields around Bulls Buses Farm were purchased in 2005 and Taylor Woodrow given options for housing development which will only be encouraged by this build;
- why was land at Park Prewett sold off for housing? Was cost a consideration?
- loss of property value;
- details of the proposal were not revealed in any property search when purchasing a property;
- why sell off land at huge profit and when it is no longer available, bid for a green site;
- no statement on handling the increased security risk – will there be increased police patrols?

Process/procedure

- application is factually lightweight, contains multiple discrepancies and seeks to de-emphasise harmful effects and to over-emphasise 'politically correct' and irrelevant considerations;
- sections 1 & 2 of the application form have a discrepancy over the identity of the applicant and agent;
- section 10 states zero parking spaces contrary to the Transport Assessment (801 spaces and the Design and Access Statement (786 spaces);
- section 11 asserts connection to the existing drainage system – there is no system;
- section 18 has an incomplete breakdown of the proposed uses in relation to A3, B1(a), B1(c) and B8;
- section 19 – the FTE figure is inconsistent within the application;
- section 23 states “no” which is incorrect as biohazard waste will be generated;
- section 24 – the site will be visible from several public roads and footpaths in the vicinity;
- the application requires further attention and does not detail the process of disposing the waste material generated, and states that no hazardous substances are involved in the proposal which is odd given the substances that hospitals normally handle;
- the application form leaves blank section 22 – “industrial or commercial process and machinery”;
- the application states the applicant is applying a “Local where possible, central where necessary” approach to the need for the hospital. Local consultants and contractors should be used rather than those from Bristol?
- atrocious that an application is allowed to be put through when MPs and other Councillors are busy with the general election.

Public consultation

- absence of prior public consultation;
- first heard of the proposal when seeing contractors doing exploratory sampling of the site;
- the site serves a wide catchment area. How can the Local Council and Health Authority mandate on areas outside of their control;
- should there not be a public inquiry for any development of Basingstoke and Winchester hospitals to demonstrate the need before any development takes place?
- no consultation with local residents until it was announced that the proposal would go ahead;
- the proposal has expanded in terms of scope and physical dimensions since the presentations and meetings, including that held by the Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust;

- the Public Consultation event suggested a “country style” building of 2 – 3 storeys in height, with the application presenting a six storey tower, only one storey lower than the Hampshire Clinic Building;
- proposal has been in the pipeline for some time and has been sprung on residents at the last stage;
- no public consultation with voters of Basingstoke, Winchester and Andover;
- the public consultation has been flawed. The local press announced the details as being finalised and approved before undertaking any form of consultation;
- consultation meetings were arranged at short notice and at a holiday time with people unable to attend;
- the Press announcement led to a belief that the meetings were a waste of time and therefore were not attended;
- the proposal has been announced prior to funding and without any planning application;
- an assessment of need would be the suitable first step in the process;
- how can planning permission be applied for when there is no agreement for funding;
- what happens if permission is granted and funding refused – with a significant waste of public money;
- other sites and options have been rejected without appropriate consultation to the public. Hospitals in Basingstoke, Winchester and Andover could have been developed to keep critical treatment local and existing services safe;
- a similar hospital in Gwent is being considered with an existing hospital being threatened with closure;
- severe demand for staff housing;
- the application is heavily based on input from external consultants.

Two letters have been received which express support but also raise comments to the proposal. Comments provided in summary:

Access

- the proposal includes a new roundabout at the western main entrance close to an existing vehicular access which is not shown on the application documents and is not accounted for;
- due to the location of the roundabout, the required separation distance to this access will not be achievable and with increased traffic flows, the ability to safely move large agricultural vehicles onto the road will be compromised;
- the roundabout should be designed to accommodate farm vehicles and provide a vehicular access to adjacent land directly from the roundabout;
- the extent of land take to form the new roundabout is not clear from the submitted plans;
- have been advised that this does not encroach onto land in separate ownership and request a condition/obligation to secure this;
- the eastern entrance is directly opposite a main access serving residential and commercial properties, including large commercial and farm vehicles;
- the Transport Assessment has not adequately addressed the implications of this access in terms of highway safety and likely additional traffic flow and could detrimentally impact the farm viability and adjacent business if not properly addressed.

Helipad

- the justification for choosing the location as opposed to on top of the building is not clear;
- the helipad would be better located at the top of the site away from the A30 and M3;
- no clear flight path and site sections have been seen to demonstrable no prejudicial impact upon future uses of adjacent land for livestock or further building requirements;
- the Helipad is in an area that experiences standing water, particularly in winter. It is unclear whether safety and drainage implications have been fully taken into account;
- the CAAi report seems brief in considering safety (e.g. prevailing wind, impact upon road users and military air corridor) and whether the size and siting is the best option;
- require assurance that the CAAi report has been independently assessed.

Two letters of support have been received – (comments in summary)

Principle of development

- it is obvious that for residents of the Basingstoke, Andover and Winchester region, a centre of excellence, available 24/7 for critical care and cancer treatment is very strongly in the public interest;
- provision of comprehensive cancer care in Basingstoke will reduce journey times and distances as currently it is necessary in many cases to travel to Guildford or Southampton;
- major benefit to the community;
- there will be no direct impact on North Waltham;

Planning Policy

- the site lies outside but immediately adjacent to the region covered by the Basingstoke & Deane Council development plan;
- the large housing developments planned nearby would certainly have a far greater impact on the area than the planned CTH;

Character of the area

- the countryside landscape will be altered adversely in the immediate area, however the Critical Care Hospital would be unlikely to significantly change the perception of the scene driving along the A30;
- the extensive adjacent fields of oilseed rape dominate, particularly in the spring.

Design and layout

- the design is functional but not unattractive in appearance;
- it will be large with 5 storeys wholly above ground level but there are few dwellings close by. Most local residents will see the hospital from a distance.

Natural Environment

- note that Natural England comment that no flora and fauna are threatened;
- the commitment to replace and extend hedges, which provide important habitats is welcomed;
- the application shows extensive landscaping with trees and shrubs, probably a greater number than exist currently;
- plans show that trees have been sited to allow a selection of approach paths for helicopters without overflying dwellings or the hospital;
- the artist's impressions suggest that the landscaping and means of enclosure will be adequate but these aspects will need tracking as the plans are developed to ensure they remain so.

Highways and traffic generation

- happy to deal with any increase in traffic if there is a centre of excellence so close;
- aspects such as traffic generation, highway safety and parking are all considered within the proposal;
- with a 24 hour service, a large proportion of staff will presumably work shifts so the impact upon the A30 and adjoining minor roads, which currently have only light traffic, will be small;
- traffic generated by ambulances is likely to be relatively small compared with the rush-hour traffic to and from London, Southampton, Andover and Basingstoke;
- the proposed site will give ambulances several route options for entry and exit (M3, A30, A303, A33) to avoid areas of traffic congestion at rush hours;
- the proposed bus service will reduce vehicular traffic to the hospital;
- existing cycle tracks will be augmented to provide pedestrian and cycle access to Basingstoke;
- parking provision makes provision for future expansion;

- the additional traffic from housing developments would require an upgrading of junctions 7 & 8 of the M3. The plans need to be put in the context of wider long-term transport plans. Growth in traffic will make it essential to upgrade the current north-south routes. One solution would be to upgrade the Basingstoke ring road and its access roads from the south and west.

Residential amenity

- there are very few dwellings close to the proposed site so issues of overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy are probably not significant.

Noise

- noise from the hospital helicopter movements will be intermittent and very localised;
- the helicopter movements will probably be less obtrusive in both volume and duration than the noise from RAF Chinooks commuting to and from Salisbury Plain via the M3 'air motorway';
- noise from plant and machinery should be relatively low level and only audible in the immediate neighbourhood;
- unlike sports or entertainment centres there is unlikely to be any other form of disturbance.

Other matters

- Commitment to energy efficiency is welcome, particularly the installation of a Combined Heat and Power engine.

Other Organisations

Dummer Action Group (in summary)

General Planning Issues

- location is outside of any current settlement boundary and has not been captured and addressed in the Emerging Local Plan;
- the long term planning process has not been used to identify the best possible solution for residents of Basingstoke and Deane;
- the development is not supported by Policies D8 and E6 of the Local Plan or EP4 of the Emerging Local Plan;
- siting a 6 storey high industrial building on an elevated plot in the countryside will not make a positive contribution to the local character and historic environment;
- the NPPF requires applications to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, and the impact on their setting. It is debatable whether this has been adequately carried out.

Cross Design Issues

- with construction to be carried out in a single phase, it is not evident where areas for storage, site offices and construction car parking will be given areas of the site to be set aside for screening, ecological and archaeological matters;
- no obvious locations off site for such activities. Construction vehicles parked on the A30 or waiting to enter the site will be a safety issue;
- no reference/recognition of the use of the Wayfarers Walk and the need to use Trenchard Lane and the A30 giving rise to safety issues;
- hedgerows to Trenchard Lane are used by bats which will be impacted upon by the removal of hedges for the proposed widening;
- ecological report recommends minimising hedgerow removal and the wider impact of the site on the habitat. New planting will take many years to re-establish;
- the impact of the hedgerow removal on bat species is not fully assessed.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- size and height fails to reflect development guidance and proposed mitigation will have almost no effect on the wider visual impact of the buildings;
- the building will stand out in the landscape both day and night;
- the site is located in the countryside with the nearest villages having conservation area status;
- even with proposed housing to the southwest of Basingstoke being proposed, the landscape character will remain of open countryside with housing and associated low rise infrastructure;
- the application identifies significant visual effects on nearby cottages, on views from properties with north facing aspects in Dummer, locations on Trenchard Lane, from the Wayfarers Walk, a footpath 0.4km to the south west and the A30 as well as Tower Hill and the cemetery in Dummer;
- The site will be visible at night.

Lighting

- the Lighting Impact Assessment fails to properly clarify the overall impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area. It will stand out both day and night in a dark area;
- the site will be visible at all times from Dummer;
- the application is inconsistent with the rural environment in which it would sit. The lighting is more consistent with a town centre/business area;
- lighting from the building, the under canopy and helipad have been excluded;
- views from the northern end of Down Street, Dummer are not considered;
- Dummer and North Waltham have been classified as suburban when they are villages in a rural environment with no street lighting;
- with the amount of lighting proposed, some with an upward light ratio and inevitability of ground reflection, it is difficult to believe that the assessment of 'barely perceptible' Sky Glow is appropriate;
- the impact of lighting from the buildings will be visible at night from the majority of nominated viewpoints and practically in all directions;
- no justification for lighting at the A30 roundabout site entrance. Other junctions carrying CTH/CTC traffic are not currently lit at night.

Transport

- the Transport Assessment fail to conform to the NPPF that requires significant development to be 'sustainable' and managed to allow use of public transport, walking and cycling;
- contrary to Policy CN9 of the Emerging Local Plan that requires development to minimise the need to travel and to provide safe, suitable and convenient access for all potential users and should offer a choice of travel modes;
- the proposal offers no practical opportunity for walking;
- the nearest cycle route terminates 1km from the site. To reach the site, cyclists would have to cycle along an unmade footpath through unlit, isolated and hazardous woodland and cross the Junction 7 gyratory with fast moving traffic on the southbound slip entry to the M3;
- cycleways via Brighton Hill and Hatch Warren involve a climb of 56m and is impractical for all but the fit and young;
- the proposed cycleway alongside the dual carriageway A30 would provide a direct alternative but is unattractive for cyclists unless well set back from the road and well screened;
- extension of bus route Jazz 8 is not practical with a journey time from the railway station of at least 25 minutes and up to 1 hour in peak periods;
- the route of Jazz 8 around Beggarwood and also the Golf Course development is tortuous and time consuming;
- staff will have strict and immovable day and night shift patterns where promptness is critical. Jazz 8 route starts at 5.55am with 15 minute intervals until 19.07 when after buses run hourly until 21.56. The Jazz 8 is unlikely to be impractical;

- it has been made clear that there will be no intra-shift movements of staff therefore the hourly hopper bus is unlikely to be used by staff at the beginning or end of a shift at the CTH. Travelling from the existing General Hospital will encounter serious traffic delays getting across Basingstoke at peak times or involve a long diversion via the M3. There would be encouragement to divert via Trenchard Lane;
- bus travel would not be an attractive or viable alternative mode of transport for employees;
- almost all access will be by car contrary to sustainability requirements of the NPPF and the Emerging Local Plan as supported by a survey carried out by Southern Communications Ltd.

Traffic Assessment

- the Traffic Assessment is inadequate and mistaken;
- all transport analysis has been based only on traffic flows from existing housing development to which only Longwood Copse Lane and Kennel Farm has been added.
- no reference has been given to substantial numbers of additional dwellings between Basingstoke and the application site;
- against planning practice to ignore the impact of the proposed hospital development as an addition to the already planned housing development;
- the Applicant should rework the Traffic Assessment to take account the Local Plan developments and include them as committed developments otherwise a decision on the application will bear no relation to reality;
- no evidence to support the decision to limit the distribution of trips to 10-15km given that the proposal is to provide care for patients from the whole geographical area covered by the HHFT, including Eastleigh, Andover and Newbury. This is not a local hospital facility;
- it is remarkable and unbelievable to state that 0% of traffic will travel from or to the M3 SW. It would be more appropriate to cover 25-30km as the unit will be adjacent to the M3;
- stating that the average distance to local hospitals for residents will decrease is contradictory as the hospital is not a local hospital;
- the Accident Study Area has been highly selective and inadequately defined and omits junction 8 of the M3. There would be increases in traffic to and from the hospital entering and leaving the M3 southbound entering the substandard bifurcation at Junction 8;
- the period of study is inadequate and should cover no less than 10 years. For the period 2004 – 2014 there were 160 PIAs with 4 fatalities rather than the 30 PIAs in the 5 years selected;
- 7 PIAs have occurred at the Stockbridge Road junction including one fatality and 15 PIAs at junction 8 with a further fatality. J8 has a continuing record of major accidents from fast moving traffic weaving to or from the A303 across slower traffic joining at J7 or leaving at the same junction;
- the proposal will materially increase the level of traffic joining or leaving the M3 at J7;
- the Traffic Assessment should include analysis of the trip attraction and impact upon Oakley Village and Trenchard Lane and Dummer village Tower Hill, Up Street and Down Street;
- it is contended that staff and patients will access the site via Oakley village and Trenchard Lane especially during peak periods as this will be more attractive than the A30 corridor. An assessment of the impact of diverting traffic should be provided;
- the Traffic Assessment shows the Mean Maximum Queue at the A30 Winchester Road/A30 junction will increase from 3.3 in 2014 to 9.5 in the PM peak by 2019 – a 188% increase which is severe. Traffic reaching J7 of the M3 will divert through Dummer via to avoid queuing. An assessment of the impact of diverting traffic on Dummer should be provided;
- conflicting information regarding car parking – 801 spaces or 786 – which is misleading. It is presumed that 15 car parking spaces consist of short term and emergency drop-off spaces;
- the applicant is being misleading with inadequate parking for 1350 staff of whom 600-700 are expected to be on site at any one time;
- a target of 65% of staff travelling singly by car is ambitious. This will probably be 75-80%;

- 501 car parking spaces for 700 staff is grossly insufficient and should be materially increased;
- increases in car parking will materially compromise the landscape screening. The site in open countryside, remote from the town is unsuitable for this development;
- the application is inconsistent and inadequate in respect of helicopter flights and likely hours of operation;
- suggestion made that non-critically ill patients would be transported by helicopter during daytime hours which would materially increase the number of helicopter movements;
- it is unclear as to why a helipad on the roof of the hospital has been rejected when this offers the quickest and most direct transfer to the hospital medical team;
- CAA rules for operating into hospital sites are frequently updated. It is preferable for a landing site to make a final approach and take off into prevailing wind to minimise engine power and increase single engine safety margins. The layout does not cater for this. The final approach would be over tall trees requiring a steeper than normal approach reducing safety margins;
- there are no suitable into wind approach paths due to the relation of the pad to the hospital. No flight paths would be into prevailing westerly wind for approach and landing.

Noise

- the noise report contains errors and uses predicted traffic figures which are undefined;
- unattended and attended monitoring at locations around the site were made in 2014;
- day and night monitoring weather conditions omit figures for temperature lapse rate;
- surface noise levels can be greatly affected by a low-level temperature inversion which may cause sound to be reflected/refracted;
- Environment Agency IPPC Noise Assessment and Control states that night background noise measurements should be taken between 0100 – 0400 Sunday – Thursday to obtain lowest readings but the survey carried this out on a Friday before 1am;
- the daytime noise assessment was taken at 17.16hrs for just 30 minutes coinciding with the rush hour giving higher than average noise readings;
- predicted noise levels of the helicopter are shown averaged and therefore appear diluted from their actual immediate noise level. The presentation is purely statistical and does not reflect being shaken by a 141dB Eurocopter on its final approach. The effects (e.g. loss of sleep) may well last well after the helicopter has departed;
- the expected 30% increase in traffic would give a minor noise increase along the A30 and in the long term will be drowned out by increases in traffic noise due to other development and is thus shown as having a negligible effect;
- whilst noise may not increase dramatically when averaged throughout the day and night, frequent, loud, short-lived siren/blue light operations would be extremely annoying in a quiet countryside environment.

Socio-Economic

- the EIA states the location would bring an important regional development to the Borough and provide significant new employment for Basingstoke with existing hospitals retained locally for treating their local communities;
- the EIA does not state what services will be retained in Winchester, Andover and Basingstoke and whether these will be wound down and whether the overall employment figures collectively with the CTH will increase in the coming years;
- it is suggested that Andover will be scaled down considerably and is not described as important as Basingstoke and Winchester indicating that employment will reduce significantly;
- a statement that circa 800 jobs may be created during the construction phase cannot be quantified in the absence of any contract being awarded. It is highly likely that a national construction firm will be appointed limiting potential for local employment;
- indirect benefits from the construction phase would be short lived if a non-local labour force were used or if local, a displacement from elsewhere around Basingstoke;

- no indication of whether local businesses are intended to supply goods or services to the hospital. One would expect the NHS to have preferred suppliers which may not be local businesses;
- the ES does not conclude that there will be any additional employment opportunities in the area of whether staff from other downsized hospitals will be relocated. There is no measurable net increase in employment in this area.

Environment

- the site in close proximity to two major roads contrasts to the Environmental Audit Committee (Dec 2014) report stating that “air pollution is a public health crisis causing nearly as many deaths as smoking”. It recommends that new hospitals should be built far away from major roads because of the danger of air pollution. No consideration has been made of this point during site selection;
- increases in houses proposed for the south west of Basingstoke with increases in traffic along the A303 and M3 will compound pollution levels and be harmful to the patients of the proposed self-ventilating hospital caring for the most sick in the area.

Cultural Heritage

- the proposed site is elevated thus it is inappropriate to state that the site is largely hidden from view. It is challenged whether a 1km study area is sufficient;
- the Baseline report does not list all the listed properties within the site search area, such as within Dummer;
- no Archaeological Impact Assessment has been made available although there is a baseline document;
- the Baseline Report details areas of significance and historical background within the area however the document does not say what will be done to ascertain the effect on these and what will be done to preserve them.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- the Statement refers to flooding along the A30, the building of culverts under the access road and upstream flow routes and catchment area draining through the site;
- given proposed developments in the area, some consideration of the impact of future building on the areas upstream should be given to the sizing of culverts.

Ecology

- the development of a 24 hour operation will introduce significant light, noise and pollution impacts that will fragment and disrupt bat foraging territories and reduce food availability;
- Slow worms have been commonly found in North Waltham and efforts should be made to record and remove Slow Worms on or near the site.

Cycle Basingstoke

- concern regarding the impact of the development on local highways;
- a mini-bus will not provide for the many permanent uses, including cleaners and porters, nor visitors and users. With 1,350 employees, a real choice of sustainable, non-polluting transport should be facilitated;
- it is essential that there is good cycle access which is well promoted as a sustainable form of transport accessible to all ages and abilities to cycle;
- time taken to travel by bike and car is comparable, and quicker by bike through motor congestion;
- the CCU is 5 miles from the town centre and railway station, taking half an hour to travel (sports cyclists may halve this);
- popularity of electric bikes is increasing, meaning that the range and speed of cyclists is increasing, making it attractive to elderly and less fit;
- folding bikes allows for journeys to be combined with bus and train and door-to-door at a time convenient to the user, being not reliant upon timetables;

- cycling is good for mental and physical health, so employees are more alert and have less time off sick;
- cycling will be more popular as congestion increases, as is the case along the A30 with new housing;
- good secure covered cycling parking is essential to deter theft;
- the cycle park should only be for cycles and not a refuge for smokers;
- there must be safe, direct cycle routes to the CCU. The travel plan proposed a 5km radius for cycling, this should be 5 miles;
- a direct cycle route with cycle lanes along both sides of the A30 with cycle facilities at all roundabouts and spurs to all residential areas along the A30 are needed, with cycle connections also to Dummer, North Waltham, Oakley and Kempshot;
- off road cycle tracks rather than on road cycle lanes are recommended and should be designed for speeds of 12mph uphill and 30mph downhill, of adequate width and not shared with pedestrians unless it is a footway conversion. Sharing with walkers reduces speeds and are unattractive for commuters;
- the proposed A30 cycle route from Quilter Road to Sainsburys has no direct link on to the A30 at Wallop roundabout;
- the proposed shared cycle route between the hospital and Beggarwood Lane will not encourage cycling. This only provides a direct connection to one cycle route and one residential area, with no connection to the town centre, railway station or any places off the A30, and with no direct connection to Kempshott, Sainsburys, or Pack Lane;
- roundabouts and junctions are deterrents to cycling causing severance, delay and danger;
- all roundabouts on the A30 are planned for increased capacity, faster moving vehicles and more lanes making cycling more difficult. Safe, direct alternatives must be provided for cyclists across all junctions;
- there must be clear leadership to encourage cycling. There are no targets for cycling;
- without improvements to cycle access, it will not be possible to promote cycling successfully;
- a health facility is expected to promote active, healthy travel;
- with over a 1000 employees, there should be an expectation of at least 100 cyclists to the site.

