

F/23/95844 – Land at Stoke Park Farm

Bishopstoke Parish Council Objection

Bishopstoke Parish Council's Planning Committee, having considered Planning Application F/23/94844 at their meeting on 12th September 2023 wish to object to the application on the following grounds.

- Parking – The plans could lead to local roads, and both Cemetery sites, being used for overspill or free parking. This would lead to difficulties in parking for local residents and mourners attending the Cemetery and will also increase the dangers for pedestrians crossing those roads.
- Traffic – there will be an obvious increase in traffic which can only increase danger on the roads within the Sewall Drive estate, but also those exiting Sewall Drive onto Stoke Common Road or Edward Avenue. Existing parked cars and the bend in the road already make turning out of Sewall Drive a dangerous manoeuvre, and adding extra traffic will only increase the danger.
- Sewall Drive and the other roads on the estate are currently unadopted, meaning that their maintenance cost is paid for by local residents. The increase in traffic associated with the proposed site can only increase the maintenance costs. It is unfair to ask the residents to pay for this and the Committee would ask that the Borough Council quantify how much it would contribute to the road maintenance, or simply adopt the roads, which would simplify matters enormously. Concerns have also been raised by HCC Countryside and the Ramblers about the legality of vehicular access to the site.
- Cllrs understand from the plans that the current bridleway is to be used to access the site. The Committee believes this may be illegal and requests confirmation that approval has been given by Hampshire County Council for this change of use. Cllrs were also concerned that allowing additional vehicular access on the bridleway would be to the detriment of horse riders, cyclists and walkers
- The extension to Bishopstoke Cemetery (known as Stoke Common Cemetery) and the allotment land on Sewall Drive are both still in the hands of developers awaiting completion of work to transfer them to the Borough Council, with the land currently standing unused. This has led to a substantial amount of anti-social behaviour on those sites. The proposed site, being more remote and accessible via a single road only, would be potentially even more likely to suffer in the same way. The Committee wishes to know what preventative measures will be used to ensure that the site remains safe and secure.
- In the course of developing both access to the site, and the site itself, a number of existing hedgerows and wildlife habitats will be damaged or destroyed. The Committee

understands and supports the concept of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) in the area but questions whether providing this facility is worth the expense it will incur in terms of existing wildlife.

- Finally, the Committee were not satisfied with the red line drawing for the plans, which seemed to be inaccurate. The Committee also understands that not every area included within the boundary line will be developed as part of the Natural Greenspace and would like to know what is planned for those areas.