

## **Bentley Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 14 Consultation**

#### **Feedback from members of the public**

#### **Overview**

This report outlines the feedback received from members of the public during the Regulation 14 Consultation. Whilst most of the comments were given on the feedback forms following the consultation events held on 21<sup>st</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> January (contained in Schedules A & B), members of the public also provided general comments from reviewing the draft Neighbourhood Plan (contained in Schedule C). This report highlights the common themes raised by members of the public. Comments in full are set out in the Schedules.

#### **Themes**

1. Conservation Area – concern that the views to the south of the old A31 should be preserved. The Plan should clarify the extent of the area proposed for its expansion opposite the Recreation Ground. Suggestion that the area to the west of the village should also form part of the CA.
2. Traffic – concern about the impact development will have on traffic, in particular at the cross roads between Hole Lane and the old A31 and in School Lane.
3. Infrastructure – concern that any development would put pressure on existing services in the village, most notably the school, doctor's surgery, sewage and station parking.
4. Footpaths/bridleways – concern that these should be adequate and well maintained.
5. School – concern that it is full to capacity. Any expansion to the north of the site may reduce the outside play space that the children currently enjoy.
6. Site identified for development in School Lane – concern about the number of houses to be built and the effect that they may have on the traffic congestion in School Lane.
7. The line of the settlement policy boundary in two places crosses a back garden – at both the eastern and western boundary of the settlement policy boundary, it is drawn across a back garden. Two residents questioned this.

## Schedule A

### Comments from members of the public attending the Consultation Event on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2015

Number of attendees: 44

Number of completed questionnaires: 31

Number of attendees broadly in agreement with draft NP: 30

Number of attendees disagreed with draft NP: 1

A1	The traffic in Bentley has got far too heavy and potentially as dangerous as before the by-pass. Capacity especially at the school is impossible and frightening. School is at full capacity.
A2	<p>The pathways etc mentioned must have a hard surface finish like tarmac. Existing pathways are not suitable in winter. Old people, cycles, prams could not negotiate as is.</p> <p>Eggars Field only has a pavement on one side. Since it was built further houses have been built. If plans re the 37 houses behind the doctors [surgery] are built then one pavement with overgrown hedges is not adequate.</p>
A3	Good idea in principle to protect the views. Station parking is a big problem if it can be corrected.
A4	Commitment to Eastbound access to A31 is going to be very important.
A5	We have concerns regarding traffic into Hole Lane. Sewers and drainage will not cope.
A6	Thank you to our Parish Council for all their time and effort that has gone into the NP. What an injustice that the District Council granted outline planning to the Somerset Field proposal before the wishes of Bentley were properly considered and formulated by the NP. Consideration must be granted to the roads going through Bentley. The traffic is already causing problems. And the crossroads at the bottom of Hole Lane is a potential accident spot.
A7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy 9 refers to Broadband. It should be broader to refer to communications – aim being to keep at the forefront of emerging comms. Technology (e.g. mobile, wireless) rather than tied to 1.</li> <li>2. Policy 2 – School Lane/10 houses. Having just won the battle to get house 1 on the old bungalow site (x3) to front straight onto School Lane how can 10 be accommodated without creating a close or similar? The School Lane land is not suitable for housing. The lane is narrow and already congested during school drop off and pick up times. It would be far better to use the land behind Eggars Field and have the entrance to the new housing through Eggars Field.</li> <li>3. The Plan states it would improve the footpaths and cycle ways. I would like to see a proper bridleway between the end of Rectory Lane and Station Road that people could use to walk or cycle to the Station. This would reduce the traffic to the village.</li> </ol>
A8	Please mini roundabout junction Hole Lane/Main Road.
A9	The number of houses planned has been greatly reduced. The vistas have been saved, overall this is the best solution.
A10	No comments to make, happy with the plan.
A11	I think that you have thought of everything. Well done and thank you.