CPRE objects and considers the development inappropriate:

- the site provides good arterial access from the M3, M30, A303 and being on green fields would be easy to develop. It is not the role or wish of CPRE Hampshire to obstruct the building of a new hospital per se;
- all have a duty to minimise harm to greenfield areas in the County and the landscape;
- the site is not allocated in the current local plan;
- Local Plan policies protect the countryside preventing the joining up with adjoining villages and to direct major employment developments to allocated sites or sustainable locations more closely adjoining the town;
- the application is for a major development situated outside the Basingstoke settlement boundary on a greenfield site situated in the strategic gap between two conservation villages and conurbations of Oakley and Basingstoke on its flanks. All within a mile or so;
- it provides for 6 storeys, 500,00sqft, parking for over 800 vehicles, landing pad, equivalent to several hundred houses;
- material damage to the countryside and the environment and would create noise, disturbance and light pollution, generate extra traffic;
- development would encourage future expansion and further development in the greenfield gap between Dummer, North Waltham, Oakley and Basingstoke;
- little doubt that if the application was for anything other than the proposed Hospital planning consent would not be granted;
- direct opposition to the Local Plan;
- little information about alternative sites considered. There is reference to 20 unspecified sites but no information as to why the current site is preferred or why other less environmentally damaging site have been rejected;

- failure to demonstrate that the proposed development would qualify as an exception to the general protection of the countryside under Policy D8 of the Local Plan.

Reconsultation following the receipt of amended and additional information to the planning application and the undertaking of third party renotification (August 2015)

Four letters of objection on the following grounds (in summary)

Principle of development

- no proof that centralisation of critical treatment facilities is the way forward;
- amendments are welcome, especially the proposal to leave Trenchard Lane alone;
- amendments largely tinker around the edges of the development on a greenfield site;
- Government has announced that consultant care must be 24/7 so the argument for a separate critical treatment hospital is lost as all hospitals have to provide similar out of hours consultant cover;
- applicant states that the current NHS model is not to centralise services;
- the proposal does not provide for local services but makes a regional provision.

Planning Policy Context

- contrary to paragraphs 7, 17 and 111 of the NPPF;
- paragraph 216 of the NPPF discourages over-reliance on emerging un-tested planning policies and warns that emerging policies should not be relied upon;
- para 111 of the NPPF expresses preference to brownfield land;
- the proposal does not follow the NPPF aims regarding decision-taking, sustainable development, rural diversification, protecting landscapes and rural character;
- contrary to Policy D8 which intends for small scale development and is irrelevant to this major application;
- going away from the Local Plan must be for the benefit of local people. This development is the opposite of that being for a population of 587,000 in Hampshire and West Berkshire with little benefit to local people;
- the policy context of the emerging Local Plan should not be speculated in relation to the settlement policy boundary prior to the Examination in Public given the contention of the Sustainability Appraisal and proposals for development beyond the south western boundary of the settlement policy boundary.

Site Location

- outside of the settlement boundary thus will drive a coach and horses through planning regulations;
- locating the site on the cheapest land is not the correct decision and not justification for concreting over the countryside;
- the major advantage of this site is cost to a nationally funded institution as greenfield land will be cheaper;
- is cost a valid reason for building outside of local plan boundaries?
- arguments for rejecting alternative sites is flawed, and does not address the possibility of providing local critical care in the other Hampshire Hospitals (e.g. by expanding Winchester and Basingstoke) to keep services local and reduce traffic movements);
- argument based on response times does not take into account urban areas. Most of the population live in urban areas therefore local treatment centre would reach more people in the target times as delays in journey times are affected by urban areas;
- no detailed argument against expanding Winchester and Basingstoke, just a bald statement;
- the supporting statement is unconvincing, appearing to be post-justification of a previous site selection decision to enter into an option agreement with the landowners;
- site selection does not include any other brownfield sites in the option analysis concluding no real intention of considering brownfield sites or those located closer to the town due to greater cost;
- a sequential test approach as not been followed as required by major developments;

- site is not located central to the catchment area being to the north close to Basingstoke;
- only one tried site (Northumberland) with centralised critical care has resulted in closure of other local A&E services. The Kings Fund opposes this form of centralisation.

Countryside/Landscape impact

- permanent impact on the surrounding countryside and on local footpaths;
- considerable landscape impact;
- negative impact on the landscape, green infrastructure and Wayfarers Walk which will be damaging to healthy lifestyles;
- loss of 50m or 600m of hedgerow to widen Trenchard Lane. Will there be 550m of new hedgerow planting? Is it suggested that new hedgerow is similar to a long standing one?
- the CTC at 2/3 storeys shows thought to landscaping and screening in this rural area;
- the CTH at 6 storeys has no regard to screening or relationship to the landscape or visual effect on the character of the rural area contrasting with careful planning of other sites such as Hampshire Clinic in Basingstoke or Spire Park Hospital near Farnham whereby 2/3 storeys minimise the effect on the landscape;
- building will be visible for long distances from surrounding countryside in several directions;
- the CTH with parking for 800+ and lighting will create a significant urbanising feature out of character with the surrounding countryside;
- scale and appearance more suited to a location nearer the town centre (like the AA offices);
- new residential development in proposed housing allocations will be mainly 2 storey development which is reasonably well screened and contained to the north by the old Roman Road. This will not extend beyond the A30/Winchester Road junction or south into open countryside. This housing is not justification for further major development in open countryside and up the sloping land to the west.

Agricultural Land

- good grade 3 agricultural land which has been improved by introduction of cover crops giving increasing crop yields. The farmers of the land are through to the final of the Arable Farmer of the Year competition in the 'Farmers Weekly';
- contradiction of NPPF para 17 given that land is currently productive agricultural land.

Transport

- transport data collected to prove the site is appropriate is insufficient. More data is required including timings for journeys and traffic movement;
- Trenchard Lane will be North Waltham's loss as regular hold ups at busy periods will result in North Waltham becoming a rat run up to Bull's Bushes;
- Trenchard Lane is not suited for use as a secondary access to a major development;
- traffic movements refer to Abergavenny and Truro and is not comparable to a site next to the motorway which connects London to the South Coast and other major population centres in the south of the County;
- routing and signage strategy must be specified before submission to the Development Control Committee;
- signage and routing will not manage traffic conflicts from increased use of Trenchard Lane;
- junction of the A30 with Winchester Road is subject to queuing at peak times. This development with those at the Golf Course and Hounsome Fields will exacerbate congestion;
- employees and visitors will add to existing agricultural vehicles and traffic accessing the M3 via Trenchard Lane. Substitution of existing traffic travelling to Southampton or Winchester is likely to be minimal as other routes are preferred;
- suggest changes to the Trenchard Lane/A30 junction to reduce the attraction of rat-running by closing the central reservation to prevent right turns from Trenchard Lane to the CTH access. This would aid road safety and reduce HGVs turning to/from Trenchard Lane, not materially affect emergency traffic access and would mitigate rat running;

- risk of commuter traffic opting to route through Dummer to avoid the CTH and increasing congestion at Southwood junction in AM and PM peaks. The junction with Tower Hill should be modified to prevent a right turn to Tower Hill;
- objection to removal of the hedgerow to Trenchard Lane and its widening to two lanes. This is a quiet, winding and narrow country lane.

Other matters

- the NE Hampshire Design Review Panel comments are generally dismissed by the applicant and those reported only relate to the colour of the buildings and roof-scape rather than scale and massing;
- under good design and planning practice, a design brief should be evolved from site survey and appraisal through analysis to design solutions. A standard design solution for the 6 storey CTH has been dropped onto the site and not worked up or positioned to reflect the site's character and landform.

CPRE

- this is a major development on 22 hectares of greenfield land outside of the Basingstoke defined development boundary in the strategic gap between two conservation areas. It is accepted as being in direct opposition to the Local Plan;
- greenfield sites will be cheaper but is this justification for destroying them and creating considerable traffic increases, noise and pollution?
- no details given of other sites (either brownfield or within the Local Plan or close to Junction 7) which have been considered nor of any relative cost comparisons;
- the absence of information prevents comparison of the relative merits and demerits of the alternatives;
- it is a duty to ensure minimum harm to greenfield areas and the landscape in the County.

Relevant Planning History

14/03537/ENS	Request for Scoping Opinion under EIA Regulations for proposed Critical Treatment Hospital, Cancer Treatment Centre and ancillary facilities	ECOM	08.01.2015
--------------	--	------	------------

Assessment

The application has been submitted in a hybrid form which enables a decision to be made on all aspects of the development, despite details of the Pathology Laboratory and the Ambulance Station being provided in outline only. The key issues for consideration arising from this proposal comprise the need and principles of locating this development within a countryside location, having regard to the impact upon the character and appearance of the countryside, design, the effects on the natural environment, residential amenity, the preservation of heritage assets, traffic generation and highway safety.

Environmental Impact Assessment

Environmental Impact Assessment's (EIA's) are needed for certain developments, and on 24 August 2011, consolidated, updated and replacement statutory provisions were introduced through The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. These Regulations place a duty on the Council to screen developments and to give reasons for negative screening decisions. The development proposal was however screened by the Applicant's Agent prior to submission and deemed to be EIA development in any event given the scale and location of the site and the likely significance of the impacts to be generated.

Article 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 sets out the directions for the publicity of planning applications. In accordance with

Article 13, the application has been publicised by display of a site notice for not less than 21 days and publicised by way of notice in a newspaper circulating in the locality in addition to local residents being notified. The neighbour notification has been carried out to publicise both the original application submission and subsequent amendments to the application.

Background

In 2013, the NHS Medical Director, Professor Sir Bruce Keogh, announced a comprehensive review of the NHS urgent and emergency care system in England which focuses upon the key challenges facing the organisation in delivering high quality urgent and emergency care across England. The Keogh Urgent and Emergency Care Review (2013) seeks to transform the basic structure for delivering health services by moving from the traditional approach of concentrating healthcare solely within general hospitals to a system that enables patients with serious or life-threatening emergency needs to be treated in specialist centres with the very best and round the clock expertise and facilities to maximise chances of survival. These specialist centres would be supported by the remaining network of local hospitals to treat those patients requiring urgent but non-life threatening needs, enabling health care to be accessed as close to home as possible.

In transferring this national approach to the local context, since its formation in 2012 the Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (HHFT) (which comprises an integration of both Winchester and Eastleigh Healthcare Trusts with Basingstoke and North Hampshire NHS Foundation Trust) has been developing its own clinical strategies for a high quality system of health care. This strategy advocates a service delivery model of “local where possible, central where necessary” to sit consistent with the national direction of the NHS. In particular, the HHFT has identified a need to maintain and further develop the most acute and specialist elements through centralising some services where necessary for patient safety and improved clinical outcomes. Indeed, some centralisation has already occurred, with a stroke service provided at Winchester and an angioplasty service at Basingstoke.

As a response also to the NHS review, during 2013/2013 the HHFT furthered plans for a centralised acute care service in conjunction with a previously identified intention for a specialist cancer centre to provide all forms of cancer treatment in a state of the art building, which includes provisions for radiotherapy. The HHFT states that the proposals for a critical treatment hospital have been shared with local groups and people, patient representative groups, HHFT members, as well as local authorities, MPs and NHS organisations. The HHFT have also spoken at public meetings and held public roadshows in Andover, Alton, Eastleigh, Winchester and Basingstoke during both Autumn 2013 and 2014 to further establish local views and to explain the HHFT proposals for the future.

In this regard, the adopted clinical strategy recognises that existing hospitals are operating close to capacity and need to serve a growing population. The model therefore seeks to maintain existing A&E departments at Basingstoke and Winchester to treat patients at these premises where appropriate. Local people would also still attend their local hospitals in Basingstoke, Winchester or Andover for operations, outpatient appointments, x-rays, blood tests and scans and where women choose to have a midwife-led birth. The local hospitals would therefore continue to treat approximately 85% of patients with only the most complex emergency services (approx. 15% of patients) best delivered in one location, the proposed CTH. This would accommodate the most at risk patients with 24/7 consultant-delivered care providing life-saving interventions and support, with the aim of rehabilitating the patient back to their local general hospital.

The proposed development subject of this application represents a new approach to the provision of NHS services in the UK with only two comparable examples within the UK, located in Northumbria and Gwent, of which only the site in Northumbria has recently become operational (June 2015). This proposal therefore sits at the forefront of new provision for the wider region.

Principle of development

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires that applications for planning permission

must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the Development Plan comprises the Saved Policies of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011 (BDBLP) which sets the application site as being located within a countryside location.

- NPPF

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policy for England and places sustainable development at the heart of the decision-taking process, incorporating roles for economic, social and environmental protection as outlined within core land-use planning principles. These principles seek to balance growth and local needs of the community against protection of the character of the countryside and built and historic environment. This intends for development to be provided in such locations to be accessible and in proximity to the community which it serves whilst ensuring that facilities and services "are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community" (para 70). No specific guidance is provided within the NPPF addressing new hospital developments however the need to provide for healthy communities is reflected within the social dimension of sustainable development (Para. 7). In this regard, paragraph 171 states that local planning authorities -

'should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population...including future changes, and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being'.

As well as encouraging health communities, the NPPF also gives regard to matters such as siting, design, highways and impacts upon the built and natural environment. These differing requirements of the NPPF are incorporated within the overall consideration of the development proposal.

- Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996 - 2011

This site lies outside of the settlement policy boundaries as defined under Saved Policy D5 of the BDBLP for the closest settlements to the site comprising North Waltham, Dummer, Oakley and Basingstoke. The site is therefore within the countryside for planning policy purposes thus within such locations development should only occur where there is an overriding need or as defined within relevant Saved Policies as an exception to the general principle of restraint. In this regard, Saved Policy D8 provides for such exceptional development adjacent to rural settlements stating that:

"...planning permission will be granted for development which the Council is satisfied will meet a genuine local need such as affordable housing, health, education, a similar community need or [Officer emphasis] to provide small-scale employment premises".

Whilst this development can meet a genuine local need, it is accepted that the proposal is not a 'small-scale employment premises', nor does the site sit contiguous to any settlement policy boundary as to be considered 'adjacent to' a rural settlement. The principle of the development therefore does not accord with the requirements of Saved Policy D8.

The Local Plan additionally gives regard to the provision of enhancement of community facilities within Saved Policy C7 which states that proposals for the "redevelopment, replacement or improvement of existing...community facilities...will be permitted" subject to meeting relevant criteria of the policy. These criteria ensure that facilities are at least of equivalent quality, quantity and accessibility, but notably do not require community facilities to be provided solely within settlement policy boundaries. Whilst the proposed development would bring an improvement to both the quality and quantity of hospital provision as a community facility, supporting text to Saved Policy C7 sets out forms of land uses covered by this policy which omits any built community facility such as a hospital. In the absence of any definition of 'community facilities' within the Local Plan, it is not considered appropriate to rely upon Saved Policy C7 as supporting the principle of development.

The absence of any specific Local Plan Saved Policy relevant to the form of development does not remove the ability for a Local Planning Authority to consider the genuine need for the development as an exception, when balancing all other material considerations in the public interest. In this instance, this means having regard to the provision of long term health care,

not just for local communities within proximity to the site, but also for the Borough and beyond given the strategic nature of this facility to the HHFT against the location of the site and its resultant impacts. Sitting at the forefront of such provision for the NHS in England, the development is a specially designed proposal for to meet an identified need.

- Submission Local Plan 2011 – 2029

Third party comments received to the application have expressed concern that this large scale development has come forward outside of the Local Plan process which prevents the opportunity for this proposal to benefit from a proper planned approach in terms of its location and impacts, with associated rounds of public consultation. It is indeed correct that this facility has not been included within the Submission Local Plan. Notwithstanding this, the Local Planning Authority are required to accept and consider planning applications coming forward during any stage of the Local Plan process, regardless of their location, scale or development type and therefore cannot decline to consider and determine such applications.

The Submission Local Plan considers the period 2011 – 2029 and proposes site allocations for anticipated forms of development, principally for housing and employment uses. No consideration has been given to any new centralised hospital provision within the Submission Local Plan nor has any site been allocated for such a use either within any built up area or contiguous to any settlement policy boundary. Notwithstanding this, emerging Policy CN7 (Essential Facilities and Services) does indicate that ‘development proposals will be permitted where they provide or improve essential services...’ and that ‘the council will work positively with local communities and support proposals to retain, improve or re-use essential facilities and services...’. Supporting text (paras 5.64 & 5.66) to Policy CN7 sets out that the aim of this policy is to facilitate both ‘good access to essential facilities and services for all residents...’ and ‘a healthy local population supported by high quality healthcare provision’.

The weight to be afforded to the Submission Local Plan prior to any examination in public is limited. However, given the Government’s proactive drive for new housing, the expansion of Basingstoke in a south-westerly direction, albeit not yet in any adopted form, is given weight in the consideration of site selection. In this regard, whilst the site of the CTH and CTC would continue to lie within the countryside, this would sit in closer proximity to the substantial new housing allocations proposed to the south west of Basingstoke comprising the sites of Basingstoke Golf Club, Kennel Farm and Hounsome Fields. An adoption of these allocated sites (subject to examination) would in fact extend the settlement boundary of Basingstoke along the A30 to abut the eastern side of Trenchard Lane. As such, in time the site would not sit in physical or visual isolation. In any event, and regardless of the location of any allocated sites, it is to be expected that the local population of Basingstoke as well as other settlements within the HHFT catchment area will continue to expand bringing a long term need to meet the associated health care requirements, which this proposal would proactively contribute towards.

- Need

The need for the development as a new facility and form of health care provision has been subject of third party concern, with representations indicating that, in the absence of other comparable facilities, the need for the CTH cannot be evidenced. The application however does set out that this development would represent a new direction of health care based on the principle of “local where possible, central where necessary” and follows the preferred clinical model set out by NHS England. This model, being to centralise acute services for the sickest and most at risk, would in turn also provide increased opportunities at local hospitals which are currently operating close to capacity. It is additionally accepted that the success of a centralised healthcare facility cannot be evidenced through a comparable assessment of another similar longstanding operational site as to further quantify the need for this development in Hampshire, given that the only operational facility (i.e. Northumbria) only opened in June 2015.

The need for the development therefore requires a judgement to be made as to whether it is appropriate to provide the HHFT with the opportunity to sit at the forefront of new models of health care delivery for its catchment area, with a population of approximately 587,000. In

terms of principle, it is not disputed that NHS England and the HHFT are in the best informed position to advise on how services can and should be improved. As such, weight is afforded to the case presented by the applicant who, as common to the planning process, has submitted the proposal to forward its own developmental goals advocated by the aforementioned new clinical strategy which responds to a changing direction of the NHS.

Being a public body, it is accepted that the HHFT therefore has the wider interest of delivering the best available public service at its heart. In the absence of evidenced success of similar facilities and any demonstration that centralised critical care and cancer treatment would be of overriding detriment to health provision and local services in the public interest, the need for the development as presented by the applicant is given weight.

- Site Selection

The application has been accompanied by details which indicate that the site at North Waltham was identified based on a site selection process which sought to find a site that sits relatively central to the overall catchment area, whilst having regard to both existing population size and future growth. This process also sought to identify a location that would be best served by the road network to achieve appropriate emergency response times, allowing also for air ambulance movements. A site also had to be capable of meeting air quality and noise requirements and able to accommodate the required buildings and their associated infrastructure to allow the use to function effectively. The HHFT has indicated that land value was a further influencing factor in the site selection process despite this not being a matter that the Local Planning Authority can afford weight.

The site selection process has received concern from consultees and third parties given that it has brought forward a site which is in the countryside and detached from a settlement policy boundary. Unfortunately the application was not supported by any fully detailed sequential analysis of all the sites examined by the HHFT as alternative locations, both to the selected application site or as alternatives to developing land at the existing hospitals to justify the HHFT's position.

From the available information, it is stated that the existing hospital sites were discounted on the grounds that the Andover and Winchester hospitals are too small to provide for the required services, would not permit suitable rapid access from across the HHFT catchment area and were not central to the main centres of population. The Basingstoke North Hampshire Hospital site was deemed to be well related to the largest catchment population and had sufficient potential to accommodate the necessary additional buildings, but was discounted due to being too far north within the overall HHFT catchment area. As such, the site would be unable to provide for the necessary level of rapid access to enable fast and efficient emergency transportation given its poor connections to the strategic road network.

The applicant has also stated that no suitable, available, affordable or deliverable brownfield sites could be identified that were of sufficient size to accommodate the scale of this development within any location equidistant from the main centres of population. With accessibility being a key factor, the applicant has stated that clusters of sites were considered, located at Bullington Cross, Micheldever, Sutton Scotney and North Waltham which were deemed to have the greatest accessibility to the road network. Shortlisted were Bullington Cross and North Waltham. It is detailed that the cluster at Bullington Cross was then subsequently discounted in favour of North Waltham as a broad location based on evidence obtained by the South Central Ambulance Trust. This evidence indicated that sites at Bullington Cross could only achieve an ambulance response rate to 290 emergency calls within a 6 minute target rate per year as opposed to 3,400 emergency calls in the same target period from North Waltham due to the proximity to Junction 7 of the M3 and good access to the A303 via the A30.

At North Waltham, a cluster of 13 parcels of primarily agricultural land were identified as having potential to accommodate the CTH and CTC, with these sitting both to the north and south of the A30 and to the northeast, south and southwest of the application site. Reasons for rejecting differing parcels included cost, allocation within the emerging Local Plan for housing

or where other constraints were insurmountable. The selected site was deemed the most appropriate on the grounds of availability, deliverability, size, access via two points (with one outside of any flood zone), meeting air quality and noise requirements, proximity to the settlement boundary of Basingstoke and the separation distance from North Waltham. The site was also able to achieve flight paths that avoided directly crossing more densely populated locations (e.g. villages) and did not sit contiguous to a residential property.

The NPPF only requires Local Planning Authorities to apply “a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan” drawing reference to retail, leisure and office uses only (para 24) or where a flood risk sequential test is necessary. With regard to development on agricultural land, Local Planning Authorities are only required to ‘encourage’ the re-use of previously developed (brownfield land) and for it to be demonstrated that the use of greenfield land is necessary (para 111-112) but does not stipulate that this has to be in the form of any sequential test. In the absence of any Government guidance to prescribe the format of any demonstration of alternative sites, the Local Planning Authority cannot evidence that the information provided is insufficient and inadequate to determine the application. It would therefore be unreasonable to refuse planning permission on the level of detail provided. Furthermore, with the Local Planning Authority not in any position to require the use of a specified site, nor itself able to provide a suitable alternative, the justification put forward by the applicant for the location at North Waltham has to be given due consideration.

- **Agricultural Land Quality**

The development proposal would result in the loss of up to 22 hectares of agricultural land of a good quality (Grade 3a) which is also in active agricultural production. This loss has been subject of third party objections on the grounds that the proposal is contrary to advice contained within the NPPF regarding use of such sites. This concern is particularly raised in the absence of any detailed demonstration that no other brownfield sites could accommodate this form of development as discussed above.

The NPPF (para 111) encourages the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed and is not of high environmental value. Paragraph 112 continues this approach by requiring Local Planning Authorities to ‘take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile land (BMV)’ and that where ‘significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality’.

The emphasis of Government is clear that BMV agricultural land (i.e. grades 1 – 3a) ‘should’ be avoided as a preference but does not place any absolute prohibition on the reuse of BMV agricultural land. Furthermore, whilst the loss of almost 22 hectares of good quality agricultural land is acknowledged, particularly in the immediate visual and physical context, there is no definition in the NPPF of what constitutes ‘significant development’ for the purposes of paragraph 112, nor as referred to above, guidance for presenting any sequential test. Therefore whilst the proposal is a ‘major’ development as categorised by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the site requires the loss of only a single field which is not deemed ‘significant’ when viewed against the context of available agricultural land in the wider landscape.

The NPPF therefore enables the LPA to undertake a balancing judgement regarding the loss of good quality agricultural land against other material planning considerations. Such considerations include the absence of suitable and alternative sites (to include brownfield land) within the HHFT area, which itself requires a central location to serve the catchment area beyond the Borough boundary as discussed above. It is therefore reasonable to accept the loss of this parcel of agricultural land to accommodate this strategic development as opposed to land which is inappropriately positioned or of too smaller an area to accommodate the required facilities which form the very basis of the future direction of the HHFT.

Sustainability

The NPPF establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development which sits at the

heart of the framework, with this principle stated to have three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. In having regard to these requirements, the site would bring economic benefits at the construction phase generated by either new job opportunities or alternatively the influx of a temporary construction workforce (of approximately 750 jobs) with an associated spend whilst located in the area. The longer term economic benefits are however derived from the operational phase with the site proposed to generate in excess of 1,300 job opportunities from new roles directly associated with the development, with potential also for further job opportunities at existing hospitals to facilitate increased provision of more local non-urgent health care.

The development proposal also accords with the social dimension set out within the NPPF by 'supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities' with provision of a new accessible local facility that reflects the community's health care needs. This seeks not to just meet the needs of present communities but also to contribute towards the health and social wellbeing of future generations. In particular, the community would benefit from the highest standard of health care for those with greatest medical need, notwithstanding any secondary social gain generated by the activities on site and growth in an employed population.

Environmentally, the development would have some adverse impacts but these need to be balanced against the proposed benefits. The development is to provide for the rerouting of an existing bus service and also access for cyclists and pedestrians as sustainable non-car modes of transport. Within the site, the development will also provide extensive new landscaping to facilitate biodiversity conservation, with the creation of both enhanced and new habitats within an otherwise heavily utilised agricultural field. Finally, the design and construction of the buildings would seek to maximise their sustainable credentials with a focus to minimise energy consumption. This is to be achieved through thermal insulation and increasing daylight ingress, natural ventilation where appropriate within these clinical buildings and use of energy efficient fittings to target a BREEAM 'very good' rating for the CTH and CTC. It is therefore considered that the three dimensions of sustainable development are met.

Impact on the character of the area

The NPPF requires that new development gives regard to its setting and responds positively to the character of the area with Saved Policy E1 ensuring that proposals are informed by the local context in terms of design and siting and reinforce attractive qualities of local distinctiveness. Saved Policy E6 of the BDBLP also requires proposals to be sympathetic to the landscape character and scenic quality of an area and sit consistent with objectives of the NPPF to protect environmental value from significant or demonstrable harm.

The site and its surrounding context is not located in any nationally or locally designated area recognised as such for its outstanding landscape character, quality or tranquillity, nor is the site designated as sitting within a Green Belt or any strategic gap. The site however is set within the countryside and falls within the Dummer and Popham Down landscape character area in accordance with the BDBC Landscape Assessment. This recognises that the area has a mosaic of open arable farmland and semi-enclosed fields demarcated by field hedgerows together with woodland blocks, although is interrupted with scattered farmsteads, business premises, depots and residential properties. Whilst some parts of this character area are unspoilt, the road network of the A30, A303 and M3 notably intrudes upon the agricultural and landscape context and generates elements of noise and visual intrusion, particularly with the close proximity to the edge of Basingstoke. The area therefore is not of a wholly isolated rural character.

The undulating topography of the site provides both short and long views across the landscape and equally, there are views gained of the site from surrounding public vantage points. The most significant views of the site would be gained in closest proximity (e.g. Trenchard Lane/A30), or from a public footpath set approximately 0.5km to the south west and from elevated positions between 0.5 – 1.5km to the south and south-east, including the northern extent of Dummer. The proposed development would therefore inevitably result in a significant, permanent and wholesale change to the views of the site as well as to the local landscape character and this has not been disputed within the application documentation. The impact of

this change is additionally more apparent given the detached nature of the site from any current settlement boundary and would be attributed, not just to the development and its infrastructure, but also from the introduction of a new landscaping regime as an extension of Ganderdown Copse with the level of planting alone bringing a change to this character.

The development does however seek to respond to the landscape impacts by sitting the CTH and CTC buildings into the landscape, suggesting use of a muted materials palette and a lighting strategy that minimises adverse impacts upon night skies. These measures along with a landscape strategy that proposes new native woodland parcels as well as areas of scrub and wildflower meadow, seek to reduce the level of change within the landscape, albeit would not fully mitigate the visual impacts of the development. These visual impacts are mainly limited to public vantage points in closest proximity to the site, such as from the A30, the Wayfarers Walk and other local public rights of way. In these views, the new planting would assist with softening and screening parts of the built development with the muted materials allowing the buildings to also recess into the landscape which they are viewed against.

Even with these mitigation measures, applicant acknowledges that there will be remaining significant and residual effects given that it is not possible to screen the scale of the development in its entirety, particularly given that the development (most notably the CTH) would protrude above the existing and proposed vegetation and into the wider skyline thus drawing attention to the site from vantage points further afield. It is however acknowledged that these more distant public vantage points are limited in extent given the combination of landform and vegetation cover. Furthermore, in being located in relative proximity to Basingstoke and the adjacent villages, it would not be expected that every existing view, whether public or private should be of a landscape devoid of built form or to remain unchanged in perpetuity.

In considering matters of landscape impact, a judgement has to be made which balances the significant change to the character and appearance of the area, the ability of new landscaping to mitigate the identified impacts and the wider public benefits that this development would bring. In this regard, it is firmly acknowledged that the countryside location is highly valued. The site however is not set within any landscape protected by designation, nor in a wholly isolated rural position, but is within an area that has notable human influences (e.g. road network, settlements). Furthermore, the development itself would affect only a single (albeit sizeable) agricultural field enabling both longer and short views of a predominately agricultural landscape to be retained extending beyond the site. On site, the defining landscape features of woodland and hedgerow are to be retained and enhanced, with new landscaping across the extent of the site providing a level of mitigation for the development, notwithstanding the overriding biodiversity enhancements. This mitigation in conjunction with regard given to lighting and building materials demonstrates that the proposal seeks to be sympathetic to the landscape, its visual amenity and historic features and as such has not been subject to any overriding objection from the Landscape Officer.

In having regard to the wider public benefits, the NPPF advocates a positive and proactive approach to new development, particularly sustainable development which extends beyond simply providing alternative modes of transport to the car. This development provides such opportunities against further economic, environmental and social improvements, despite the landscape impact. It is therefore considered that the development would not have such an overriding harmful impact as to be significantly or demonstrably harmful to the character and appearance of the area, the landscape interests or visual amenity which would enable the Local Planning Authority to justify a reason for refusal against Saved Policies E1 and E6 of the Local Plan.

- Landscape strategy

The proposed development adopts the intention of providing a 'Hospital Copse', responding to health benefits derived from having a connection to nature. With this in mind, the masterplan responds to a principle that the buildings will appear as being set within a woodland 'clearing'. This principle commences at the site entrance with the provision of a tree lined avenue extending through woodland which continues along the A30 with space provided for scrub edges to enclose wildflower meadow with such planting also repeated to the rear (north) of the

site. The scrub and wildflower meadow is to extend up to the formal public plaza to provide connections between the formal and informal planting. This extent of landscaping would also serve to reinforce the site boundaries, define the public and private areas of the site and also serve to enhance nature conservation interests.

The overall landscape strategy has been subject to consultation with the Landscape Officer with no overriding objection received although it is stated that the landscape designs could be amended and also contain further detail to ensure that the onsite landscape strategy is commensurate with the locality. For instance, it has been suggested that greater encouragement is given to using native or ornamental varieties of native species within spaces in and around the proposed buildings. It is additionally advised that further consideration be given to the phasing of the development to bring landscaping works forward within the overall build programme to improve upon the visual impacts. With these considerations in mind, it is considered both reasonable and necessary to impose appropriate landscaping conditions in addition to securing the long terms landscape management within a legal agreement.

Design Principles

Consistent with the NPPF, Saved Policy E1 of the BDBLP requires proposals to apply a high standard of design, to make efficient use of land and have regard to the local context in terms of design, siting and spacing. Whilst of a hybrid form, the detailed aspects of the proposal have been highly articulated. Although details have not been provided of the outline elements, it is clear to understand how the Pathology Laboratory and Ambulance Station would sit and connect with the overall masterplan. The master planning of the overall site has sought to develop a 'Hospital Copse' which, as indicated previously, sets the built form within a green setting to facilitate the wellbeing of site users. This also reflects the national NHS project entitled 'NHS Forest' which seeks to 'green' the NHS through new planting and thus at this site, would bring a connection between this site and the woodland copses that also feature within the local landscape. The design of the CTH, CTC and Energy Centre do not seek to respond to any existing built context common to nearby settlements and are contemporary in their built form. Given that this site is detached from, and is not viewed in conjunction with any existing settlement there is no objection to the overall development site setting its own context, quality of built form and external appearance which in turn reflect the functional requirements.

The layout has received concern from third parties with particular regard to the positioning of the buildings at a mid-point across the site as opposed to being at the lowest ground levels. The layout itself provides for differing 'zones' east to west with separation of the CTC, CTH and the ancillary/servicing requirements as well as north to south to provide for the landscaping as required by the overall design ethos. The layout has also been informed by the topography with the differing ground levels which enable buildings to be set into the landscape to reduce the overall visible massing, whilst also avoiding areas of flood risk and to achieve required levels of air quality and internal noise. As such, the site layout is considered to be appropriately justified and would also provide for a site that has clear distinctions between the differing buildings as well as public and private (i.e. servicing) areas. This also provides for a legible form of development to aid direction for visitors, staff and other users whilst also making efficient use of the available land.

In having regard to the design of the buildings, third parties have particularly raised concern to the scale and massing of the CTH, as well as its proposed external appearance which is attributed mainly to the external facing materials. The dominant building on the site would be the CTH which, extending over 6 storeys would have a distinctive massing. The CTH however has a form derived from the internal clinical requirements with separate 'zones' for emergency departments, maternity care, for non-critical patients transferring to local general hospitals and servicing requirements. These zones are set about a series of landscaped courtyards which would be used to connect the site with the natural environment, provide visual interest and aid navigation about the hospital.

Externally the building would be articulated as a series of blocks extending in height from 2 to 6 storeys which are to receive differing external treatments in terms of the colour and texture of the facing materials, ranging from white brick and concrete panels through to curtain walling of

differing tones. The variations in materials would also extend to the internal courtyards where curtain walling panels would provide colour themes to compliment the functions of the adjacent departments. The CTH building is to be set under both ballasted brown and sedum roof finishes thus further assimilating parts of the building within the landscape and providing visual variations in landscape planting. The roof materials would also assist with the surface water strategies whilst increasing opportunities for biodiversity, being attractive to birds and insects.

Whilst the concerns regarding the scale, bulk and massing are acknowledged, the design represents its functional form and, within this new development, sets and responds to its own context. In the absence of being set directly parallel to existing buildings, it is not considered that the building is of an inappropriate size or height and does not overdevelop the site. Furthermore, the massing is to be broken by the differing storey heights and mix of materials, the final selection of which would be controlled by a planning condition which enables the Local Planning Authority to seek the most appropriate coloured tones for the external facades thus responding to concerns of the Design Review Panel. The design of the CTH is therefore not considered to be of overriding demonstrable harm as to sit contrary to the requirements of Saved Policy E1 of the Local Plan and design guidance within the NPPF.

The CTC as a standalone building comprises three storeys arranged about two landscaped courtyards, which in turn sit adjacent to the tree filled plaza which connects the building to the CTH. The building will however be perceived as a two storey form upon its approach with the lower ground floor and southern courtyard sunk into the landform with the building also extending below ground to link to the CTH. The CTC continues the contemporary approach to the architecture and is to be constructed from a palette of cladding materials which combine textured brickwork rising to timber veneered cladding panels and glass fibre reinforced strip cladding interrupted by glazing panels and a fully glazed double height entrance to the most prominent eastern corner accessed via the public plaza. The mix of materials provides for combinations of privacy for patients alongside spaces that benefit from views, daylight penetration and fresh air. This resultant building therefore provides a high quality approach that generates its own distinctive character.

Finally the Energy Centre as a service building has a form and massing that is again determined primarily by its functional use and has a simple contemporary character. The massing and external appearance is informed by the CTH with parallels in the external colours of the curtain walling; however this building is again to have its massing broken through the variation in materials.

In being submitted in outline, no details have been provided of the form, scale and external appearance of the Pathology Laboratory and the Ambulance Station. It will therefore remain for any reserved matters application to consider a sympathetic/complementary design for these buildings with use of appropriate high quality materials to ensure that the overall site has a cohesive appearance.

Highways and Transport

Saved Policy E1 (iii) requires that any highway movements generated by new development are not of an inappropriate type or level, with safe and convenient access also provided for users of a site. This is considered in conjunction with Saved Policy A1 (Parking) and the relevant SPD on parking provision.

The highway matters associated with this development, comprising access from the A30 and Trenchard Lane, the volumes and type of traffic to be generated by this development together with the location of the site in relation to public transport and on-site parking have generated a large number of concerns to the development from third parties. This also includes the impact of traffic movements within the wider locality, to include potential for increases in vehicular movements through the villages of North Waltham, Dummer and Oakley.

The planning application has been accompanied by a Transport Assessment to set out the likely significant effects in terms of access and transportation from the quantum of development proposed across the site. This also has consideration to impacts upon both access to the local

and wider highway network, road and junction capacities and the ability to serve the site through alternative modes of transport to the car and potential. This later issue acknowledges that currently the site is unlikely to be attractive for walkers with a minimum walk of 2km from the south west of Basingstoke in conjunction with an absence of direct footways, and there is currently no access to bus services to/from the proposed site. The location is however seen as having potential for cyclists, sitting within the radius for average cycling distances.

The assessment of traffic acknowledges that the development would create increases in volumes of traffic from the construction phase onwards, with the construction period likely to generate morning and evening peaks in traffic flows. It is stated that a Construction Traffic Management Plan would therefore be required to address traffic generated both on and off site for this temporary period. Once operational, the nature of the traffic volumes and types would change and it has been determined that the proposals would generate a neutral to moderate effect upon the magnitude of traffic, but with no material impact upon the roads and junctions local to the site as to exacerbate any existing road safety problems.

The Assessment also recognises that the principal source of movements would be from staff thus mitigation would be required to encourage alternative modes of transport through a Travel Plan. To assist with making alternative modes more attractive, a new footway would be provided to the northern side of the A30 to encourage pedestrian and cycle access and it is indicated that diversion of an existing bus route to serve the site can be secured. To further encourage bus use, the NHS currently operates an hourly 'hopper' service for staff travelling between all existing Hampshire Hospital sites which can be extended to include the proposed new hospital.

The Transport Assessment, together with additional information received during the course of application, has been subject to consultation with the relevant highway authorities. The traffic impacts on the road network have been accepted by these technical consultees, with the highway network deemed to be capable of accommodating traffic movements to and from the site assisted by a routing and signage strategy. The development would additionally secure opportunities for alternative modes of transport therefore providing a choice for users of the development. In the absence of no overriding evidence to demonstrate that the development would generate demonstrable harm to the safety and free-flow of traffic on the highway, the proposal is considered to accord with Saved Policy E1(iii) of the Local Plan.

- Access

The development proposes to connect to the A30 via a roundabout junction positioned approximately 725m west of the existing A30/A30 Winchester Road signal junction. A secondary access is provided from Trenchard Lane which is to take the form of a simple priority T junction. The proposed use of Trenchard Lane to access the site has been revised during the course of the application with its use downgraded to provide resilience for emergency vehicle access only in the event that the main A30 access is unavailable, and is to be controlled accordingly. The detailed design of both access points to the site, together with the access routes through the site for vehicles and pedestrians have not received any overriding technical objections and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

- Parking

The development would be provided with a number of dispersed parking areas for both visitors and staff. The principle area for visitor parking would be positioned to the south of the main plaza which provides access via footpath links to the CTH and CTC and to a new footpath/cycle link with the A30. Further visitor parking would be available to the north of the CTC building to more specifically serve this building. Also adjacent to the public plaza and the public entrance is the provision of a visitor drop-off area with a nearby bus stop which is to serve both the CTH and CTC. The overall provision of parking has not been met with an overriding objection as being insufficient to meet the requirements of the site therefore, subject to planning conditions is considered to accord with Saved Policy A1 of the Local Plan.