A12	I accept that some degree of development within Bentley is required, however the District Council's approach is ill considered and crude. The Bentley NP is a far more elegant solution to balance housing needs with an environmental touch which protects the rural nature and harmonious aspects of the village.
A13	Needs fall back i.e. eggs in one basket on one site to provide. Suggested "policy" or infill to cover. Wish list needs to be seen to be achievable for car parking etc, so that funds collected from developers' contributions are suitably used. Review plans prepared for Rec.Pavilion and legal challenges on lease with Scouts.
A14	Policy 3 Design and Development Principle Viewpoint should be extended to the western boundary of the village to protect the open views when entering of exiting the village. Policy 4 the area designated for possible future community facilities on the recreation ground appears rather large in scale and if fully utilised would spoil the openness of this part of the village.
A15	I think the draft plan is a preferable way forward to facilitate the requirement to have these extra houses built here. The community projects are a very good idea – whether or not we have the extra houses built. I am very much in favour of this plan being promoted as an alternative to the council's ideas.
A16	Well thought out plan with 14 good community projects.
A17	The plan seems to meet village needs very well.
A18	Excellent piece of work!
A19	Any development south of the Old A31 will spoil the unique nature of the village. There has to be conservation around the cross roads area. I know that I have a vested interest in this as my house overlooks the field, but this is a unique area.
A20	Bentley is one of the few villages left that has shop, post office and open green spaces with unassailed views over the countryside. The fields to the south of the Old A31 must be preserved and the new houses spread around the existing "newer" houses.