- Air Traffic

The proposed development incorporates the provision of a helicopter landing site (HLS) with lighting and a wind sleeve set forward of the CTH to provide rapid transportation for the most critically ill patients thus avoiding the need for road transfer by ambulance. The submission suggests that the use of the HLS would not be high, and could range from once a month through to three-four trips per day. In any event, the use of the HLS would correspond with the absolute medical need and therefore cannot be accurately predicted. Notably, the application proposes only a single HLS despite the function and ability of the CTH to respond to major incidents. As such, any future proposals to increase the numbers of HLSs as identified in a hospital Emergency Response Plan would be considered at the appropriate time, should a selected site require planning permission.

Despite any helicopter movements responding to only the most critical of medical needs, the provision of the HLS has been subject to objection having regard to siting, safety, associated noise and disturbance, the relationship to Ganderdown Copse and prevailing winds and also the potential for conflict with air traffic generated by RAF Odiham.

In response, the siting of the HLS has been determined by the HHFT to provide the best access to the Emergency Department when considering patient welfare and dignity, and was preferred over any rooftop or purpose built raised structure. Whilst there is no licencing requirement for a HLS through the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), the use of the site would be regulated through the helicopter operators themselves. These operators each require permission from the CAA to use the helipads with the CAA regulating operational safety. On site safety has been acknowledged within the design process, with the potential need identified for some related tree works and also landscaping maintenance within the vicinity of the HLS to ensure obstacle free approaches and take off. This is pertinent within the proximity of the HLS for which its use would create a downwash, estimated to extend to a distance of 30-50m. Further afield, such as within the flight path of the helicopter, this downwash is not expected to adversely affect properties within the vicinity of the site and should this be felt, is described as 'no more than the effects normally experienced on a gusty windy day'.

With respect to matters of pollution, the noise generated by the HLS is a material consideration. The impact however has to be balanced against the benefits for patients, the small number of trips likely to be generated and the planned flight approach paths. In this regard, the HLS has been designed to only accommodate the use of light to medium helicopters, with flight paths to avoid unnecessary low flights over sensitive areas (e.g. settlements). Furthermore the landscaping on site will provide noise baffles and night operations would be limited to transporting only the most critically ill patients during unsocial hours (2300 – 0700hrs). The impact of helicopter noise was additionally addressed within the accompanying Noise Assessment report and not deemed to be 'significant', therefore a reason for refusal on noise grounds would not be considered reasonable. Finally, any pollution from the HLS would be drained separately from both the surface water and foul water drainage systems to ensure that any fluids from the HLS (to include rainwater, snow, small quantities of aviation fuel etc) do not result in any land or water contamination.

The use of the HLS would also sit within the Military Aerodrome Traffic Zone surrounding RAF Odiham which does not prevent the operation of a HLS from the development site providing that the MOD is aware of its location. In response, the MOD has requested an operational management plan which is secured by a planning condition. The planning application has also been subject to consultation with the National Air Traffic Control, Popham Airfield, and the Safeguarding departments for the MOD (Odiham), Farnborough Airport and Southampton Airport with no objections received. With no evidence that the inclusion of the HLS would generate demonstrable harm, the inclusion of air traffic to this site is deemed to be acceptable.

Natural Environment

- Biodiversity

The NPPF (para 118) and Saved Policy E7 of the Local Plan ensures that new development will not have any adverse effect on biodiversity interests and protected species, with an emphasis placed upon conservation and enhancement. A responsibility is placed upon the

Local Planning Authority to ensure that an application has taken into account nature conservation interests and that practicable mitigation/compensation measures have been secured.

In addressing ecological matters, the development site currently has limited biodiversity value given its use as active agricultural land with minimal field margins and is recognised as being located outside of any site designated for its ecological interest. Notwithstanding this, the land sits adjacent to Ganderdown Copse which itself is designated as an Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC). Further SINCs sit within the wider landscape which also comprises ancient woodland, either semi-natural or replanted. The boundary hedgerows additionally provide suitable foraging and commuting opportunities for fauna, such as bats, birds, badgers and dormice and are classed as a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitat.

The application was accompanied by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey which was later supplemented by an additional assessment for the presence of dormice and revisions to the scheme to retain hedgerow, previously earmarked for removal to Trenchard Lane. It has been demonstrated that the proposals will not have any adverse impact upon Ganderdown Copse as a SINC and in fact provides opportunities to significantly enhance the biodiversity through the extensive provision of new landscaping across the site. The detail of the ecological enhancement can be secured via planning conditions.

- European Protected Species

The development has been considered for the presence of protected species having regard to badgers, bats, dormice, birds, reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates and their habitats. In having regard to these species, the Phase 1 Ecological Assessment revealed only one off site Badger Settle with no evidence of recent activity, and the presence of a single dormouse nest within a hedgerow to Trenchard Lane. The site with its boundary hedgerows and woodland habitats was however recognised as providing suitable foraging and commuting habitats.

In accounting for these findings within the development proposals, no works are to affect the woodland habitats and, with the exception of creating the new access points, the boundary hedgerows are to remain in place. This affects the hedgerow to Trenchard Lane which has reported the presence of hazel dormice however mitigation can be imposed by requiring an ecological watching brief, new planting and securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to provide the valid protection via planning condition. This hedgerow has already been historically managed therefore the Council's Biodiversity Officer has deemed the focus upon providing new planting to be a positive and practical mitigation. This CEMP can additionally provide for enhancements to the corridors to the woodland belts which are recorded as providing commuting and foraging habitats for bats and should also give consideration to, and sit alongside, an appropriate final lighting scheme.

In addition to the planning requirements, the development of the site will require a European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) for dormice from Natural England. This will need to be secured prior to the commencement of development, and whilst administered by Natural England as the statutory undertaker, the licensing process does have regard to any planning permission granted. In this regard, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 requires the Local Planning Authority to satisfy itself that the development authorised by a planning permission would not be "detrimental to the maintenance of a population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range" and whether an EPSL is likely to be granted from Natural England. An EPSL can only be granted if the development proposal is able to meet three tests, which together are known as the Derogation Tests and are as follows:

1. the consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e));
2. there must be 'no satisfactory alternative' (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and

3. the action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range' (Regulation 53(9)(b)).

With regard the first test, it is considered that the proposal would contribute towards increasing opportunities for preserving public health and therefore has imperative and overriding public interest. With there being no alternative to providing this opportunity for public health other than within the form of hospital care, and with no suitable and deliverable alternative sites identified, the proposal is considered to meet the first two derogation tests.

In order to assess the development against the third test, sufficient details must be available to show how the loss of dormice will be avoided and also how harm to the habitat will be compensated. As such, details of mitigation as well enhancement through replacement hedgerow planting has been provided to the satisfaction of the Biodiversity Officer and can be secured through a planning condition. It is therefore considered that the proposal meets the final derogation test. With no objection to the application from the Biodiversity Officer or Natural England and subject to the imposition of conditions to secure mitigation measures and enhancements, the proposal would accord with Saved Policy E7 of the BDBLP and the NPPF.

- Trees

Saved Policy E6 (v) seeks to protect trees, hedgerows and other landscape features which contribute to the landscape character and quality of an area. The application site does not contain any Tree Preservation Order nor are trees offered protection as part of any conservation area. Notwithstanding this, the site is acknowledged to sit to the south west of Ganderdown Copse as a designated Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and northeast of a further small woodland area positioned to the upper ground level. The site is also enclosed to all sides by hedgerows of Hawthorn, Hazel and Field Maple which contain a number of tree species which predominately comprise English Oak and mature Ash. The application was therefore accompanied by a full Arboricultural Impact Assessment informed by on-site surveys of the trees undertaken during August 2014 and January 2015. The trees surveyed were deemed to be in a generally good condition. Overall, the tree species on and adjacent to the site do contribute strongly to the landscape character of the area and towards the local biodiversity interests.

The proposed development does require the removal of trees to facilitate the access to the site from the A30 and Trenchard Lane. These removals comprise the loss of Hawthorn and Common Ash to the A30 and a small group of Elder to Trenchard Lane which is not deemed to result in any adverse impact upon the wider landscape. These removals would sit alongside crown works to two Oak trees on the A30 (subject to confirmation by the Civil Aviation Authority), and some minor pruning to retained species of Hazel, Field Maple and Hawthorn to the woodland edge of Ganderdown Copse. The tree works required by the development have been met with no objection from the Tree Officer subject to the inclusion of a planning condition to ensure that tree protection and tree works are carried out in accordance with approved details. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Saved Policy E6 (criteria v).

Flood risk and drainage

The NPPF requires that new development should be either directed away from areas at highest risk or alternatively demonstrated to be flood resilient and resistant, to include safe access and egress without increasing residual flood risk elsewhere. This applies a sequential approach, taking advice from the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities, to ensure that risks of flooding are adequately managed.

The Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps position the site as lying primarily within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding) whereas a depression to the south west lies within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk of flooding). With the absence of any main river in the vicinity of the site, flood events could potentially originate from a winterbourne stream which flows during wet winters from a spring exiting the ground creating a risk of surface water ponding. However groundwater monitoring at the site has informed a conclusion that the creation of any

winterbourne stream is extremely unlikely, thus the site is presented to be at low risk from both groundwater and fluvial flooding. This would correlate with the absence of any flood records at the site, even during significant flood events (1:50 – 1:200 years) occurring in 2000-2001 generated by surface water or ground water sources.

Given the size of the site and the sensitive form of development, the application has been accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate how the risk from all sources of flooding can be managed, whilst also accounting for future climate change. The submission demonstrates that the proposed development has been designed to manage any exceptional flood events (1 in 1000 year) with the buildings elevated within the landscape to sit above the 1 in 1000 fluvial flood level and outside of any area of risk.

A proportion of the site lies within Flood Zone 2 therefore in accordance with the NPPF; the application has also been accompanied by a Sequential Risk Report to consider the reasonable availability of sites with the lowest risk of flooding against the vulnerability of the proposed land uses. Technical Guidance to the NPPF cites hospital uses as appropriate in Flood Zones 1 and 2 therefore there is no objection raised to the location of the site in this regard. The Ambulance Station however is classed as a 'highly vulnerable use' given that this would be expected to remain operational during a flood event. Whilst the Ambulance Station itself is positioned within Flood Zone 1, to ensure safe access and egress, vehicles would have to cross Flood Zone 2. Therefore, in order to ensure that the development remains flood resilient, the masterplan has been designed to maintain both the main and secondary access routes as available to vehicles, with the primary access overlying culverts to maintain surface water flows. These culverts are to be designed to maintain surface water flows from the wider catchment for a 1 in 100 year event (+ climate change) in combination with a fluvial flood event up to a 1 in 1000 year event. Given that the access to the site can be maintained, no objection has been raised by the Environment Agency or the Lead Local Flood Authority (Hampshire County Council). The culvert works will however require the formal approval of the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 which sits separate to any planning permission as well as consent from Hampshire County Council as the Highway Authority.

- Surface water drainage

The site has been accompanied by a surface water drainage strategy that employs SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) principles by incorporating opportunities for the natural infiltration of surface water run-off from the development. This would be achieved by utilising methods such as permeable paving, infiltration trenches, swales and soakaways. The soakaway systems from areas susceptible to pollutants (e.g. car parks, HLS) would be supplemented by filtration measures, such as oil separators prior to discharge to the ground to achieve suitable water quality. These surface water systems are designed to allow water to be collected and dissipated to subsoils in a controlled manner that mimics the existing green field rate of run-off. These mechanisms will additionally accommodate excess water from the roofs of the buildings, above that collected by the green/brown roof constructions.

No objection to the impact of the development upon surface water flows has been raised by the Environment Agency or the Lead Local Flood Authority subject to the confirmation of further details, design amendments and corrections to the submission (to remove inconsistencies) which are matters that can be reasonably be controlled via planning conditions. With no evidence presented to determine that the proposed development would be at risk of flooding or generate an increased risk of flooding off site and no objection received on flood risk grounds, the development is deemed to be acceptable and would therefore accord with Policy A7 of the Local Plan.

- Foul drainage

The development proposes a gravity-fed foul waste system with an on-site pumping station to be constructed to an adoptable standard as stipulated by Thames Water as the statutory undertaker. The detail and adoption of the foul waste system would occur under the Water Industry Act 1991 as the legal mechanism to connect to the local network and thus sits outside

of the planning process.

- Water Resources

South East Water is the statutory undertaker for the provision of a water supply to service the development with any provision to be secured under the Water Industry Act 1991 as the legal mechanism to connect to the local network.

Heritage Assets

- Built environment

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires consideration of a proposal upon the setting of a heritage asset, which could comprise a listed building or conservation area. This requirement is reflected within the NPPF which requires that, when determining applications, account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of assets. When substantial harm is considered to arise, this needs to be weighed against the public benefits. Locally, Saved Policies E2 and E3 referring to buildings or areas of historic or architectural interest are relevant to this consideration upon the historic environment.

The application site does not sit within or adjoin the curtilage of any statutory listed building, with the nearest assets comprising a milestone to the southern boundary and Southwood Farmhouse (approx. 460m east from Trenchard Lane entrance), both of which are Grade II listed. Further afield sit the Dummer Conservation Area (approx. 1km south) and North Waltham Conservation Area (approx. 2.5km southwest) which additionally contain collections of listed properties. Whilst not listed, the Sun Inn (approx. 900m south west) and the hedgerows to Trenchard Lane form Parish boundaries therefore also having local importance as a heritage asset and under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 respectively.

The proposed development would bring new built form in proximity to the referenced heritage assets with a direct imposition upon the listed milestone. This asset however is not to be destroyed or altered thus its retention within the roadside boundary is maintained and can be protected during the construction process via condition. Similarly Southwood Farm will receive a level of intervisibility with the development site and new built form. Notwithstanding this, the dwelling will remain both physically and visually detached from the application site separated by Trenchard Lane, and will remain positioned in its garden setting. Whilst the wider appearance of the area will change, this is considered to result in less than substantial harm to, or loss of, the significance of these heritage assets when balanced against the public interest of the proposed new community facility.

Concern has been raised regarding the impact upon listed buildings and non-listed assets further afield and the character and appearance of the conservation areas. It is accepted that there are likely to be limited views of the site from highest ground levels to the north of Dummer Conservation Area, however the development remains sufficiently detached to ensure that less than substantial harm arises in terms of the NPPF (para 134) therefore, to accord with the tests of the Act, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is to be preserved. With no objection from the Conservation Officer, the proposal is considered to accord with Saved Policies E2 and E3 of the Local Plan.

- Archaeology

The considerations of the NPPF are not limited to just above ground structures but also have reference to any archaeological interests that may be present on the site. This site is located within a wider area reputed to have good archaeological potential with prehistoric field systems located within the local area giving potential for new discoveries from early Prehistoric, Bronze and Roman periods. Despite intervening agricultural activities (e.g. ploughing), the archaeological potential of the site and its immediate vicinity have been assessed, and a preliminary survey carried out with the results presented within the application.

The preliminary work has identified a number of potential archaeological sites within the application boundary that require some clarification, and a general archaeological potential (that is the potential to encounter archaeological remains which are not as yet recorded) has been described. This could include the identification of ephemeral archaeological sites such as early prehistoric settlements. The supporting information has been subject of consultation with the Hampshire County Council Archaeologist who requires further archaeological evaluation to be carried out, to include field walking, geophysical testing and field trenches, the detail of which can be secured within a Written Scheme of Investigation via a planning condition.

The results of such investigations may require further archaeological mitigation to ensure that any archaeological remains identified and impacted upon by the development are properly recorded before damage or destruction. This in itself may require a further and more detailed programme archaeological fieldwork to preserve by record the level of archaeological value of the site with the implementation of an archaeological mitigation strategy, including the reporting and dissemination of results of any archaeological remains impacted by the development. This mitigation strategy can again be secured by archaeological planning conditions. In the absence of any objection from the HCC Archaeologist, subject to the imposition of planning conditions, the proposal accords with requirements contained within the NPPF to protect for archaeological interests.

Pollution

- Land Contamination

The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing development from contributing to or being put at risk from unacceptable levels of pollution. This requirement is reflected locally within Saved Policy E1(vii) which seeks to minimise the potential for soil contamination. In this respect, the site is directly underlain by a principal chalk aquifer with a source protection zone within 400m of the southern site boundary. Despite records of historic excavation of the land, on site investigation has not found evidence of any or potential contamination or of groundwater within 15m of the surface of the Chalk at the lowest site level. The long standing agricultural use of the land has been identified to give rise to low levels of potential contamination.

The proposed development itself is additionally considered to generate low risk to future contamination. Matters such as surface water drainage likely to contain pollutants (e.g. from car parking areas and the HLS) can be provided with solutions to prevent contaminants entering the ground. In addition, the provision of radiation therapies within the CTC could generate risk but any harm can be mitigated through the design and construction of the building (e.g. thickness of walls and construction materials) thus attenuating any harm to the environment. In the absence of evidence that the development would generate adverse land contamination, the proposal is deemed acceptable.

- Noise

The NPPF seeks to ensure that the planning system should avoid the generation of 'unacceptable levels' of noise pollution where this would give rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life or harm to areas that are relatively undisturbed by noise. Locally, Saved Policy E1 gives consideration to avoiding noise impacts which would harm living and working conditions or the enjoyment of the built and natural environment.

The location of the site in the countryside does not divorce the area from a level of background noise which is particularly influenced by road traffic using the A30 (approx. 20m south) and M3 corridors (approx. 380m south) and, to a lesser extent, local rural roads against the time of day and/or weather conditions. The proposed development, as a sensitive use but also as a traffic generator (both road and air), together with the location has nevertheless generated local concern regarding potential harm to quiet enjoyment of residential properties and the countryside, as well as the Dummer Conservation Area. Notably, the representations express notable concern regarding the traffic related noise from both road and air sources, in addition to episodic noise from the use of sirens.

Given the sensitivity of the proposed use as well as additional noise likely to be generated from the site upon the locality, and most notably to the closest residential properties to the northeast and also to Dummer Garden Centre to the south west, the planning application was accompanied by a noise assessment. Whilst the content and methodology of the noise assessment has been commented upon by third parties and the Environmental Health Officer, this has not received objection from Environmental Health as being fundamentally flawed.

The Noise Assessment indicates that in a worst case scenario, the development would present increases in background noise of 1.1dB generated by traffic which in the short term is of 'minor significance' but barely noticeable to the ear. The Assessment does however acknowledge that the attendance of helicopters at the site would generate audible noise over and above background noise levels. This noise however would extend over a short duration and would be less frequent than road traffic, with flight paths also scheduled to avoid the most densely populated areas. The helicopters servicing the site are also required to be certified by the International Civil Aviation Organisation with a noise certificate being a mandatory requirement of the aircraft Certificate of Airworthiness'. Similarly, ambulance vehicles sounding sirens would be audible for short durations and predominately during daytime hours only given that operators are advised not to use sirens between the hours of 23:30 – 07:00 and at night, are only permitted to do so in built up areas if essential to the safety of the vehicles or road users when on urgent journeys only.

In having regard to the new built form, the layout of the site and the position of the buildings has been informed by the primary noise sources. The assessment indicates that the development can therefore can achieve target criteria set by the Council for hospitals albeit subject to providing appropriate mitigation such as double glazing and mechanical ventilation. With mitigation to be secured by planning condition, no objection has been received from the Environmental Health Officer. On these grounds, it has been concluded that the proposed development would not raise background noise levels to an unacceptable level which would lead to a significant adverse level upon health or quality of life. Furthermore, whilst there will be audible impacts in this location, these too are not considered to generate overriding significant or demonstrable harm to the public's enjoyment of the built and natural environment. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the proposal accords with Saved Policy E1 of the Local Plan with respect to noise.

- Air Quality

Third party representations have drawn reference to a report of the Environmental Audit Committee (Dec 2014) entitled 'Action on Air Quality' which states that "The planning system should be used.....to ensure that buildings such as houses, schools, hospitals and care homes are not placed near major road intersections or other pollution hotspots". The cited report however does not provide any appropriate guidance or requirements (e.g. appropriate distances) for new development to any major road intersections, nor does it define the nature of other 'pollution hotspots'. Notwithstanding this, the local representations express concern that the selected site is not appropriate on air quality grounds for the siting of a sensitive development.

Air quality is a material planning consideration with the NPPF (para 124) only requiring that "Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan". Air quality was a matter considered by the applicant at the site selection stage with the proposal situated outside of any Air Quality Management Area and outside of any area identified as requiring air quality monitoring by the Council. Notwithstanding this, the application was accompanied by an air quality impact assessment which addressed both construction and operational impacts of the proposed development, to include the impact of additional traffic, the on-site Energy Centre or from radiation treatments at the CTC.

The Assessment has been subject to examination by Environmental Health with no objection raised. In this regard the location is agreed to be acceptable for this sensitive use and the operation of the site would not generate a level of air pollution which would result in the local air

quality exceeding air quality standards. Matters of air quality therefore do not impose any evidenced constraint to the proposed development either at the construction or operational phases. With the proposal according with the requirements of the NPPF and Saved Policy E1(vii) of the Local Plan, it would unreasonable to refuse planning permission on air quality grounds.