## Schedule B

### Comments from members of the public attending the Consultation Event on 24th January 2015

Number of attendees: 73

Number of completed questionnaires: 55

Number of attendees broadly in agreement with draft NP: 55

Number of attendees disagreed with draft NP: 0

B1	No further planning decisions should be made until the plan has been finished.
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We need to be able to maintain what we have before “new” comes in e.g. roads, footpaths (pavements).</li> <li>- Parking at the station and near the shop</li> <li>- We need to hold EHDC accountable for their own policy compliance to ensure no development over 12 units comes forward.</li> <li>- Also there are no more burial plots in the churchyard!</li> </ul>
B3	How is the infrastructure going to cope? Local school, local doctors, country lanes, sewage, parking at the station.
B4	I support the idea of new development being contained within existing development areas. I would be keen to get involved with helping to improve biodiversity.
B5	Carry on the good work. Many thanks.
B6	Thank you all for putting this together. I think that you have done an excellent job!
B7	Having seen the careful consideration and wide ranging soundings which the working party took in preparing the Plan, I am confident this is a good representation of feelings in the village on how the future development of this area should be shaped.
B8	I would like to request that the Policy 3 ..... extended west along the main village road to the west of Crocks Cottages and the South of Pax Hill Lane and Holmwood Cottages. Otherwise good effort under trying circumstances. Thanks for your good work.
B9	An excellent piece of work. I confess I still hope that Somerset Field will not satisfy the conditions! However, this is no doubt the best solution in present circumstances. A credit to the Steering Group and Jacqueline and the Chairman Chris Mace.
B10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to keep village feel, so agree smaller developments are needed.</li> <li>- As and when the village does grow, need to invest in infrastructure including drainage to prevent flooding.</li> <li>- Any new house to have adequate car parking.</li> </ul>
B11	Area protected under the plan should, if possible, be extended to cover neighbouring fields more forcibly to protect the wider boundary. “Hub” provision should provide a larger space for Scouts. Not just set as same space. Provision should also be made to control “manipulative” building such as 4 Oakway.... Where multiple applications are made to gain unrequired goals.
B12	I support the idea of the Neighbourhood Plan and would hope that this can be in place, or at least considered before any further planning applications are submitted. I broadly agree with the settlement boundary proposed.
B13	Interested to know further details about options for traffic calming measures at Main Road/Hole Lane.
B14	An excellent report which has been well co-ordinated and supported by the community. Has my full support, makes me feel proud to live in Bentley.
B15	Any further development must be closely monitored and curtailed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Until the plan is adopted.</li> <li>- The essence of the village is not destroyed.</li> <li>- The infrastructure can support any development however small.</li> </ul>
B16	Well done having got something in place and thank you for explaining so well.
B17	My only concern is the potential for additional traffic along School Lane particularly at drop off and pick up times for school. Road is already dangerous with vehicles parking anywhere.
B18	Roundabout at cross roads to slow down traffic? Ref project 9. Put Bentley Station area in Bentley Parish/plan as it is directly involved in development impact.
B19	Does it take into account further planning requirements?
B20	Well done the Steering Group. However, I have concerns about the process of this plan. Re:37 houses at Somerset Field – outline permission granted . Once that happened shouldn't the PC/Steering Group have re-started consultations with the village? Much work was done over the summer. This work was negated by Somerset Field.
B21	Broadband speed.
B22	Not happy about access onto bypass- slip road. Restrict size of sewerage works (could prevent future housing). Land opposite the Pollards formerly a golf course. Monty had little to do with the village. Why conservation area excluded from strip between Prestons and Green Farm. Road surface to be improved east and west of village on bypass (reduce noise level). In development prevent off road car parking.
B23	If Somerset Field does not pass all the water and service problems, it would be good to reduce the house numbers there and offer another location e.g. Blaydens Field above Longcroft. This would keep a “village like” small development grouping.
B24	Froyle needs its own school and probably also its own GP Surgery. Bentley will be unable to cope.
B25	A slight concern about Policy 5 which safeguards land to the north of the school for possible expansion. At the moment the land marked is the school play area and forest, which I consider to be valuable resource for the school. Expansion within the current school boundary would stand to create a school with lots of classrooms and no outdoor space.
B26	Still worried that even with a plan, the village won't have its say into the future.
B27	Very much in agreement with the proposed plans particularly from an infrastructure point of view i.e. station parking, improve/expand school/GP etc. Would like the plan to state benefit for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders as the current bridleways are non-existent.
B28	Broadly in favour but worry about the infrastructure school, doctors, roads etc. We live on the old A31 and since the bypass was completed have seen a steady increase in traffic and can only imagine the gridlock lots of building might bring. Basically we want Bentley to stay as a village and not another Hollybourne or Four Marks!
B29	The views – I think the other side of the main road should be considered in more detail. It would balance the village.
B30	I feel especially strongly about keeping the views across the south of the village. Thanks for all the hard work that has gone into this – great job!
B31	All good.
B32	Protection of the fields on the south side of the road is a most important consideration for the spacious character of Bentley. Even if I were not a resident on the road, there is no doubt that as a resident of 30 years, I would feel the same.

## Schedule C

### General comments from members of the public

C1	<p>Many thanks for the draft, a most impressive piece of work. My only substantial comment concerns the proposal to extend the Conservation Area, which of course I fully support. However, the Plan C map giving the shaded areas of proposed increase does not seem to embrace the area south of the recreation ground, although I think the text states that this area should be included. As you know, this was where the Bay Tree Cottage development was proposed and thankfully refused (appeal pending?), so it is obviously important to include it.</p> <p>On points of detail, only three:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 2.14 – remove the word “either”, as there is no “or” (Listed Buildings)</li> <li>2. Para 3.5 – Bentley is “to the north” of the SDNP, not “in the north” of SDNP.</li> <li>3. Policy 6v – it is now River Road not Station Road.</li> </ol>
C2	<p>I find the Plan very heavy-going despite having been involved with discussions and some drafting. The required bureaucratic style makes it particularly indigestible and I do wonder how many people will bother to find and tackle the Plan. Most importantly, it is hard to identify what we are being asked to support – what matters and what does not?</p> <p>The Newsletter is certainly informative and an easier read but it does not tell me what I will be voting about.</p> <p>By choice no one would issue such documents just before Christmas with so much else to occupy people’s minds. No doubt the timing was unavoidable but, with no obvious motivation to read and react, I have the uneasy feeling that many, like me, will put it all to one side and then forget about it.</p> <p>You have, however, organised ‘Consultation Days’ in January and this should be the golden opportunity to take people to the heart of the matter using comprehensible prose I am sure that you can achieve the latter but I am really worried about the former. The ‘Vision for Bentley in 2028’, ‘The Eleven Key Objectives to achieve this Vision’ and ‘The Twelve Key Planning Policies’ (apart from sounding like a Christmas Carol) are sterling ambitions that represent the wishes of residents but do they stand up to reality?</p> <p>Look at the first two Key Objectives.</p> <p>To achieve growth through a few, smaller developments rather than one or more large development.</p> <p>To develop on a scale of 8 to 12 dwellings in separate pockets connected to the Village with housing to meet local needs, particularly for local elderly downsizers.</p> <p>Then explain how Somerset Field has come about and what it augurs for the future.</p> <p>Look at the first Planning Policy.</p>