- Light pollution

Saved Policy E1(vii) of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new development proposals minimise the potential for light pollution which “harms living and working conditions or the public’s enjoyment of the built and natural environment”. This requirement recognises light pollution as a material planning consideration, with the NPPF also requiring that planning decisions should “limit the impact of light pollution on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”. The planning application has therefore been accompanied by a Lighting Impact Assessment having regard to the design of the development at this planning stage, as opposed to the final built specification (e.g. internal lighting schemes).

The lighting assessment acknowledges that the site and the surrounding area is currently unlit with the nearest street lighting positioned as the A30 enters Basingstoke. Therefore in accordance with guidelines for assessing environmental effects of exterior lighting, the site has been designated as a ‘Rural’ area (E2 Zone) with ‘Low District brightness’ corresponding with examples such as ‘villages or relatively dark outer suburban locations’. This category has received third party concern which suggests that the area should be categorised as having an ‘Intrinsically dark’ environment (E1 Zone), commensurate with more distinctly rural locations, such as National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, despite the close proximity of the site to Basingstoke.

In having regard to the lighting effects generated by the development, a lighting scheme has been designed to accord with required standards for safety and security (e.g. to light pedestrian and vehicular access routes and the HLS) but not exceeding limiting criteria for an E2 Zone. This scheme serves to minimise horizontal light spill, sky glow, light trespass and glare, whilst also having regard to ecological sensitivities from light sources and energy consumption. Whilst it is not disputed that the resultant site would be more visible in the landscape than an unlit agricultural field, the impact has to be balanced against the public benefits of the development and the wider long term growth of Basingstoke along the A30 thus reducing the isolation of this site. Subject to the provision of a final lighting scheme for approval by the Local Planning Authority as secured via a planning condition, the development is not considered to cause significant adverse harm to living or working conditions or the wider enjoyment of the environment and is therefore considered to accord with Saved Policy E1(vii).

Energy

The third party representations have raised comment to the energy requirements for the premises and how these are to be effective in a development of this size. The energy requirements have been incorporated into the master planning of the scheme and within the design of each building with the incorporation of passive measures to maximise thermal insulation, and opportunities for natural day-lighting and passive solar gain.

In terms of energy consumption, the CTH and CTC is to be provided with a combined heat and power (CHP) system to generate power and capture useable heat supplemented by a biomass and gas fired boilers. Furthermore use will be made of fresh air provided to maintained internal air quality as well as energy efficiency (e.g. lighting) and water saving technologies. This combination of systems seeks to utilise proven technologies for a facility of this scale whilst minimising the need for fuel deliveries.

Community Involvement

The development proposal was subject to public consultation hosted by the applicant prior to submission through the holding of three events during February 2015; the display of the proposal at the Andover War Memorial Hospital, the Basingstoke and North Hampshire

Hospital and the Royal Hampshire County Hospital, Winchester; press releases; and also with details available to view on line. In particular, the public events provided the opportunity for Stakeholders and members of the public to view an exhibition of the project which included details of the development principle, as well as illustrations of the site masterplan and elevations and sections of the proposed CTH and CTC. Contrary to third party concerns raised during the subsequent formal consultation undertaken by the Local Planning Authority for the planning application, the design of the buildings (and in particular the height of the CTH) has not changed between the public consultation and submission of the planning application.

The accompanying Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) indicates that 480 people attended the three events and from responses received direct to the applicant at this pre-application stage, 74% of respondents expressed support to the principle of development. The SCI acknowledges that there was also a level of opposition, which primarily concerned the site selection process, landscape impacts, traffic and transport and effects of noise and lighting upon the local area.

- CCG/HHFT public consultation

In the event that planning permission were to be granted, then the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) working with the HHFT would be legally required to undertake a separate public consultation process regarding the proposed change to how the local health services would be provided. Any major change to the direction of health care provision can only be decided upon in consultation with the public and the Clinical Commissioning Group with this process taking into account the affordability for the overall health system in the area and the impact of any change on other providers. NHS England would also be required to scrutinise the proposals before giving any final approval for such a change in services to proceed. This consultation process sits separate to any planning application but requires to first ascertain if planning permission would be granted for the physical infrastructure which would enable such reorganisation to occur.

Section 106 agreement - need and compliance with statutory tests

Saved Policy C1 and the accompanying interim guidance seek to ensure that development does not result in an adverse effect on existing infrastructure, and makes appropriate provision to mitigate documented impacts. It is therefore common to anticipate that development would either, by way of Obligation (legal agreement) make appropriate provision/improvements in line with the advice provided within the NPPF. Where mitigation is sought, due consideration has been given to the tests as set out within the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2015, namely that a planning obligation must be (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In having regard to the nature and location of the proposed development, a S106 agreement is in preparation at the time of reporting which recognises the need to mitigate the impact of the development upon the local area. In this regard, the S106 seeks to secure:

- a bonded Full Travel Plan;
- an Access, Drop-off/Pick-up and Parking Servicing Management Plan;
- a Routeing and Directional Signage Strategy;
- completion of highway works as required by Hampshire County Council; and
- a landscape management plan.

In addition to a S106 agreement, the developer would be required to complete a S278 agreement under the Highways Act 1990 to secure off site highway works which take the form of highway improvements to include the provision of the junction to the site and provision of the footpath/cycleway from the site to the junction of the A30 to Beggarwood Lane.

Conclusion

The development proposal comes forward as a departure from the development plan having regard to the wider public interests generated by a new clinical strategy to be implemented by

the HHFT. It is recognised that the development proposal would result in a significant change to the landscape character of this countryside location and generate new traffic flows within the vicinity of the site, but in turn would meet a particular community need and provide capacity for existing facilities in the HHFT catchment area to accommodate clinical provision for a growing population in the long term.

A positive and proactive approach to new development is advocated by the NPPF in paragraphs 7 and 171 where such development supports strong, vibrant and healthy communities where overriding demonstrable harm does not arise and the impacts of a development can be satisfactorily mitigated. The development brings notable sustainable benefits in terms of health care, employment, social interactions and environmental enhancements. Furthermore despite being positioned within the countryside, which is valued for its own sake, the location is not wholly isolated as to be truly tranquil, nor is in any location designated for its landscape quality. The development does affect only a single (albeit sizeable) agricultural field enabling both longer and short views of a predominately agricultural landscape to be retained with defining landscape features of woodland and hedgerow to be enhanced. Extensive new landscaping across the extent of the site provides a level of mitigation for the development, notwithstanding the overriding biodiversity enhancements, and can be considered in conjunction with opportunities to control aspects of noise, pollution, lighting and highway safety through planning conditions. The development therefore is not considered to have such an overriding harmful impact as to be significantly or demonstrably harmful to the character and appearance of the area, the landscape interests, heritage assets, highway matters or the natural environment.

Given the Government's strong agenda for growth, and an expectation that the site in the future will not sit in such detachment from the settlement boundary of Basingstoke, it is considered that there are sufficient material considerations that cumulatively weigh in favour of the development. The proposal is therefore recommended for permission.

Conditions

1. The development hereby granted full planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority:
 - General Arrangement Plan (dwg ref 0381-STL-00-LL – DR-L-XX-91001 rev P1) received 27 July 2015;
 - Helipad Plan (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0190-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
 - Proposed Site Access Arrangements (dwg ref 14082-010 Rev B) received 27 July 2015;
 - Proposed Site Access Arrangements (dwg ref 14082-011) received 13 April 2015;
 - Ambulance Swept Path Analysis (dwg ref 14082-TR006 Rev C) received 27 July 2015
 - Geometric Design Check Roundabout (dwg ref 14082-SK150529.1) received 27 July 2015;
 - Proposed Secondary Access (dwg 14082-012 Rev B) received 27 July 2015;
 - Proposed Footway Cycleway Link – Sheet 1 of 2 (dwg ref 14082-013 Rev B) received 27 July 2015;
 - Proposed Footway Cycleway Link – Sheet 2 of 2 (dwg ref 14082-014) received 27 July 2015;
 - Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevations 1 & 2 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03005-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
 - Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevations 3 & 4 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03006-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
 - Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevation Sections 5 & 6 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03007-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
 - Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevation Sections 7 & 8 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03008-PL01) received 20 April 2015;

- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevation Sections 9 & 10 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03009-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevation Sections 11 & 12 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03010-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevation Sections 13 & 14 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03011-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Elevation Sections 15 & 16 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03012-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Floor Plan L 00 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02001-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Floor Plan L 01 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02002-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Floor Plan L 02 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02003-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Floor Plan L 03 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02004-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Floor Plan L 04 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02005-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Floor Plan L 05 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02006-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Critical Treatment Centre – Planning Roof Plan L 06 (dwg ref V4498-STL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02007-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Cancer Treatment Centre – Level 00 (Lower Ground Floor) Plan (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-00-GA-A-000001) received 13 April 2015;
- Cancer Treatment Centre – Level 01 (Ground Floor) Plan (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-01-GA-A-000002) received 13 April 2015;
- Cancer Treatment Centre – Level 02 (First Floor) Plan (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-02-GA-A-000003) received 13 April 2015;
- CTC-CTH Underground Link (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-00-GA-A-000004) received 20 April 2015;
- Cancer Treatment Centre – Elevations (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-XX-EL-A-000005) received 13 April 2015;
- Cancer Treatment Centre – Sections (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-XX-EL-A-000006) received 13 April 2015;
- Cancer Treatment Centre – Lower Courtyard Northwest Elevation (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-XX-EL-A-000007) received 20 April 2015;
- Planning Elevations – Energy Centre (dwg ref V4498-STL-06-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-03004-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Planning Floor Plans – Energy Centre (dwg ref V4498-STL-06-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-02601-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Site Sections (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0914-PL01) received 20 April 2015;
- Detail Plan – Entrance Plaza (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0916-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Detail Plan – Wildflower Meadow (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0917-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Detail Plan – ED Entrance (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0918-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Detail Plan – Service Yard (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0919-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Detail Plan – Staff Access (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0920-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Visualisations – Landscape Masterplan (dwg ref V4498-HSL-00-ZZ-DR-A-ZZ-0912-PL01) received 13 April 2015;
- Landscape Sectional Elevations (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-XX-SE-L-900001 Rev A) received 13 April 2015;
- Landscape Sectional Elevations (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-XX-GA-L-900003 Rev A) received 13 April 2015;

- Courtyard Masterplan (dwg ref 5417-BDP-XX-XX-GA-L-900004 Rev A) received 13 April 2015;
- Tree Constraints Plan (dwg ref 1 Rev 0) received 04 August 2015
- Tree Removal and Protection Plan (dwg ref V4498_RSK_Y_00__ZZ_DR_2_XX_0101 Rev 4).

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. The development hereby granted full planning permission comprising the erection of a critical treatment hospital, cancer treatment, centre additional development including energy centre, service yard, link building and underground link, helicopter landing strip and pad, associated internal roads, car parking and landscaping together with the means of access via a new roundabout on the A30 shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3. Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the proposed Pathology Laboratory and Ambulance Station of the development hereby permitted (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development of that phase is commenced. The development of all phases shall be carried out as approved.

REASON: In order to secure a satisfactory development and in accordance with Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

4. The development of the Pathology Laboratory and Ambulance Station hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

REASON: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) and to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

5. Applications for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.

REASON: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

6. Notwithstanding details shown on the approved drawings, no development shall commence on site until full details of the types, textures and colours of all external materials to be used, including colour of mortar, together with samples, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the details so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011. Details are required in the absence of being provided to accompany the planning submission.

7. All arboricultural detailing, protective measures, including fencing, ground protection, supervision, working procedures and special engineering solutions shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment - Stage 1 and 2 Arboricultural Report (ref 855671), provided by RSK Environment and dated 31/07/15. Any deviation from the works prescribed or methods agreed in the report will require prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that reasonable measures are taken to safeguard trees in the interests of local amenity and the enhancement of the development itself, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Saved Policies E1 and

E6 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

8. Notwithstanding the details submitted, no development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include, as appropriate:
- finished levels or contours;
 - car parking layouts, other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
 - means of enclosure to all site boundaries and where this includes fencing, details of the type and materials for such fencing;
 - hard surfacing materials;
 - minor artefacts and structural features (e.g. furniture, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, external services, etc).

Soft landscape details shall include:

- a planting plan with specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, (including replacement trees where appropriate), noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;
- schedule of tree planting to include the specification of tree planting pits where appropriate with details of any included irrigation or drainage infrastructure and tree root barriers (if necessary) to prevent damage or disruption to any proposed hard surfacing or underground services, drains or other infrastructure;
- details of the location of external lighting sufficient to demonstrate how lighting is to be achieved without conflict to proposed tree planting, with allowance for reasonable growth.

In addition, the submission shall include implementation timetables and maintenance programmes detailing all operations to be carried out to allow successful establishment of soft landscaping. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority which should include appropriate planting to be undertaken at the earliest opportunity. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved, to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs and in accordance with Saved Policies E1(ii) and E6 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011. Details are required in the absence of being provided to accompany the planning submission.

9. No development shall take place on site until a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The production of the landscape management plan shall also incorporate the long term maintenance of biodiversity enhancements. The landscape management plan shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the details so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal public, nature conservation or historical significance the area in accordance with Saved Policies E1(ii) and E6 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011. Details are required in the absence of being provided to accompany the planning submission.

10. No development shall take place on site until a full detailed lighting scheme for both the construction and operation phases of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting scheme shall include full lighting specifications and address the cumulative effects of all external lighting sources in conjunction with the external effects of internal lighting from the buildings

hereby approved upon the landscape character and nocturnal animals sensitive to external lighting (including dormice and bats). The lighting scheme shall conform to the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations for Environmental Zone – E2 (Rural) contained within Table 1 of the Institute of Light Engineers Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting, GN01, dated 2011 unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The equipment shall be installed before the development is first occupied and shall thereafter be operated and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the area and potential impact upon foraging bats and dormice, in accordance with Saved Policies E1, E6 and E7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011. Details are required prior to development in the absence of being provided within the application documentation.

11. Notwithstanding the details submitted, no development shall commence on site until an archaeological investigation of the site has been carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved by in writing the Local Planning Authority. The investigation shall be carried out in accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To assess the extent, nature and date of any archaeological deposits that might be present and the impact of the development upon these heritage assets in accordance with the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012). Details are required in the absence of being provided to accompany the planning submission.

12. No development shall commence on site until a programme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with the approved written scheme of investigation as secured under Condition 11 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme of archaeological mitigation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To mitigate the effect of the works associated with the development upon any heritage assets and to ensure that information regarding these heritage assets is preserved by record for future generations in accordance with the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012). Details are required in the absence of being provided to accompany the planning submission.

13. Following completion of the on-site archaeological fieldwork, a report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and the Hampshire County Council Archaeologist in accordance with the approved programme of archaeological investigation as required by condition 11. This report shall include where appropriate, a post-excavation assessment, specialist analysis and reports, details of publication and public engagement.

REASON: To contribute to our knowledge and understanding of our past by ensuring that opportunities are taken to capture evidence from the historic environment and to make this publicly available in accordance with the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

14. No development, including any site preparation, shall commence until a scheme for the protection in situ of the Grade II listed milestone to the A30 during the construction phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To mitigate the effect of the works upon this heritage asset thus ensuring its preservation in accordance with the advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Saved Policy E2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011. Details are required in the absence of being provided to accompany the planning submission.

15. No development, including any site preparation, shall commence until a Habitat Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Habitat Management Plan shall detail the plans for biodiversity mitigation and enhancement schemes, to include the open mosaic habitats (green and brown roofs), aquatic habitats and woodland buffer zones and should be produced in conjunction with the landscape scheme (including implementation, management and maintenance) to ensure a consistent and comprehensive approach to the site and to ensure that ecological mitigation and enhancements are managed and resourced in perpetuity. The CEMP should incorporate the mitigation measures proposed within sections 8.6.7 to 8.6.8 of the Environmental Statement - Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation Effects (as amended July 2015) as a minimum. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the absence of being provided to accompany the planning application, details are required to secure the long term enhancement of nature conservation interests, including protected species, in accordance with advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Saved Policy E7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

16. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a management agreement to co-ordinate use of the Helicopter Landing Site with the on-going military low flying activities within the area have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Senior Air Traffic Control Officer at RAF Odiham. The development shall be operated in accordance with the agreement management agreement unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: Details are required in the absence of accompanying the planning application to ensure a coordination of activities and aircraft safety to accord with advice contained in the NPPF to have regard to public safety.

17. No development, including any site preparation, shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan must demonstrate the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust and site lighting. The plan should include, but not be limited to:
- a) An incorporation of the ecological mitigation measures proposed within sections 8.6.1 to 8.6.6 and 8.6.11 to 8.6.15 of the Environmental Statement - Chapter 8 Ecology and Nature Conservation Effects (as amended July 2015);
 - b) Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison;
 - c) Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Environmental Protection Team;
 - d) All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the following hours: 0730 Hours and 18 00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays and 08 00 and 13 00 Hours on Saturdays and; at no time on Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays;
 - e) Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above;
 - f) Mitigation measures as defined in BS 5528: Parts 1 and 2: 2009 Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites shall be used to minimise noise disturbance from construction works;
 - g) Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours;
 - h) Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants;
 - i) Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes;
 - j) Measures to ensure that all contractors are to be 'Considerate Contractors' by being aware of the needs of neighbours and the environment as encouraged by BDBC when working in the Borough;

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details of the approved plan unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the absence of being provided to accompany the planning application, details are required to secure the mitigation against the effects of the works associated with the development upon residential amenity, the highway network, local environment and nature conservation interests, including protected species, in accordance with advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Saved Policies E1, E6 and E7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

18. No works pursuant to this permission shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-

(a) a site investigation report documenting the ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as being appropriate by the Enzygo Phase 1 Desk Study Report and in accordance with BS10175:2011 - Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice;

and, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority,

(b) a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants/or gases when the site is developed. The scheme must include a timetable of works and site management procedures and the nomination of a competent person to oversee the implementation of the works. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and if necessary proposals for future maintenance and monitoring.

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR11'. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011. Details are required prior to development in the absence of being included within the application submission.

19. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until there has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority verification by the competent person approved under the provisions of condition 18(b) that any remediation scheme required and approved under the provisions of condition 18(b) has been implemented fully in accordance with the approved details (unless varied with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority in advance of implementation). Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority such verification shall comprise;

- As built drawings of the implemented scheme;
- Photographs of the remediation works in progress;
- Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free of contamination.

Thereafter the scheme shall be monitored and maintained in accordance with the scheme approved under condition 18(b), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

20. Notwithstanding the details accompanying the planning application, no development shall take place on site until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to detail the window glazing specification and room ventilation provisions (to include any mechanical ventilation) to ensure that internal noise levels for both the Critical Treatment Hospital and Cancer Treatment Centre hereby permitted shall not exceed internal noise criteria as detailed in Table 1:

Table 1: Internal noise criteria

Proposed Room	Period	Noise Level (dB)
Wards (including day recovery rooms)	Night-time (2300 – 0700)	<30 LAeq, 1 hr
Operating theatres, reception areas	Daytime 0700-2300)	<35 LAeq, 1 hr
Kitchens, laundry, physiotherapy, x-ray, utility and store rooms	Daytime 0700-2300)	<45 LAeq, 1 hr

The internal noise criteria should be achieved without a requirement for windows to be fixed closed. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that acceptable noise levels within the healthcare facilities are not exceeded in the interests of occupier amenity and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

21. The internal noise levels associated with any mechanical units and associated ductwork shall achieve the noise rating (NR) curve criteria identified in Table 2 of the Department of Health guidance 'Health Technical Memorandum 08-01: Acoustics'. The ventilation systems shall be designed to ensure that noise from external sources is not conducted into any habitable room unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that acceptable noise levels within the buildings hereby approved are not exceeded in the interests of user amenity and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

22. The buildings hereby permitted shall not be brought into operation until all works which form part of the scheme for protecting the proposed buildings from noise as approved by the Local Planning Authority under conditions 20 and 21 above have been implemented and an acoustic testing carried out by a suitably qualified and competent acoustic consultant to verify that the internal noise levels agreed in condition 20 above have been achieved. The testing shall be carried out in accordance with a written protocol, details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before testing is carried out.

REASON: To ensure that acceptable noise levels within the dwellings are not exceeded in the interests of residential amenity and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

23. The buildings hereby permitted shall not be brought into operation until a noise impact assessment has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that all plant or equipment will be equal to or below the existing background noise level as measured at the nearest noise sensitive dwellings. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and any measures required by the local planning authority to reduce noise from the plant or equipment shall be completed prior to it being brought into use.

REASON: To ensure that acceptable noise levels within the dwellings are not exceeded in the interests of residential amenity and in accordance with Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

24. Notwithstanding any details submitted to accompany the planning application, no development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall demonstrate that the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year (30% climate change allowance) critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall also include details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion of the development. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is completed.
- REASON: To ensure that the site does not generate adverse levels of surface water run-off within an area recognised to be at risk from associated flooding in accordance with Saved Policy A7 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.
25. Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development shall commence on site until full details (including plans and particulars) showing the detailed proposals for all the following matters of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- a) Full engineering details of the width, alignment, gradient, sight lines, internal directional signage and type of construction proposed for the vehicular, pedestrian and cycle routes (including the crossing facilities) and accesses, and for the avoidance of doubt a scheme to permit access, turning and waiting of public transport buses in a forward gear within the site, together with details of the surface lighting, the method of disposing of surface water, a programme for the making up of the vehicular, pedestrian and cycle routes and an independent Stage 2 Road Safety Audit covering the full extents of the internal movement network;
 - b) The detailed design of the vehicle parking facilities in accordance with the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, including the conveniently located and signed parking facilities for people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility impairments) and the associated pedestrian/mobility compliant transit routes to/from the building entrances;
 - c) The provision of public and community transport pick-up/drop-off and passenger waiting facilities with sufficient capacity to serve the site, including the provision of access kerbs, seating, shelter(s), timetable information and signage and the associated pedestrian/mobility compliant transit routes to/from the building entrances;
 - d) The provision of conveniently located, easy to use and signed visitor (including taxis) pick-up/drop-off and waiting facilities, and the associated pedestrian/mobility compliant transit routes to/from the building entrances;
 - e) The locations, numbers, types, styles and signage of the conveniently located, easy to use and secure short and long-stay cycle parking facilities with sufficient capacity to serve the site. The long-stay cycle parking facilities shall be covered, weather and vandal proof and long-stay users shall be provided with access to suitable changing, shower, drying and storage facilities;
 - f) The locations and signage of the conveniently located, easy to use and secure Powered Two Wheelers parking facilities with sufficient capacity to serve the site. These facilities shall be drained, level, with a firm non-slip surface and a suitable provision of easy to use and secure anchoring points, and long-stay users shall be provided with access to suitable changing, shower, drying and storage facilities;
 - g) Vehicle swept path analysis demonstrating the ability for all service vehicles whether rigid and/or articulated, including the Hampshire Fire and Rescue's aerial ladder platform, to adequately service the site. Vehicles using the service areas shall be able to enter, load/unload, turn and exit in a forward gear; Details of the intended use of each service area (including the vehicle types, the frequency and duration of the servicing activities) shall be provided to demonstrate that each service area provides sufficient capacity to serve the site;

- h) The provision and operation of the ambulance drop-off/pick-up and waiting facilities with sufficient capacity to serve the site (including by blue light emergency response ambulances) to provide safe convenient and unhindered entry and exit by ambulances.

Once approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the agreed details ('a' - 'h') shall be fully implemented and thereafter retained in accordance with the agreed details.

REASON: In the absence of satisfactory details being provided to accompany the planning application, details are required in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Saved Policies E1, A1 and A2 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

26. No development shall take place, including any site clearance works, until a 'Site Clearance and Construction Method Statement' that demonstrates safe and coordinated systems of work affecting or likely to affect the public highway has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the site clearance and construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

- a) compliance with The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 and in particular Part 3 Regulation 8 General duties, whereby construction must be undertaken 'in a manner that secures the health and safety of any person affected by the project;
- b) full details of the timetable and phasing plan covering the undertaking of the site clearance and construction activities;
- c) the routing of construction traffic accessing and leaving the site via the principal highway network only (not via Trenchard Lane);
- d) full details of a Scheme providing for the temporary means of access from the public highway (A30) including the associated traffic management measures (in accordance with Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual), the provision of suitable right turn facilities, access and forward visibility sight lines in accordance with the prevailing vehicle speeds to provide safe and convenient access, with written confirmation that the Scheme has been agreed with Hampshire County Council;
- e) the provision of measures to prevent access to/from Trenchard Lane;
- f) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors clear of the public highway;
- g) the safe loading and unloading of all plant and materials clear of the public highway;
- h) the delivery, installation, commissioning, use and decommissioning of any proposed cranes or other large items of plant;
- i) the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development clear of the public highway;
- j) the erection, design and maintenance of security hoarding, scaffolding and other measures to contain all site clearance and construction activities within the curtilage of the site;
- k) measures to control the emission of dust, dirt and surface water during occupation of the site, to prevent emissions and surface water from being discharged onto the public highway;
- l) the location, layout, design and operation of vehicle and wheel washing facilities and the associated signage, management, inspection and maintenance measures to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site have been cleaned and dried sufficiently to prevent soil, mud, other debris and water from being deposited upon the public highway;
- m) the provision of road sweepers and the associated management and inspection measures to ensure that the public highway is retained clear of soil, mud, other

debris and surface water arising from this site, especially during periods of inclement weather;

- n) a scheme for recycling and disposing of waste resulting from all the construction activities;
- o) the management and coordination of deliveries and collections to avoid undue interference of the operation of the public highway Monday to Friday between 06:30-09:30 and 16:00-18:30;
- p) a detailed before and after condition survey, including photographs, of the adjacent sections of the public highway network extending up to the A30 signalled control junction to the east (incorporating the junction with Trenchard Lane), 200m westwards from the western site boundary along the A30, and the southern section of Trenchard Lane from the junction with the A30 up to the northern site boundary with assurance that any damage caused by the undertaking of the construction activities is rectified prior to the occupation of this site; and
- q) a schedule of any required highway licenses, traffic regulation orders (including any speed limit changes), temporary road closures or other consents from the Local Highway Authority.

REASON: In the absence of details being provided to accompany the planning application, details are required to ensure that the construction processes are undertaken in a safe and convenient manner that limits impact on local roads and the amenities of nearby occupiers and the area generally in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

27. No deliveries of construction materials or plant and machinery and no removal of any spoil from the site shall take place before the hours of 07:00; nor after 18:00; Monday to Friday, before the hours of 08:00; nor after 13:00; Saturdays nor on Sundays or recognised bank or public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties during the construction period and in accordance Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996-2011.

Informative(s):-

1. 1.1 - The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that the above conditions (if any), must be complied with in full, failure to do so may result in enforcement action being instigated.

1.2 - This permission may contain pre-commencement conditions which require specific matters to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before a specified stage in the development occurs. This means that a lawful commencement of the approved development CANNOT be made until the particular requirements of the pre-commencement conditions have been met.

1.3 - The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that the Local Planning Authority has a period of up to eight weeks to determine details submitted in respect of a condition or limitation attached to a grant of planning permission. It is likely that in most cases the determination period will be shorter than eight weeks, however, the applicant is advised to schedule this time period into any programme of works. A fee will be required for requests for discharge of any consent, agreement, or approval required by a planning condition. The fee chargeable is £97 per request or £28 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwelling house or other development in the curtilage of a dwelling house. A fee is payable for each submission made regardless of the number of conditions for which approval is sought. Requests must be made using the standard application form (available online) or set out in writing clearly identifying the relevant planning application and condition(s) which they are seeking approval for.

2. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in dealing with this application, the Council has worked with the applicant in the following positive and proactive manner:-

- Seeking amended and additional information during the course of the application;
- considering the imposition of conditions and a Legal Agreement;

In this instance:

- the applicant was updated of any issues following receipt of consultation responses.

In such ways the Council has demonstrated a positive and proactive manner in seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to the planning application.

3. Birds nests, when occupied or being built, receive legal protection under the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended). It is highly advisable to undertake clearance of potential bird nesting habitat (such as hedges, scrub, trees, suitable outbuildings etc.) outside the bird nesting season, which is generally seen as extending from March to the end of August, although may extend longer depending on local conditions. If there is absolutely no alternative to doing the work in during this period then a thorough, careful and quiet examination of the affected area must be carried out before clearance starts. If occupied nests are present then work must stop in that area, a suitable (approximately 5m) stand-off maintained, and clearance can only recommence once the nest becomes unoccupied of its own accord.
4. The developer should enter into a formal agreement with Thames Water to provide the necessary sewerage infrastructure required to service this development.
5. The developer should enter into a formal agreement with the South East Water Company to secure a water supply to the site. Contact should be made via the South East Water Company, 3 Church Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex. RH16 3NY. Tel: 01444-448200.
6. In accordance with the requirements of condition 16, the applicant is advised in the first instance to make contact with RAF Odiham Air Traffic Control – Senior Air Traffic Control Officer on 01256 367276.
7. The landscaping implementation secured by condition 8 should make provision for mitigation planting to be carried out where appropriate on the site prior to the commencement of building operations.
8. With respect to the required 'Site Clearance & Construction Method Statement' planning condition, the Applicant is advised to give careful and detailed consideration to the planning, design, coordination, management and construction of the proposed development to avoid any undue interruption of the safe and unhindered operation of the local highway network during the site clearance and construction periods. The 'Site Clearance & Construction Method Statement' also needs to take into account any relevant provisions contained within the Section 106 Planning Agreement as well as the Section 278 Highway Agreement(s). General guidance and advice which needs to be taken into account by the 'Site Clearance & Construction Method Statement,' including with respect to the provision of vehicle and wheel washing facilities is also provided by the below links:
 - The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015
<http://www.hse.gov.uk/construction/cdm/2015/index.htm>
 - HSG151 - Protecting the public: Your next move
<http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg151.htm>
 - Roadways / site traffic control / immobilisation of vehicles
<http://www.hse.gov.uk/comah/sragtech/techmeastraffic.htm>
 - Environment Agency - (PPG13) Vehicle washing and cleaning: prevent pollution

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vehicle-washing-and-cleaning-ppg13-prevent-pollution>

9. The applicant is advised that the conditions listed apply to the elements subject of both outline and full planning permission as hereby approved.
10. This Decision Notice must be read in conjunction with a Planning Obligation completed under the terms of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). You are advised to satisfy yourself that you have all the relevant documentation.
11. This Decision Notice must be read in conjunction with an Highways Agreement completed under the terms of Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended). You are advised to satisfy yourself that you have all the relevant documentation.

APPENDIX 1:
Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust CTU –
North Waltham Parish Council Planning Comments

Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust CTU

North Waltham Parish Council Planning Comments

15/01225/OUT | Hybrid application for Full planning permission for the erection of a critical treatment hospital, cancer treatment centre additional development including energy centre, service yard, link building and underground link. Helicopter landing strip and pad, associated internal roads, car parking and landscaping together with the means of access via a new roundabout on the A30. Outline planning permission for the details of siting and means of access to the site for proposed ambulance station and pathology laboratory with all other matters reserved | Land West of Ganderdown Copse Winchester Road Dummer Hampshire.

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Key Issues
3. Context
4. Assessment of the Design Proposals against Development Plan and National Planning policy
 - 4.1. Cultural Heritage
 - 4.2. Landscape and Visual Impact
 - 4.3. Ecology and Nature
 - 4.4. Lighting Effects
 - 4.5. Traffic and Transport
 - 4.6. Noise Effects
5. Assessment of Planning Policy
6. Conclusions

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust, under their service delivery model of "Local where possible, central where necessary", are seeking planning permission to develop a new Critical Treatment Hospital (CTH) and Cancer Treatment Centre (CTC) in open countryside next to Ganderdown Copse to the south west of Basingstoke. The site is 22ha of actively farmed agricultural land bounded by low, trimmed Parish defining hedgerows, in a landscape of open arable farmland, with few buildings and limited urban form.
- 1.2. The applications aim is to acquire full planning permission for the 6 storey Critical Treatment Hospital (41,178m²), The Cancer Treatment Centre (5,690m²), Energy Centre (3,394m²), helicopter landing pad and car parking for c.821 vehicles along with outline planning permission for Central Pathology Laboratory (c. 3,000m²) and an Ambulance Station (c. 5,000m²)

2. Key Issues

- 2.1. **The principle of the proposed development does not accord with planning policy**, which presumes against development in the countryside. Exceptions have to be adequately justified and there are strong arguments to be made that the proposed scheme does not do so.
- 2.2. **The need for the health facility has been far from demonstrated.** No evidence base has been supplied demonstrating inadequate response times for ambulances or lack of existing suitable facilities or whether these can be sufficiently upgraded to meet identified need.
- 2.3. **The need for the greenfield location has not been proven.** At page the DAP Statement accepts that no Brownfield sites have been considered. The cost of land allocated in the proposed Local Plan is not an acceptable reason for ruling out those locations and the proposed health facility should not be permitted at the cost of the character and amenity of the countryside, landscape, ecology and cultural heritage so highly valued by local people
- 2.4. **The unacceptably harmful impact to the heritage of the local area** including the importance of the rural setting to the historic Roman road (which lies to the east and also bordering the south-east of the site following the line of the A30), milestone marker (close to the southern boundary of the site), Grade Two listed building (Southwood Farm House to the east of the site) and ancient woodland including Ganderdown Copse, and which planning policy requires to be preserved and protected for the public benefit long-term.
- 2.5. **Unacceptable harmful visual impact to the character and amenity of the landscape.** The proposed scheme would be located on the hillside and, despite the proposed planting scheme, which it would tower above and be very prominent in the landscape and irrevocably harm public views from the A30, M3 and other PROWS and, in particular, from The Wayfarers Walk and from the Dummer Conservation Area. This is acknowledged at page of the application Design & Access Statement. The proposed scheme, including the planting, would block views, that currently exist, through the site to the surrounding

countryside that are currently available and are much valued by local (residential and business) and visiting populations (working and tourist/leisure). There is already harmful impact on the rural area arising from light spill from the town and road network and the harm would be significantly increased by the proposed scheme. This would have an unacceptable impact on the 'dark skies' at night important to star gazers and much valued by local people. Removing the darkened night environment that is required for many of the star gazers in the area.

- 2.6. Unacceptable harmful external/environmental impacts including those arising from traffic impacts and noise** due to the amount and type of vehicles including Ambulances (with sirens and flashing lights) and supply lorries. A proportion of staff, patient, visitor and supply vehicles are likely to use inappropriate routes and roads to reach the site through the widespread use of GPS technology. It would be very difficult to control this by condition. Especially from the settlements to the north of the proposed site, i.e. Kingsclear and Overton where the direct route would be through North Waltham. It should be noted, that all the grade one and listed buildings in the village have no foundations and will be adversely affected by the increased volume of traffic.
- 2.7. Unacceptable harmful impacts to valuable landscape important to the setting of the cultural heritage** including Listed buildings and monuments and the Dummer Conservation Area and proximity to the North Wessex AONB.

3. Context

- 3.1. The proposed development site is located on farmland under crop production to the north west of Ganderdown Copse approx. 2km from the present Basingstoke settlement policy boundary and approx. 1km from the proposed revised settlement policy boundary.
- 3.2. The location of the proposed development is such that there is limited inter-visibility between the proposed site and the Basingstoke settlement policy boundary reinforcing that the location is in character landscape with attributes, heritage assets and ecology/biodiversity that are quite different for the more urban environment and as such highly valued and prized by local residents.
- 3.3. The very highly valued landscape attributes include, but are not limited to;
 - 3.3.1. A substantial number of Grade two listed buildings in local, including the conservations areas of Dummer and North Waltham.
 - 3.3.2. Various scheduled Ancient woodlands, including Ganderdown Copse and South Wood.
 - 3.3.3. The Grade II listed Milestone marker on the A30.
 - 3.3.4. A landscape of semi-enclosed arable fiends, bounded by ancient hedgerows and infrequent woodland blocks.
 - 3.3.5. The Wayfarer's Walk long distance footpath and the associated panoramic vistas
 - 3.3.6. Buildings in a style that is general two story and domestic in character, with no urban sprawl
 - 3.3.7. A feeling of countryside with relative openness and a sense of relative darkness with limited urban influence.
 - 3.3.8. The next commercial environment is over 1.5 K away
- 3.4. The locations character area is described in the Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Assessment (2001) as;

"This is a varied landscape of open arable farmland, a more enclosed part around the road network and North Waltham, and an area of semi-enclosed arable fields, given coherence by the well-defined dry valley that runs through the area. The predominant large arable fields are bounded by low, trimmed hedgerows and infrequent woodland blocks, creating a feeling of relative openness".

Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Assessment (2001), Area 17 - Dummer and Popham Down

- 3.5. The location character area is described in the Basingstoke and Deane Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2008) as;

"There is a pattern of medium to large-scale arable fields with large woodland blocks on the areas underlain by clay and flint. There are many trees and hedgerows throughout and varying inter-visibility across the area. The area has a generally quiet, un-spoilt rural character." "New development should be carefully sited in the landscape with consideration for long distance views and traditional settlement form. Consideration should be given to views of the countryside from the railway

lines and from the Wayfarers Walk. Narrow country lanes should be protected from unnecessary improvements and urbanisation."

Basingstoke and Deane Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2008), Appendix 14

3.6. Design and Sustainability SPD describes the majority of building in the area as;

"Buildings are generally two-storey and domestic in character. Many were built as farmhouses and farm workers' cottages." and that "New development should reflect the traditional building styles, materials and colours. Boundaries should be marked by hedgerows or by walls that are built out of materials characteristic of the area, for example brick and flint."

Design and Sustainability SPD - Appendix 14

- 3.7.** The location is also within 0.1km of landscape character area 14: Oakley/Steventon Down and 0.6km of landscape character area 16: Basingstoke Down.
- 3.8.** Ganderdown Copse, mixed woodland designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland, bounds the site to the South East. There are also two further Ancient Semi-Natural Woodlands within 1km of the proposed site (South Wood and Deane Heath Copse).
- 3.9.** The ancient Milestone on the A30 adjacent to the site is Grade II listed along with Southwood Farmhouse, also Grade II listed, (circa – 1900), that is approx.700 metres from the proposed secondary access point and with views of the eastern profile of the site. While not in a conservation area nor listed the Sun Inn, located 900 metres to south west, is a much valued local landmark and is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset in line with National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG Paragraph 39), important to the character and amenity of the area together with its rural setting.
- 3.10.** There are two conservation areas within 2.5km of the proposed site. Dummer Conservation Area, which is a 'historic rural settlement', is set at an elevated position in the landscape and with clear inter-visibility with the application site approx. 1km to the south. North Waltham Conservation Area is located 2km to the west of the application site important to the rural setting of the historic environment including views and the countryside along the approach roads from the south and east.
- 3.11.** The hedgerows bounding the application land to the east, south and west of the site are all historic parish boundaries and are classified as "important" in accordance with the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations. These Hedges also qualify under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) in that more than 80% of the hedgerow supports native species. In addition to those directly related to the site there is a further hedgerow down the section of Trenchards Lane that is deemed Important under the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations and qualifies under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP).
- 3.12.** Other recent decisions made by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, as the Local Planning Authority, have set the precedent with regards to development that would harm the character and amenity of the rural landscape noting the following comments on a number of local planning refusal notices.

- 3.12.1.** (BDB/73408) Refused due to unduly prominent position along a main road, which is within the countryside. The refusal stated its siting would fail to respond to the local context of the area and adversely affect scenic quality of the area. This was refused to ensure the LPA could refuse similar proposals within the countryside and was against policy E1 and E6 of BDBC LP.
- 3.12.2.** (14/03422/FUL) Refused for one caravan in the countryside due to the unsympathetic impact on the rural landscape. (14/03245/FUL) Refused due to the verdant character being impacted in the countryside, yet this was one house.
- 3.12.3.** (BDB/74134) Stated that The Sun Inn is an attractive cream-rendered building with a tiled roof. It is not within a conservation area and is not listed, but the Council have identified it as a 'heritage asset', in line with the guidance contained within Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment. The planning inspectorate agreed the existing building is attractive in itself and in its setting within the landscape which, combined with the age of the property, gives the building value as a non designated heritage asset.
- 3.12.4.** (14/03431/FUL) Was Refused due to their sitting and relationship to the undeveloped parcel of land, represented a harmful isolated form of development in the open countryside therefore in this highly visible location the proposed development would be harmful to the visual amenity an open character of the countryside. It was noted this proposal will have an impact on the A3030 Stockbridge Road causing undue interference with the safety of road users.
- 3.13.** These decisions set the approach to be taken by the LPA in this application for the land in the open countryside adjacent to Ganderdown Copse. The LPA must be consistent in its approach and decisions.

4. Assessment of the Design Proposals

4.1. Cultural Heritage

- 4.1.1.** The Dummer Conservation area is located 1km to the south of the site and is described in The Dummer Conservation Area Appraisal (BDBC, 2003).
- 4.1.2.** The appraisal notes that the outward views from the conservation area and the contribution of open land "cannot be underestimated".
- 4.1.3.** The noted views from Tower Hill and the cemetery would be impacted by the development, with the upper levels of the development clearly visible and incongruous to the countryside setting from 1km away.
- 4.1.4.** The ancient Milestone on the A30 adjacent to the site is Grade II listed and is located approx.50m from the site and its setting will be irrevocably harmed by significant alterations to the A30 in the proposal.
- 4.1.5.** Southwood Farmhouse (Grade II) is located 700 metres from proposed secondary access point and its setting will be considerably changed and harmed by views of the eastern profile of the development site.
- 4.1.6.** The local landmark of the Sun Inn, located on the A30 900 metres to south west, is a recognised non-designated heritage asset and deemed attractive in itself and in its setting and should be adequately protected in line with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG Paragraph 39),
- 4.1.7.** The hedgerows along the east of the site are all historic parish boundaries and along with those on the south and west parameters are classified as "important" in accordance with the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations.