	<p>To define a new settlement boundary for Bentley within which development can only take place (this boundary will be modified to include the proposed development of 37 houses in Somerset Field once ratified by EHDC).</p> <p>Then explain the moving Settlement Boundary and what confidence this gives us for the future.</p> <p>Traffic and Parking are amongst the leading concerns of residents. But it appears that all that matters to EHDC is the number of new houses that can be built.</p> <p>I would hope to see something like the following (albeit rather more convincing) before the Consultation Days.</p>
C3	<p>Thanks for the email. As I think you know, unfortunately I will not be able to make any of the events you mention. I have finished “my homework” and attach an edited version of the BNP.</p> <p>Mostly relatively minor editing issues. A few of points of substance however are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think it would greatly help when it comes to the vote if an Executive Summary could be prepared;</li> <li>• Policies are listed without explaining what they are;</li> <li>• I believe it is important to have drainage strategies independently checked against expected rainfall in a 100 year + 30% event. BPC needs to independently verify any calculations of both the EHDC and the developer.</li> </ul> <p>Hope this helps.</p> <p>Look forward to hearing the outcome of the consultations.</p>
C4	<p>I have read through the BPNP 2015-2028 Draft Pre-Submission Plan, and would like to take this opportunity to pass on my congratulations to you, the Steering Group and the Working parties for the excellent and speedy production of this important and helpful document.</p> <p>I have a few points which the editors/BPC might like to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You will remember that I mentioned the references to the Conservation Area in the Neighbourhood Plan. I attach a plan (dated 9/2/2012) and letter from EHDC which I received and circulated in February 2012. The Plan is slightly different to the one included as Plan C, for instance the agreed extension included a patch west of Crocks Farm Cottages, and a crescent shaped bit immediately east of Crocks Farm. I entirely agree with the references to the Conservation Area, but suggest that clarity would be improved by the addition, at the end of paragraph 2.12, of the words “referred to in paragraph 5.5”.</li> <li>2. In paragraph 2.26, would the addition of the following sentence, after the word ‘Froyle’, be helpful? “<i>In addition, hundreds of additional vehicle movements at</i></li> </ol>