4.2. Landscape and Visual Impact

- 4.2.1.** The amount of built form and other operational development, including hard-standing around the buildings, will result in obtrusive features in the open landscape given the scale and complexity of the proposal and is contrary to the most up to date planning policy set out in Paragraphs 109 and 123 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which is the most up to date planning policy to be applied.
- 4.2.2.** The removal of hedgerows during the construction would result in the loss of 'green corridors' vital to the conservation of ecology and bio-diversity of the landscape and area and contrary to the requirements of Paragraphs 109, 113, 118 and 199 of the NPPF
- 4.2.3.** The rural and undeveloped character of the site itself is likely to be significantly affected by the proposal, including removal of parts of the boundary hedgerow, such as along Trenchards Lane
- 4.2.4.** The construction works are likely to be as equally harmful to the landscape and rural roads as the completed development

- 4.2.5.** The development is likely to have significant visual impact upon 8 of the 13 representative viewpoints as shown in the Environmental Impact Assessment
- 4.2.6.** The host landscape character area will also be Significantly impacted, due to the introduction of a large-scale built development (i.e. a 6 storey Hospital and a significant number of additional buildings housing other healthcare facilities and support services) into a rural and undeveloped location and would be contrary to the requirements of Paragraphs 109 and 123 of the NPPF
- 4.2.7.** The limited inter-visibility between the proposed site and Basingstoke only serves to reinforce the impact the development will have on the host character consisting mainly of isolated farmsteads and small settlements. Perhaps this should be included in the 'context' section above as well?
- 4.2.8.** The introduction of a six storey (31 metre high) building, in addition to the considerable footprint, into undeveloped land area would be a significant change to the identified and valued character of the landscape
- 4.2.9.** The height of the proposed development would be prominent and obtrusive in the undeveloped character of the site
- 4.2.10.** The introduction of a cooling stack (approx. 33m) is a significant alteration to the host character area, and would be utterly incongruous
- 4.2.11.** The nature of the development would alter the site beyond recognition and a valuable area of landscape would be lost
- 4.2.12.** The cumulative effect of these would result in a Highly Significant impact upon the host character landscape.
- 4.2.13.** The introduction of a large scale development will have a harmful and significant impact on the visual amenity on the two adjoining character areas given that neither have developments of this scale and nature and would be completely out of keeping
- 4.2.14.** Despite the introduction of mitigating planting the proposed development will continue to be highly visible from the Wayfarers Walk to the east of the site (VP2). Therefore there is a Major adverse level of visual effect and the effect will remain Highly Significant.
- 4.2.15.** Mitigating planting will result in a significant reduction of views from the Wayfarers Walk to the north of the site (VP3) resulting in an unacceptably harmful affect to public amenity
- 4.2.16.** Due to the inability of the mitigating planting to screen the upper floors of the CTH building, ambulance building and the cooling stack the eastern profile of the development will present a Highly Significant visual impact to New Cottages at Southwood Farm (VP4) which will remain as Major Adverse.
- 4.2.17.** The view from the Footpath near to the Sun Inn (VP5) will suffer from a Moderate adverse level of visual effect as a result of the mitigating plantings limitations with

regards to screening the upper storeys of the CTH building, ambulance building and cooling stack and the effect will be Significant.

4.2.18. A Moderate adverse level of visual effect due to the proposed mitigating planting not providing any screening to the upper storeys of the CTH building and the cooling stack will again affect the Wayfarer's Walk to the South-east (VP6), and as such the effect will be Significant.

4.2.19. The view from besides Ganderdown Copse (VP11) will receive little effect from the proposed mitigating planting and as such will receive a High degree of change and a Moderate adverse level of visual effect, which is Significant.

4.3. Ecology and Nature

4.3.1. 600 metres of hedgerow to the east of the site along Trenchards Lane have been deemed 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, Schedule 1, Paragraph 7 in that at least 7 woody species listed in schedule 3 to the regulations are present (Oak, Whitebeam, Wild Privet, Dogwood, Hazel, Bramble, Hawthorn, Field Maple, Blackthorn, Rose), and connects to 2 other hedges.

4.3.2. The aforementioned hedgerow is also been deemed 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, Schedule 1, Paragraph 8 and is adjacent to a byway open to all traffic and a road used and a public path (Wayfarers Walk), has a bank on one side for at least 50% of its length, gaps do not exceed more than 10%, there is 12 standard trees in a length of 240 metres (at least one per 50 metres) and also has a parallel hedge within 15 metres.

4.3.3. All of the hedgerows to be by the proposed development of Trenchards Lane qualify under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) in that 80% of the hedgerow supports native species, and as such should be protected in line with the 1990 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

4.3.4. During the construction phase of the proposed development there is a risk to direct and indirect impacts on retained hedgerows including root damage and compaction from machinery, and pollution from litter and dust.

4.3.5. During the operational phase of the proposal there is potential impact upon remaining hedgerows from poor management and the polluting effect of litter.

4.3.6. There is a total of 13 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) within 2km of the proposed site the closest being Ganderdown Copse that directly adjoins the site.

4.3.7. Ganderdown Copse is designated Ancient Semi-Natural woodland and is included in the Ancient Woodland Inventory (Provisional) for England.

4.3.8. Pardown Copse and Small's copse (1.2km to the north) and Peak Copse (275m to the south east) are both SINC's with a record of dormice.

- 4.3.9.** South Wood and Deane Heath Copse (both within 1km of the site) are designated Ancient Semi-Natural woodland and are included in the Ancient Woodland Inventory (Provisional) for England.
- 4.3.10.** As a result of the construction phase of the proposed development Ganderdown Copse could be impacted by pollution from dust and litter, disturbance from construction machinery and works along with increased light and noise levels.
- 4.3.11.** There is the potential for the construction phase to result in alterations to the hydrology affecting Ganderdown Copse. There is also the potential for these changes to the local hydrology to persist well into the operational phase of the proposed development.
- 4.3.12.** With one outlier badger sett to be found on the edge of woodland to the east of the site the proposed development will result in approx. 30% of typical badger territory.
- 4.3.13.** The new proposal will result in an increase in the volume of vehicular traffic to the road network around the site, which will present an increased risk of road mortality for the local badger population.
- 4.3.14.** Increased levels of lighting and noise from the proposed development, if poorly mitigated, will have a detrimental impact upon the present dark foraging and commuting areas for bats.
- 4.3.15.** North Waltham and Southwood Farm have recorded resident population of slow worms.

4.4. Lighting Effects

- 4.4.1.** The proposed location and the surrounding area are described by Hampshire County Council's Street Lighting Policy Document (4th edition) as Environmental Zone E2, primary defined as being those within "the Countryside Policy Area Boundary" for development purposes, as described in District and Local Plans.
- 4.4.2.** The site is presently unlit, as are all local roads including Trenchards Lane.
- 4.4.3.** The closest occurrence of street lighting is at a distance of 1.5km to the east of the site along the A30.
- 4.4.4.** The degree of lighting that would be introduced by the proposed development would result in the site being reclassified to Environmental Zone E3 (Areas of Medium District Brightness),
- 4.4.5.** The impact on the surrounding character landscape of the introduction of an area of greater brightness cannot and should not be underestimated.
- 4.4.6.** The introduction of street lighting around the proposed A30 roundabout and entrance to the site will result in light spill into the surrounding area.
- 4.4.7.** There is insufficient statistical evidence that the proposed mitigating back light shields will provide effecting protection against intrusive light spill into the surrounding hedgerows.

- 4.4.8.** There is insufficient evidence that the proposed footpath/cycleway connecting the site the southerly extent of Basingstoke will receive the required lighting to meet the required levels of pedestrian safety or personal security as described in Hampshire County Council's Street Lighting Policy Document (4th edition).
- 4.4.9.** Notwithstanding point 4.4.8 there is insufficient analysis of the impact of increased highway lighting between the proposed site, Basingstoke and the adjacent primary road infrastructure.

4.5. Traffic and Transport

- 4.5.1.** The Traffic Assessment for the proposed development states that all analysis has been based only on traffic flows from existing housing development, with the minimal addition of Longwood Copse (57 dwellings) and Kennel Farm (310 dwellings).
- 4.5.2.** Assuming the developments proposed schedule it is due to open no sooner than 2018. This makes the BDBC's Emerging Local Plan (ELP) a material consideration in decisions on planning applications. The ELP contains proposals for a number of developments that will have significant impact on the number of dwellings between the proposed site and Basingstoke. These include the Golf Course (1000 dwellings), Hounsome Fields (750 dwellings) and Manydown North (3,400 dwellings) along with the already approved Beggarwood N development (96 dwellings). It seems distinct unreasonable that the proposed CTH development does not take these into account with its traffic assessment, nor is the CTH considered in the ELP Traffic Assessment (provided to BDBC by Parsons Brinckerhoff).
- 4.5.3.** The proposal's Traffic Assessment limits its distribution of vehicular trips to 10-15km (paragraph 4.5.2), while elsewhere the application stated that the facility will be providing care for the whole geographical extent of the HHFT's remit. This includes the proposed maternity unit, which is scheduled to provide all consultant delivered obstetric care within the HHFT. Therefore patients and visitors will, by definition, be travelling from considerably further afield than the suggested 10-15km.
- 4.5.4.** The assumption made in Table 5 of the proposals Traffic Assessment that 0% of traffic will be travelling to the site from the M3 SW is completely incompatible with the stated role as providing essential resources for the whole of the geographical extent of the NNFT.
- 4.5.5.** Paragraph 2.7.5 of the proposals Traffic Assessment state that as a result of locating the new development at this site will result in a reduction in the average distance of travel to a local hospital and thus the proportion of the borough's population living within 8km of their local hospital. This contrary to the HHFT specifically stipulate elsewhere in the application that the CTH will NOT be a general hospital and for regular outpatient activities. Therefore this proposal will not, as stated in paragraph 2.7.7, improve local access.

- 4.5.6. The Accident Study Area (Inset 2.5) fails to include Junction 8 of the M3, which would be subject a considerable increase in traffic having to negotiate the sub-standard bifurcation at junction 8.
- 4.5.7. The proposals Traffic Assessment fails to include analysis, with regards to trip attraction and impact, the complete rural road network north of the site and that through the village of Dummer on the opposite side of M3 junction 7.
- 4.5.8. Contrary to the proposals statement that additional traffic using Trenchards Lane will be "for service and resilience purposes", there will in practice be a considerable percentage of staff and patients commencing any car journey from the existing Basingstoke Hospital, Buckskin, Manydown North, Popley, Rooksdown, Winklebury and Worting will access the site be travelling through Oakley village via Trenchards Lane. This will be a considerably more attractive option than traversing Basingstoke and A30 corridor especially at peak periods.
- 4.5.9. In addition to the above routes, there will also be a similar effect upon routes through North Waltham with a percentage staff and patients from Whitchurch, Overton and other communities in the North West of the HHFT catchment area, electing to take a more direct route than the A34 and A303.
- 4.5.10. The proposal indicates a 188% increase in the Mean Maximum Queue at the A30/ Winchester Road signal junction. Such an increase in congestion will result in an increase in the number of vehicles travelling though the village of Dummer to avoid queuing traffic.
- 4.5.11. Paragraph 3.6.2 of the proposals Traffic Assessment states that the development will have 801 car parking spaces. Yet the Design and Access Statement stipulates;

Staff Parking Provision

CTH	376
Pathology	90
CTC	35
Total	501

Visitor Parking Provision

Main	250
CTC	35
Total	285

Grand Total 786

- 4.5.12. Given the statement in the proposals Travel Plan that it is an ambitious target of having little as 65% of staff travelling by car and the limitations of opportunities of modal shift. The car park provision of 501 spaces for 600-700 staff is completely insufficient and entirely inflexible.
- 4.5.13. Considering the site's location, it is not reasonable to target approx. 6% of employees to travel by rail to/from the hospital, nor is it reasonable to expect as many as 10% of staff members walking to work.

4.5.14. Given the volume of residential property that presently falls within the approx. 5km average journey time by cycle specified by the 2013 National Travel Survey it is not reasonable to expect more than 2% as presently represented by the model split of journey times to work for Basingstoke and Deane.

4.5.15. Although the proposal indicate that the number 8 bus service will be extended via a three year subsidy and access discounts will be provided via access to the easinet scheme. However;

- The extension of the bus route is likely to result in an increase from the present 15-minute journey time to near 25 minutes, which could easily reach 1hr at peak traffic times.
- Given the potential for substantial increases in the residential developments, e.g. the Golf Course will doubtless have significant detrimental impacts upon travel times for the No. 8 route.
- As the proposal is not for a General Hospital the majority of staff members with strict and immovable shift patterns will make prospective journeys. Therefore a bus service that has the risk of severe delays due to peak time traffic in the A30 corridor, and only runs an hourly service after 19.56 is unreliable and unacceptable.

4.5.16. Paragraph 1.6.45 of the proposals Environmental Statement states that “with regard to non-car accessibility, the assessment concludes that the Proposed Development will have a beneficial and long term effect” is not borne out by the facts. The application admits that hardly anyone will walk, cycling will be unattractive and impractical due to distance, gradient and exposure to fast moving traffic and bus travel will not be a practical alternative for staff with critical care responsibilities and non-social shift patterns. The location and nature of this proposed hospital will mean that almost all access will be by private car, contrary to the sustainability requirements of the NPPF and the policies of the emerging Local Plan.

4.5.17. The proposals Travel Plan target of 65% of staff journeys being by private car travel rebutted by evidence from a survey carried out by Southern Communications Ltd whose offices are located near the proposal site at Junction 7. Their 2014 survey, presented as part of the Travel Plan for their planning application 14/03618/FUL, shows that of their 80 in-house employees, only 2 walk or cycle to work and the remaining 78 employees travel by private car (4 of these by a Company provided taxi).

4.6. Noise Effects

4.6.1. The application is inconsistent with its analysis of the potential impact of helicopter noise. The Environmental Statement indicates that there will be "one flight per month", while the CAA Consultants report suggests that there is the potential for "four a day". While the noise effect of each visit will be short in duration (typically 3-4 minutes), the potential for 4 flights a day (24 hours a day) will present a significant noise disruption for local residents.

- 4.6.2.** While the proposal recognises the developments need for alternative ventilation inline with the excessive noise levels that may result from open windows. Such mitigation is not proposed for nearby residential properties that are likely to equally affected by helicopter and other noise resulting from the development.
- 4.6.3.** The long term rise in noise levels from the increased traffic generated by the development will present a 37% increase across the tested location, spreading as far from the proposed development as Stockbridge Road (2.5km from the site).
- 4.6.4.** While the potential inclusion of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) during any construction phase, is to acknowledge as a positive move. It is a misguided belief that communication and simply providing information on construction can be an effective means of mitigating the impact of noise upon sensitive receptors especially local residents.
- 4.6.5.** Due to the proposals lack of detailed design there is insufficient evidence that the cumulative impact of plant noise from emission points, vents etc. will be within acceptable tolerance levels for background noise at the nearest residential receptors.

5. Assessment of Planning Policy

- 5.1.** The primary policy for determining planning applications in Basingstoke and Deane are;
- The saved policies of the BDBC Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011)
 - Adopted supplementary planning guidance, e.g. the Design Guidance, Conservation Area Guidance.
 - BDBC Emerging Local Plan (2011-2029)
 - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)
 - National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (2014)
- 5.2.** National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 24 describes the sequential testing of potential development locations as part of good and sound planning practice. This proposal does not contain any evidence of a sequential test.
- 5.3.** The proposal contains insufficient evidence of a robust site selection study and thus the justification for the selection of the proposed development site. The application fails to prove that a proper strategic assessment to examine a range of reasonable alternatives was undertaken in advance of the selection of the proposed site.
- 5.4.** Although not an explicit legal requirement there is insufficient evidence that any potential alternative sites were appraised to the same level as the preferred option (Heard v Broadland District Council, South Norfolk District Council, Norwich City Council, February 2014)
- 5.5.** Contrary to NPPF Paragraph 111 there is insufficient evidence in the proposal that there is no suitable previously developed land that meets the requirements of the development.
- 5.6.** The announcement of details of the project in the local press as being the finalized and approved application before undertaking any form of consultation was distressing and misleading for a number of local residents.
- 5.7.** The consultation meetings subsequently arranged were arranged at short notice at a holiday time that meant that a lot of people were unable to attend and provide their input to the process.
- 5.8.** The application has changed significantly from that sent out for consultation (increased in size from 3 to 6 floors).
- 5.9.** The application is heavily based on input from external consultants. The Trust has only released the information reluctantly and in an incomplete form after several Freedom Of Information (FOI) requests. The Trust initially denied having this information and only after being submitted to FOI reviews did it make a poor quality black and white scan of a coloured document available. The Trust also claimed that the scoping and tendering documents (which would be needed to fully understand the document supplied) had been 'lost'.
- 5.10.** Given that documents used to scope the questions that led to the site selection were 'lost' it is not possible for the answers to be trusted. A new analysis should be undertaken

and all information relevant to that analysis should be supplied as a part of a proper consultation exercise.

- 5.11.** The application site lies outside of a settlement policy boundary and within the Countryside, being of a sufficient distance it to result in no inter-visibility between the site itself and Basingstoke (primarily due to an intervening ridgeline) thus the development is not supported by Saved Policies D8 and D9 of Basingstoke and Deane's (BDBC) Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011), and is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) section 11.
- 5.12.** The proposed development by virtue of its scale, both vertical and land coverage would be incongruous in the landscape adversely affecting the scenic and visual quality of the landscape and would therefore have an unacceptably harmful impact on the rural amenity of the area. As such the proposed development fails to comply with Saved Policies D8, E1i and E6 of Basingstoke and Deane's (BDBC) Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011) and does not meet the NPPF's Core requirement to take account of the different roles and character of different areas, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
- 5.13.** The application dominates the surrounding cottages and Grade II listed building. This is introducing buildings/urban form in a location where there have historically been no existing builds. The proposal would significantly change the character and context of the site, disrupting hierarchy and wider outlook of the existing listed buildings and their relationship with the landscape. This therefore does not comply with section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, NPPF (section 12) and Saved Policies E1 and E6 of Basingstoke and Deane's (BDBC) Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011).
- 5.14.** The landscape character of the site is described in Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Assessment (2001) as, "This is a varied landscape of open arable farmland, a more enclosed part around the road network and North Waltham, and an area of semi-enclosed arable fields, given coherence by the well-defined dry valley that runs through the area. The predominant large arable fields are bounded by low, trimmed hedgerows and infrequent woodland blocks, creating a feeling of relative openness". The proposed development is unsympathetic to the rural landscape and visual amenities of the area. As such the proposal would be contrary to Saved Policy D8, E1 and E6 of Basingstoke and Deane's (BDBC) Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011), Policy EM1 of the BDBC Emerging Local Plan (2011-2029), section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 5.15.** The unacceptably harmful impact to the heritage of the local area including the important rural setting in which the Roman road (which lies to the east and also bordering the south-east of the site following the line of the A30) and the milestone marker (close to the southern boundary of the site) are, Grade Two listed building (Southwood Farm House to the east of the site) ancient woodland including (names to be added) and which planning policy requires to be preserved and protected for the public benefit long-term.
- 5.16.** The development would represent a dangerous precedent for other similar major development schemes in the area and create the potential for coalescence with the

adopted and proposed settlement policy boundary of Basingstoke, i.e. unchecked urban sprawl in to the countryside’.

- 5.17.** The accumulative impact on infrastructure in the area particular when taking in to account proposals for large scale housing development on land at Kennel Farm and other sites being proposed in BDBC’s draft local plan.
- 5.18.** Creating potential for coalescence with the adopted and proposed settlement boundary of Basingstoke, i.e. unchecked urban sprawl in to the countryside. There is no proposed strategic gap between the adopted and proposed settlement boundary to the east and therefore very little to protect the sprawl continuing.
- 5.19.** High standard of design - as the proposed design is not in keeping with the character of the local area as defined in Design and Sustainability SPD - Appendix 14 and does not reflect traditional building styles, materials and colours the development is contrary to Saved Policy E1i Basingstoke and Deane's (BDBC) Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011) and Policy EM1 of Basingstoke and Deane’s Emerging Local Plan (2011- 2029)
- 5.20.** The proposed design presents a detrimental impact upon the visual amenity of locations such as the Wayfarers Walk and the grade-II listed Southwood Farm along with the Sun Inn (heritage asset). This shows minimal consideration for the Design and Sustainability SPD Appendix 14 which states "Consideration should be given to views of the countryside from the railway lines and from the Wayfarers Walk. Narrow country lanes should be protected from unnecessary improvements and urbanisation." These effects are therefore contrary to NPPF (paragraph 134).
- 5.21.** The setting of the adjacent conservation areas especially Dummer but including North Waltham would be detrimentally effected by the proposed development. Primarily the visual impact from Tower Hill and the cemetery in Dummer and this is against Saved Policy E3
- 5.22.** In proposals Traffic Assessment fails to take in to account to not take into account the potential severe impacts on the local highway network with resulting in unacceptable harm to the character and amenity of the rural roads and lanes in the parish of North Waltham along with neighbouring parishes. Conflicting with Saved Policy E1iii of the adopted local plan.
- 5.23.** Contrary to Saved Policy E1 the likely increase volumes of traffic using the rural road network will impact greatly upon the day-to-day lives and amenities of the local population. The likelihood of delivery lorries and emergency vehicles taking inappropriate routes will have a detrimental impact upon verges and banks in rural roads and cause congestion, along with limiting the local agricultural community to move plant and livestock.
- 5.24.** The proposed location was rejected under the SHLAA report compiled for Basingstoke and Deane’s Emerging Local Plan. The site was deemed unsuitable for Strategic Housing on the grounds of no planning history, being open countryside and reducing the gaps to adjoining settlements. All of which are valid material considerations with regards to the proposed development.

- 5.25.** Contrary to Saved Policy A1 the number of staff car parking spaces against the number of staff that will be on duty at any one time is inadequate before visitors even join the site. It is unknown how many would use public transport. There is no option for an overflow car park due to the rural setting and country lanes.
- 5.26.** The infrastructure contribution of the roundabout does not fully cover the impact to the rural lanes and the A30 further afield and the increased flow of traffic it will cause, against policy C1.
- 5.27.** The site location is too far into the rural environment for a footpath to be considered viable. The quote of 10% of staff to be walking to work when the next substantially housing development is over 1.5 KM away is not realistic and is against policy A2 and NPPF core planning principles.
- 5.28.** The likely substantial percentage volumes of staff members commuting by single occupancy car journeys to the development fails to meet the NPPF's Core Planning Principle of making "the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable" and is in conflict with Saved Policy A2 Basingstoke and Deane's (BDBC) Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011).
- 5.29.** Core planning principles should be plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings and positive vision for the future area; this is against what people voted for in the North Waltham Village plan.
- 5.30.** Planning should have a high degree of predictability, as the CCG has not proven the need this removes the predictability of future planning applications for housing if the NHS do not use the site.
- 5.31.** The proposed widening of Trenchards Lane to the east of the site in order to facility improved access to the secondary site entrance will result in the loss of a hedgerow that have been deemed 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, Schedule 1, Paragraph 7 in that at least 7 woody species listed in schedule 3 to the regulations are present (Oak, Whitebeam, Wild Privet, Dogwood, Hazel, Bramble, Hawthorn, Field Maple, Blackthorn, Rose), and connects to 2 other hedges. This hedgerow have also been deemed 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, Schedule 1, Paragraph 8 and is adjacent to a byway open to all traffic and a road used and a public path (Wayfarers Walk), has a bank on one side for at least 50% of its length, gaps do not exceed more than 10%, there is 12 standard trees in a length of 240 metres (at least on per 50 metres) and also has a parallel hedge within 15 metres. In addition to this hedgerow the others along the proposed section of widening all qualify under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) in that 80% of the hedgerow supports native species, and as such should be protected in line with the 1990 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).
- 5.32.** In addition to these planning based objections we also have a number of more ordinary concerns, for example the likelihood that the development is to grow in the future and the potential for the HHFT to wish to expand the facilities and services that the site provides resulting in the potential development of adjoining fields.

- 5.33.** The North Waltham Village Plans (2005, 2010), 100% respondents stated that they would like to keep the rural nature of North Waltham, and would like extensions in line with the rural nature of the village. It is therefore not surprising to find that in line with the desire to keep North Waltham rural, a large majority (92%) said no to Basingstoke expanding closer to North Waltham. There was little desire for any urban services, i.e. streetlights.
- 5.34.** The North Waltham Village plan noted that residents are not generally disturbed by noise and light except from the M3 and low flying aircraft. The proposed development would increase the disturbance levels as already noted and therefore have an adverse effect upon the quality of life for residents.
- 5.35.** It has been recorded in the village plan of (2010) that the residents would like to see more public footpaths around the village.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1.** Taking in to consideration the points raised by the Parish Councils review of the proposal North Waltham are formally objecting to planning application 15/01225/OUT. It is our belief that HHFT have undertaken a flawed consultation process. This has led to an application that is, in our opinion, ill informed, poorly constructed and has given rise to the large number of objections raised. We would request that the application is withdrawn or reconsidered, a proper consultation is undertaken including the review of brown field sites, and a revised application is submitted. As documented throughout this report our concerns relating to the proposal quite substantial, however the primary concerns are as follows;
- 6.1.1.** The principle of the proposed development does not accord planning policy, which presumes against development in the countryside. Exceptions have to be adequately justified and there is room to argue that the submission does not do so.
- 6.1.2.** The need for the health facility has not been adequately demonstrated. No evidence base has been supplied demonstrating inadequate response times for ambulances or lack of existing suitable facilities or whether these can be sufficiently upgraded to meet identified need.
- 6.1.3.** The need for the greenfield location has not been adequately demonstrated. At page the DAP Statement accepts that no Brownfield sites have been considered, which is in against the guidance of paragraph 111 of the NPPF, as it fails to prove the lack of suitable previously developed land. The cost of land allocated in the proposed Local Land is not sufficient reason for ruling out those locations and the proposed health facility should not be permitted at the cost of the character and amenity of the countryside, landscape, ecology and cultural heritage.
- 6.1.4.** The unacceptably harmful impact to the heritage of the local area including the important rural setting in which the Roman road (which lies to the east and also bordering the south-east of the site following the line of the A30) and the milestone marker (close to the southern boundary of the site) are, Grade Two listed building (Southwood Farm House to the east of the site) ancient woodland including, Ganderdown Copse, and which planning policy requires to be preserved and protected for the public benefit long-term.
- 6.1.5.** Unacceptable harmful visual impact to the landscape. The proposed scheme would be located on the hillside and, despite the proposed planting scheme; it would be prominent in the landscape and detrimental to public views from the A30, M3 and PROWS and, in particular, from The Wayfarers Walk and from the Dummer Conservation Area. This is acknowledged at page of the application Design & Access Statement. The proposed scheme, including the planting, would block views, that currently exist, through the site to the surrounding countryside that are currently available and are much valued by local (residential and business) and visiting populations (working and tourist/leisure). The lighting impact in the area would be likely to increase. Removing the darkened night environment that is required for many of the stargazers in the area.

- 6.1.6.** Unacceptable harmful external/environmental impacts including those arising from traffic impacts and noise due to the amount and type of vehicles including Ambulances (with sirens and flashing lights) and supply lorries. A proportion of staff, patient, visitor and supply vehicles are likely to use inappropriate routes and roads to reach the site through the widespread use of GPS technology. It would be very difficult to control this by condition. Especially from the settlements to the north of the proposed site, i.e. Kingsclear and Overton where the direct route would be through North Waltham. It should be noted, that all the grade one and listed building in the village have no foundations and will be adversely affected by the increased volume of traffic.
- 6.1.7.** Unacceptable harmful impacts to the setting of landscape and cultural heritage including Listed buildings and monuments and the Dummer Conservation Area and proximity to the North Wessex AONB.
- 6.1.8.** In relation to section 11 of the NPPF, the proposed development fails to protect or enhance a valued landscape. It impacts greatly on the biodiversity of the area failing to provide a net gain and thus does not contribute to the government's commitment to establishing coherent ecological networks. As a result of a lack of a valid sequential site assessment the proposal fails to demonstrate that the impacts of developing the proposed greenfield site are justifiable in comparison to a those on brownfield site (paragraph 111), or one of lower agricultural value (paragraph 112).
- 6.1.9.** The proposed development is contrary to Paragraph 109 and 123 of the NPP because: 'The amount of built form and other operational development, including hard-standing around the buildings, will result in obtrusive features in the open landscape given the scale and complexity of the proposal'
- 6.1.10.** The proposed development would result in the loss of, although not limited to, the following highly valued landscape assets;
- Rural countryside with a feeling of relative openness.
 - Culturally and ecologically important Hedgerows.
 - Local biodiversity.
 - Valuable agricultural land and soils vital to crop production and to the economy and food production.
 - A landscape of long distance views and traditional settlement forms.
- 6.1.11.** This application against all of the following policies;
- NPPF – paragraphs 111, 24 (section 11, section 12)
 - North Waltham Village Plans (2005, 2010)
 - BDBC Local Plan Saved Policies A1, A2, C1, D8, D9, E1(i)(iii), E3, E6
 - BDBC Emerging Local Plan EM1
 - Section 66 – of the Planning (Listed buildings and conservation areas Act (1990)
 - Design and Sustainability - SPD Appendix 14

- SHLAA Report in Basingstoke and Deane's Local Plan
- Hedgerow regulations 1997 – Schedule 1 Paragraph 7 and 8
- 1990 Convention on Biological Diversity

BASINGSTOKE & DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 07/10/2015

UPDATE

MAJORS

Item No	Ref No	Address	Ward Councillor	Recommendation
1	15/01225/OUT	Land West Of Ganderdown Copse, Winchester Road, Dummer Oakley And North Waltham	Cllr Diane Taylor Cllr Rob Golding Cllr Stuart Frost	Approve subject to Legal Agreement

Agenda Page: 1

Officer Presenting: Katherine Fitzherbert-Green

Parish/Town Council: Dummer Parish - Julian Jones, North Waltham Parish Council

Objectors: Mr J Pilcher (CPRE), Heather Rainbow (Cycle Basingstoke)

In Support: Mary Edwards (HHFT Chief Executive), Mike Harris (Agent), Colin White (Connect Consultants), James Leamon (Aecom)

Ward Councillor: Councillor S Frost, Councillor R Golding

Visiting Councillor: Councillor P Harvey

Viewing Panel

At the request of the local ward councillor the Viewing Panel approached the application site from the north (Oakley) following the route of Trenchard Lane south towards the site.

The Viewing Panel was met on site by the applicant's representatives and a representative of Dummer Parish Council. The proposals were explained to the Panel, noting the fact that the buildings would be set within the landscape within well landscaped grounds. The Panel noted that the northeastern part of the site was its highest point with the land dropping away southwest to the A30.

Members were advised that access to the site would be from the A30. An emergency gated access would also be provided onto Trenchard Lane adjacent to the proposed ambulance station.

The Dummer Parish Council representative asked members to note the location of 3 oak trees along the northeastern boundary together with their height in relation to the proposed hospital buildings.

The Viewing Panel continued along Trenchard Lane (southwards) to the A30 where they noted that improvements are proposed for the junction of Trenchard Lane with

the A30. The Panel then travelled along the A30 southwestwards and noted the site and the fact that the land rises away from the main road. Members noted the location of the proposed roundabout access into the site.

At the request of Dummer Parish Council, the Viewing Panel then approached Dummer from the A30 and noted the views across to the site from Dummer, having walked along the public footpath to fields to the rear of properties in Tower Hill. Members noted the oak trees on the site's northeastern boundary and the fact that the land rises from the A30 up to the trees. Members noted the location of the M3 adjacent to the A30.

The Dummer Parish Council representative advised the Panel that the view from the rear of the properties at Tower Hill was recognised as an important vista in the Dummer Conservation Area appraisal. It was agreed with the representative of Dummer Parish Council that the Panel did not need to view the site (as had been requested) from the graveyard, because the views of the application site from that location were limited.

Update

North Waltham Parish Council:

CTU Traffic Issues and proposed solutions

The following is a list of issues and potential mitigating factors. They generally refer to concerns about the traffic flow in and around the proposed site. Also included in the documents is a map that illustrates locations of signs to help manage traffic flow [map not included].

The proposed design of sign is purely illustrative as it is accepted that the design may need to be along the lines of coercing drivers to take a preferred route rather than preventing them from using the less desired roads.

- 1) Clear signs indicating the low bridge down Trenchard Lane.
- 2) Make sure that the complex is not referred to North Waltham Hospital and that name North Waltham is not included in any address, directions or any other literature pertaining to the site.
- 3) The site is issued its own postcode to differentiate it from any to the surrounding villages.
- 4) Clear signs deterring drivers from exiting the A303 and using the A30 to access the site, instead directing them to use the M3.
- 5) Improvement of visibility on the north bound exit slip road of M3 Junction 7, as there is recorded incidents of vehicle joining the roundabout at speed.
- 6) Improved layout of the filter lane from the M3 turning south bound onto the A30 to allow for the passage of emergency vehicles in heavy traffic, presently they is nowhere of other traffic to manoeuvre to allow and ambulance through.
- 7) Provision at the proposed new roundabout on the A30 to allow for other road users to manoeuvre out of the way of emergency vehicles moving at speed.
- 8) Major review of junction between A30 and A33 at Flowerpots Junction,

- known black spot with a number of recorded fatalities, due to vehicles travelling at speed.
- 9) Improved layout of two adjacent T-junctions to allow access to and from the A30 with increased volumes of traffic. At present there is a requirement, when turning right, for a driver to position themselves in the middle of fast moving traffic.
 - 10) Make sure that there is clear indication that there is no access to the hospital via Maidenthorne Lane.
 - 11) Clear signs in and around Whitchurch that the preferred route to the hospital site is via the A303/M3 rather than the B3400.
 - 12) Clear signs that there is no access to the hospital via the country lane from the B3400, be this as either explicit not access signs or more coercive signs indicating a preferred route via Basingstoke.
 - 13) Signs in Basingstoke indicating the preferred route from across the settlement is along the A30 rather than the B3400 and through Oakley
 - 14) Parking restrictions along the A30, in the form of Yellow lines, to prevent the public using verges/roadside parking rather than that provided by the site.
 - 15) Improved layout of the filter lane from the A30 continuing south bound on the A30 to allow for the passage of emergency vehicles in heavy traffic, presently they is nowhere of other traffic to manoeuvre to allow and ambulance through.
 - 16) Improved layout of the filter lane from the A30 continuing north bound turning towards the M3 to allow for the passage of emergency vehicles in heavy traffic, presently they is nowhere of other traffic to manoeuvre to allow and ambulance through.
 - 17) Signs in and around M3 junction 9 (Winnell Interchange) indicating the preferred route to the site is via the M3 rather than the A33.

Public Observations

Further representations have been received to the planning application since the completion of the Agenda. These comprise three letters, with the contents summarised as follows:

Position Statement of the Clinical Commissioning Group

- An article was presented in the Hampshire Chronicle and the local TV News regarding the development proposal;
- Understand that any uncertainties over the likelihood of financial support for this proposal are irrelevant to any planning decision;
- The Committee however may feel it appropriate to delay the decision on the application and may look for a good planning justification for proposing such a delay;
- This is a controversial strategic application Would it not be more helpful, fair and transparent to delay the application going to committee until the HHFT have funding and sufficient evidence this is the right option for the NHS and one the Commissioners will support?
- HHFT have not got backing of the funding commissioners, the CCGs have not given this as a preferred option or undertaken any public consultation in the area;
- The CCG will be looking at a programme wide delivery of all services (i.e.

- social care, critical care etc.) and are looking at all possible options;
- It has been revealed that the CCG's joint board recommendation is not to move forward on Public Consultation as the option (CTH) is not affordable;
- If the CCG's move to other options to deliver this service (i.e. co-locate on existing sites, or a smaller Centralised Service), the sequential requirement to look at brownfield sites would have been relevant;
- The only reason for the CTH location is the absence of large enough brownfield sites;
- With the CCG's looking again at design, costs, location for these services, this planning requirement may apply?

Submission Local Plan

- Paragraph 216 of the NPPF discourages over-reliance on emerging un-tested planning policies in the development control process and warns that emerging policies should not be relied upon where "there are unresolved objections to relevant policies";
- The application makes extensive reference to the emerging but unapproved Local Plan in support of its sustainability;
- The Basingstoke South West Action Group and others will be arguing at the upcoming EiP that the Plan is unsound in its reliance on a west/southwest focus for development;
- These are "unresolved objections" and the Committee has every right to delay any decision on this application until critical objections are resolved by the Inspector at the EiP.

Planning Precedent

- Would a planning refusal for the Sun Inn, Winchester Road (planning ref BDB/63633, dated 13/07/2006) to provide letting rooms set a precedent with the absence of sufficiently evidenced need for a commercial hotel or any sequential planning requirement?
- The Local Planning Authority have a duty to protect our countryside.

Other matters

- Concern expressed regarding delayed release of the Agenda;
- Concern expressed regarding the opportunities available for speakers at Committee, particularly in relation to this large scale application. It is suggested that it would be transparent and fair for all people (6 in number) registered were able to speak;
- Request that the 4 minute rule for speaking be overturned.

Comments have additionally been received from the Basingstoke and Deane Area - Access for All Working Group. Comments are provided in summary:-

- The group have met with Mary Edwards and plan to meet with other members of her team and considered proposals for transport to and from the new site;
- Feel there are not enough car parking spaces;
- cycling proposals are idealistic and may not be practical for staff on 12 hour shifts;
- There may be a few cyclists and facilities should be provided for them. This aspect has been over-emphasised;
- Bus and minibus proposals look reasonable providing a low floor bus is

- provided, and not just at peak times;
- There will not be as many visitors to this facility, but a fair number will need to be catered for given with babies born and cancer treatments undertaken.

Officer Comment

In relation to the points raised in additional representations above the planning application has been subject to recent publicity following a press release dated 23rd September 2015 from the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) setting out their current position in relation to the proposed development. In summary, this press release states:

- work has been undertaken with the HHFT over the last two years to build a new critical treatment hospital near the M3;
- the CCG has reviewed its financial position and is recommending to the Governing Bodies that this proposal cannot go forward to formal consultation at present;
- the CCG is recommending the launch of a 'whole system' programme to design health and social care across north and mid Hampshire to encompass acute, community, mental health, primary and social care in a model which is high quality and affordable;
- the future of acute care will be a significant part of this programme;
- the Commissioners accept a need to change, which includes the centralisation of certain services;
- there are options, but it is still possible that a new critical treatment hospital near junction 7 of the M3 might emerge as part of the preferred option and would be part of the public consultation at that time.

In response to the CCG press release, the Applicant's Agent has provided a representation to the application. In summary, this states:

- the strategic goal of Hampshire Hospitals is to improve medical services for the population it serves across north and mid-Hampshire. The CTH is crucial to delivering that goal;
- the proposal for the CTH has been developed by the HHFT as expert providers of acute hospital services in conjunction with GP leaders;
- the principle of centralising services to make care better and safer has been supported by the CCGs;
- the CTH will ensure 24/7 consultant-delivered treatment for patients with life threatening conditions and the CTC will provide local access to radiotherapy and other cancer services;
- proposals reduce the cost of delivering those hospital services compared to current costs;
- the CCG has a role to purchase a wide range of healthcare services and is challenged with meeting increasing health needs;
- the CCG needs to plan for the future so that they can afford to buy all the healthcare required for their population, including mental health, community care and hospital care;
- the Hampshire Hospitals believe that centralising the most acute services into the CTH could facilitate change that would help with this;

- it will be a matter for the CCG to determine the timing of necessary formal public consultation process;
- progressing the planning application places the HHFT at the best possible position to move forwards swiftly to implement improved services following the consultation process, in the event of a positive outcome;
- Hampshire Hospitals is clear that planning approval will assure the local population in a future public consultation that the proposal for centralising acute service has a viable solution, as well as being the right clinical and financial solution.

For Members information, the relationship between the CCG and HHFT and the respective consultation processes is provided on page 76 of the Agenda and this position has not changed.

All other additional matters raised in representations that are material to the consideration of the planning application have been addressed in the main report. With regards to the specific request for signage from North Waltham Parish Council in their additional response the recommendation for approval of the application includes a requirement for a Section 106 Agreement to include a Routeing and Signage Strategy which will be drawn up in consultation with Hampshire County Council as the Highway Authority. The points raised by North Waltham Parish Council can be passed forward for consideration as part of that process.

Recommendation

Revision to condition 6 to read:

Notwithstanding details shown on the approved drawings, no development shall commence on site pursuant to the elements of the approved scheme hereby granted full planning permission until full details of the types, textures and colours of all external materials to be used for those elements, including colour of mortar, together with samples, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Notwithstanding any details submitted at the Reserved Matters stage, no development shall commence on site pursuant to the elements of the approved scheme hereby granted outline planning permission until full details of the types, textures and colours of all external materials to be used for those elements, including colour of mortar, together with samples, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the details so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Saved Policy E1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan 1996- 2011. Details are required in the absence of being provided to accompany the planning submission.