	<p><i>the Crossroads have been projected, as the Whitehill Bordon Eco-Town development of up to 4000 dwellings over the next 13 years progresses."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Paragraph 2.27. "Lane" should be "Road".</li> <li>4. In the table in paragraph 2.31, what actually happened at Longcroft was that the original 11 council house were pulled down and replaced by 22 new dwellings.</li> <li>5. In paragraph 3.12, may I suggest an unobtrusive and uncensorious alteration, to ensure that a reader of the document in a few years time will have a better appreciation of the planning and development difficulties that Bentley residents and the Parish Council have experienced since early in 2014, and fits in with the content particularly of paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10:   <i>"However, due to the coming forward in 2014 of a large development in Bentley on a site not previously identified by the village, some of the sites originally identified by the community in the LIPS document have <del>since</del> had to be changed. The Neighbourhood Plan will now....."</i> </li> <li>6. Policy 6: Open Spaces on page 25. "Station" should be "River"   I wonder whether the Old Recreation Ground be mentioned? </li> <li>7. Policy 11:re affordable housing. There would be merit in mentioning that BPC will have or should have input into the setting of the criteria against which occupants of new affordable housing in Bentley will be selected.</li> <li>8. Will BPC make changes to the BPNP to reflect the very real possibility of successful appeals being made by developers against refusals by EHDC, e.g re land west of Bay Tree Cottage?</li> <li>9. Will the BPNP need amendment or strengthening for additional planning applications for even more dwellings being submitted e.g. land east of Hole Lane?</li> <li>10. Should not the 12 dwellings permitted but not yet built at Pax Hill be taken into account in the BPNP.</li> </ol>
C5	<p>I am broadly in agreement with the objectives, planning policies and community projects set out in the draft Neighbourhood Plan but do have the following comments to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy 2 - 4.11 Land off School Lane – "up to 10 dwellings" is, in my opinion, an excessive number of dwellings if it's the Plan's intention to retain the rural nature of the village and maintain the views and character of the rural lanes. Previous planning regulations have stipulated that development up School Lane should retain the characteristic linear frontage onto the lane (as was insisted for the development of 3 new houses at the Honeywood site). There is no way this will be achievable for 10 houses on the proposed plot. It will have to be a close type development which will not be in character with other properties up that section of School Lane.</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. 2.0 Amenities – to quote “the excellent school has no space for more pupils”. Where, in that case, are all the primary aged children from the new development in Upper Froyle and the proposed pockets of new housing in Bentley meant to go if the school already has no space?</li> <li>3. 2.28 Parking – to quote “woefully inadequate and dangerous”. This must be a serious consideration and will need addressing. In addition to the new houses already being built in Upper Froyle and those proposed in Bentley, the number of commuters wanting to use and park at Bentley station, additional school traffic and more cars in general (on average 2 per household) will necessitate better and additional parking facilities at the station, school/recreation ground and by the shop.</li> <li>4. Policy 5 - 4.19 Education – ditto above with regard to school parking and drop-off facilities. If the school size is increased to accommodate additional pupils, then transport arrangements must be addressed to match the increased numbers.</li> <li>5. Policy 9 – this shouldn’t just be restricted to better broadband but should also support any other form of improved communication such as wi-fi.</li> <li>6. 2.29 Transport - consideration should be given to improving bus services to and from the village in the evenings and at weekends. One of the reasons so few people use the bus to get to work must be because the service is infrequent and doesn’t operate beyond early evening. Likewise it would be great if the last train back to Alton left Waterloo later than 11:27pm and for lighting to be improved from the station to the main part of Bentley which might encourage people to walk rather than take their car.</li> </ol>
C6	<p>I was unable to attend either of the public sessions I'm afraid but I have viewed the draft plan and would like to provide the following comment.</p> <p>In relation the expansion of Bentley Industrial Centre I feel that the building of further units needs to be carefully controlled in terms of the type of business it attracts and the visual impact on both the site and the residents of Poplar Cottages. The recent leasing of a unit by a courier caused traffic chaos and safety issues with extremely large heavy goods vehicles attempting to negotiate the village and speeding delivery vans exiting the estate at peak times. The location of the Centre and the proximity of its entrance to the hub of the village renders it unsuitable for such use.</p> <p>My recommendation is that if development is necessary then it is limited to low level office style facilities. These should use natural materials, such as timber and slate, to blend more conservatively into the surrounding area rather than the steel clad monstrosities that currently occupy the site. The proposed development of the site at Crocks Farm Cottages is an excellent example of sensitive design in-keeping with the surrounding area in a 'farm building' style. This style of building attracts smaller local entrepreneurial and start-up type businesses it would be favourable to encourage in the area, particularly if they originate in the village.</p> <p>I hope the Neighbourhood Plan is accepted by the local authority and residents are given some control in the future of Bentley.</p>
C7	<p>Apologies that i was un able to attend the public consultation on the Bentley neighbourhood plan last Saturday, I have however had time to review it over the last couple of days and would like to offer my full support for this plan and its contents.</p>

C8	<p>I'm sorry I was unable to attend the recent meeting as I am currently on holiday outside UK but I do give all your comments my full support as we hope you will ours again at the Broad view Farm application.</p>
C9	<p>The Plan reads as a highly competent and comprehensive document, obviously the outcome of a great deal of hard and detailed work. Bentley is fortunate to have villagers willing to undertake such time consuming work and the rest of us should be suitably grateful.</p> <p>That said, it is difficult for villagers to comment because by definition they know so much less about the Plan and process than those involved. Comment is thus very much by exception.</p> <p>But first, one general point. Those drafting the Plan know infinitely more about Bentley than the people reading it whose decisions could be vital to our future. Please re-read the Plan thinking constantly whether something in it may be entirely reasonable and implicitly understandable to Bentley people but still might lead an outsider to draw an unlooked for wrong conclusion with negative consequences. Point 2.13 is an example (covered below).</p> <p>Comments are in Plan order for ease of reference, not necessarily in order of importance. Hopefully that will be obvious from the context.</p> <p><b>Accuracy of Detail</b></p> <p>Absolutely essential. We do not want some jobsworth being able to throw doubt on the Plan by being able to say: "Huh, we can't give any weight to this, they can't even get their dates right!". Points 2.12 and 2.31 refer. Did the by-pass open in 1995 etc, etc?</p> <p><b>Approaches to Bentley</b></p> <p>We understand completely why 2.13 is written as it is. But it could lead to a reader believing that the Northern approach was not rural in character and worse, not thought of to be of importance. In fact, it is probably the most rural of the four approaches and any extension to the village to the North could be calamitous for Hole Lane, which is by far the most visually interesting and important in many ways of the four roads into/out of Bentley. Therefore we think that it is vital to re-phrase 2.13 to include the Northern approach.</p> <p><b>2.15</b> – No argument with the sentiment, but very poor quality/inappropriate developments have been allowed in the Conservation Area in recent times and the 37 house development drives a coach and horses through this point. Everyone involved must be much, much tougher in future if this point is to be anything but a pious hope.</p> <p><b>2.16</b> – The three cottages south of the main road are Crocks Farm Cottages. The two opposite north of the road are Crocks Cottages.</p> <p><b>2.26</b> – We are concerned about the phrasing of this point. Volume, speed and noise of traffic are unacceptable now. The final sentence would not mean much to an outside reader. There have been no serious attempts at traffic calming because effective change will only come with physical change to the roads concerned. This is not to downplay the</p>

	<p>efforts which have been made – signage, change in speed limit – but these will never have the degree of impact needed.</p> <p><b>2.31/2.32</b> – we have concerns about both the accuracy of detail and the layout of the table at 2.31 and the comment at 2.32. Presumably the object is to leave the reader thinking that Bentley has already had considerable expansion, so is not nimby, with the possible further implication that all (most?) of the sensibly available option have already been taken up.</p> <p>Next we need to tell the outside reader where the new build has taken place. We suggest listing not by date order but by general location by group, as follows:</p> <p>Village centre: Eggars Field 1 &amp; 2, Broadlands - 76 houses.  Hole Lane and side roads: Hole Lane, Oakway, Babs Field, Longcroft, Bonners Field – 89 houses.  Main Road: Main Road, Crocks Farm – 21 houses</p> <p>The above totals exclude the “others” (3 houses) because we cannot identify their location. Whatever form the table takes we suggest that a total is important, in this case 199 or 46% of the total housing stock.</p> <p>The justification for the Hole Lane and Main Road groups is that the developments listed would not have been envisaged had the two thorough fares not existed and that is where all the traffic movements feed in and out of.</p> <p>Doctor’s Field is excluded from the above because it remains as a separate entity.</p> <p>We have a measure of concern about some of the numbers and dates in the table, viz:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some Hole Lane houses are much later than the 1960s</li> <li>• Eggars Field (1) started in 1970s</li> <li>• We think Broadlands may have been earlier than 1990s</li> <li>• Main Road number of houses much underestimated and opening dated much too late. We have not carried out a vision reminder check but we estimate 24 houses excluding Crocks Farm’s 9. Earliest dated 1970s, maybe 1960s.</li> <li>• We think “others” (what are they?). Should be separated from Crocks Farm, date of which will now be 2015.</li> <li>• Have you counted Rectory Lane?</li> </ul> <p>We wonder also whether the comments column in the table might be improved. At present the comments are inconsistent in what they describe. Some queries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is “council estate” now the correct term?</li> <li>• Is “to satisfy commuter demand” entirely accurate? Does everyone in all developments commute?</li> <li>• Longcroft: “re development” does not identify the type, presumably housing association affordable housing. We think that when re-developed that there was some increase in dwelling numbers, not nil as shown.</li> <li>• Crocks Farm: perhaps a definition of construction is needed: commercial or private developer?</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p><b>2.32</b> – The point made may or may not be accurate, but in any event is not clearly demonstrated either in the point itself or in the table. The point is one which it is desirable to make if the number in question is sufficiently impressive.</p> <p><b>4.2</b> – We believe that it is essential to protect completely the setting and character of Hole Lane, which we would claim is the most interesting road in the parish. First, it is a sunken lane, a feature important to Hampshire. When one adds the unusual high level footpath, the framing walls and hedges of Jenkyn Place and the decorative almost chinoiserie bridge over the road, one can claim that Bentley has a highly visual and unusual asset unlike anything in the county or even in the UK. The existing pressure on the lane can only grow with the addition of another 37 dwellings, with the strong possibility of more in the future. At that stage it would be entirely likely that enormous pressure could arise to re-align completely, i.e. destroy, the existing lane and to turn it into just another dull and featureless road. We think that would be tragic. We urge all concerned with the final draft to include a key objective for the protection of Hole Lane.</p> <p>We would also suggest adding another objective, to protect the setting of the parish church, the most important single building in Bentley. We think that something along the lines of no building of any sort to take place within the sightlines from the church would be ideal and not unreasonable.</p> <p><b>4.9</b> – We assume that the last sentence in the first paragraph at the top of page 23 refers to the development of 37 houses on Hole Lane. If so, this is the only thing in the draft plan with which we are in strong, even violent, disagreement.</p> <p>The village as a whole, with the Parish Council in the vanguard, were completely against this development for good and cogent reasons. We see no reason why the Plan should automatically include it in the BSB. Let EHDC add it themselves and ensure that it is then recorded that Bentley rejects that inclusion, only accepting under duress. This will show just how serious the village is about inappropriate development.</p> <p><b>4.10</b> – We do not argue this point but cannot find where rising contours “have previously been identified as having landscape significance”. We think our comment on 2.13 above chimes in with the mention here of the northern perimeter.</p> <p><b>Policy 2: Housing Site Allocation</b></p> <p>We think that we understand the reasons for confining future development to the village core. There are other sites which could accommodate housing development with minimal visual impact. We do not necessarily advocate their use, but they do exist.</p> <p><b>Policy 4: Recreation Ground</b></p> <p><b>Policy 6: Open Spaces</b></p> <p>It may not fit easily into either of these sections, but we query whether it is wise not to mention the Old Recreation Ground somewhere in the Plan.</p> <p><b>4.28</b> – we apologise for mentioning this because people’s views on what is good written style are subjective and therefore differ. Nevertheless we feel that “heavy rainfall</p>
--	---

	<p>episodes” is a less than fortunate phrase – if “episodes” was exercised would the sentence suffer?</p>
C10	<p>I was unfortunately away for both the Consultation meetings, but would like to comment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Settlement Boundary cuts right through my property with land to the North included within, but then the boundary joins in around the main part of my garden, and then bends out to include Glebe House. Why?</li> <li>2. There is no room northwards of the School in which to extend .... Obvious answer is to me Glebe House land as the new playing field.</li> <li>3. I would object strongly to the 10 houses being built on Glebe House land (which I assume would be knocked down). This is the whole of my southern boundary, and would leave me terribly overlooked. I have already had to put up with intense development on the site of Honeywood.</li> </ol> <p>I was surprised that was the only site that could be found in the whole of Bentley. Also with developments already approved and those in the pipeline, Bentley must be way over the number of houses required already?</p>