

APPENDIX 3 - PART 2 (24 items)			
	Brookvale Community Association	B&DBC Initial Response	<b>Planning issues to be resolved</b>
A1	1. High Voltage power lines need to be rerouted	Details of the location of services, including the location of the overhead high voltage electric cables were provided to the tenderers as part of the tender information. It is accepted that the overhead power cables will need to be relocated to accommodate the development. The tenderers will have allowed for this within the financial bids.	How will the existing 11KV cables be replaced what will be the new route?
A2	2. Site drainage issues to be addressed as soakaways are unlikely to remove surface water quickly enough due to saturation of ground at certain times of the year (see Victory Roundabout reports, Loddon flood plain issues)	Prior to tendering the Council commissioned a ground investigation report on the site to investigate the ground conditions and the contamination status of the site. A copy of the full report was provided to the tenderers as part of the tender information. As part of the investigation soakaway tests were undertaken. The report advises that surface water soakaways should be possible but that the use of soakaways would require approval by the Environment Agency. This would need to be addressed by the developer as part of the detailed design of the scheme.	Have the environment Agency responded in detail. The soakaway tests were conducted in the dry season. Recent flooding of the Victory roundabout subway is evidence that ground water levels are high in the late autumn and winter period. Great concern for the long term effect of hard area surface water drainage being concentrated into localised soakaways where previously it was evenly dispersed. Hydraulic survey of valley bottom not conducted at peak of wet season to establish capacity in substrate to cope in deluge conditions.
A3	3. Sewerage system to be uprated at all stages of the process	Details of the location of services, including the location of the foul sewers were provided to the tenderers as part of the tender information. Any scheme would require connection to the public foul sewerage system. Tenderer 1 has received confirmation from Thames Water that there is capacity for its scheme, a connection is required by requisition and its bid includes a sum to achieve this.	Provision of a sum of money to "achieve" connection to the main sewers is insufficient for planning purposes. We would question the figures from Thames water following bitter experiences of "blown" manhole covers outside Queens Road old post office, at the moose Centre and in the basement of the Anvil where double seal screw down covers are now installed. Calculations including flow patterns to be requested, received and understood from Thames water before planning approval granted.
A4	4. Assumption that capacity for fresh water is available.	Details of the location of services, including the location of water mains were provided to the tenderers as part of the tender information. A connection to the existing services in the area will be required and this together with the issue of capacity will need to be agreed with South East Water as part of the detailed design of the scheme.	Have Thames water agreed to the supply of fresh mains water to the site? Required prior to the granting of permission.

<p>A5</p>	<p>5. Car crossing Churchill Way West will cause safety, congestion and pollution issues</p>	<p>The Adopted Development Framework envisaged that a new signalised junction will be required to allow safe, regulated access to the site. This was also identified in the Central Area Action Plan. A Transport Assessment was commissioned by the Council and this assessment formed the basis of discussions with the Highway Authority, which accepts the principle of a signalised junction. A further Transport Assessment will need to be submitted by the Developer as part of the planning process, at which point the Highway Authority would be formally consulted and would need to approve the detailed design of the junction, together with associated improvements.</p>	<p>The further transport assessment has been submitted and relies on the presumptions made at the vision and briefing stages. The plans indicate an eventual traffic link with May street which is unacceptable. The proposed crossing of the central reservation will permit right turning traffic to cross the dual carriageway of this integral part of the ring road system, this will be the only place on the system where this will be permitted. The risk of accident, injury and death by this means on Basingstoke's ring road is currently zero (probability = 0). The introduction of a crossover gap is deplored , such gaps are being closed across the country yet here the planners are encouraging motorists to take risks. Planners to consider legal risk of prosecution by future claimants. The route is an emergency route for Fire and Ambulance vehicles to access the M3, both agencies have previously strongly objected to restrictions on this route. The proximity of two major roundabouts makes the right turn provision unnecessary on safety grounds.</p>
<p>A5</p>		<p>Safety. One of the main reasons for proposing a signalised junction on CWW is to allow a safe crossing of the road by pedestrians and cyclists in accordance with the Council's adopted objectives for the Central Area. The proposed traffic lights will modify vehicle speeds along CWW and provide a protected crossing for pedestrians and cyclists. The investigation of personal accident injuries along CWW, undertaken as part of the TA, noted that, whilst the overall level was not considered to be more than expected, all recorded pedestrian and cyclist accidents occurred near to Victory and Thorneycroft roundabouts and that "<i>it is likely that these accidents occurred due to the lack of surface crossing opportunities</i>". It is the Council's view that the junction should improve safety by reducing vehicle speeds on CWW and that pedestrians and cyclists will have a safer crossing point than currently exists.</p>	<p>The further transport assessment has been submitted and relies on the presumptions made at the vision and briefing stages. The proposed pedestrian crossing of the dual carriageway will introduce pedestrians to this integral part of the ring road system, this will be the only place on the system where this will be permitted. The risk of accident, injury and death by this means on Basingstoke's ring road is currently zero (probability = 0). The introduction of a pedestrian crossing is deplored. Planners to consider legal risk of prosecution by future claimants. The e route is an emergency route for Fire and Ambulance vehicles to access the M3 both agencies have previously strongly objected to the introduction of pedestrians onto this route. The proximity of two underpasses at college road and victory roundabout makes the provision of pedestrian crossings unnecessary on safety grounds.</p>

A5		Congestion. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the allocation of the site. The Council's TA referred to above concludes that " <i>the development transport impact can be accommodated on the transport network subject to the various mitigating measures</i> " and that " <i>the proposals are acceptable in transport planning terms and help support sustainable development principles</i> "	Both the HCC and B&DBC have this aspect seriously wrong. Indemnities should be sought to protect the rate payers and citizens of Basingstoke from this error should the proposed crossings be approved.
A5		Pollution. Whilst there may be a marginal and very localised increase in pollution from vehicles waiting at a new light-controlled junction on CWW, the Principal Environmental Health Officer advises that CWW is not identified as being an area of concern as regards air quality. Given the open nature of CWW, prevailing south-westerly winds and the fact that the dwellings in Brookvale are set well away from the road, it is not considered likely that a new junction to serve the development site will cause a significant increase as regards air pollution in the locality.	
A6	6. There appears to be no SAFE Pedestrian crossing that can be provided at Churchill Way West for site access and bus users. See HCC paper 7Mar02 attached on the problems caused by at grade pedestrian crossings to traffic, pedestrians and emergency vehicles ( Churchill Way is a key route for emergency vehicles ).	The HCC paper relates specifically to Victory Roundabout and the problems associated with at grade crossings at a signal controlled roundabout (see also comment above under 5: safety). The TA demonstrates that the at-grade pedestrian crossing at the new light-controlled junction is appropriate and, as stated in 5 above, should improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians wishing to cross CWW.	The safety principles identified and established at Victory roundabout apply equally 200m to the west.

<p>A7</p>	<p>7. No disabled access to Phase 1 (<i>Victory Hill</i>) and this unclear in Phase 2 (<i>CWW</i>)</p>	<p>Whilst land levels rise around 10 metres between the lowest (south east) and highest (north west) corners of the CWW site, gradients across the site are 6% or less, which is within the limits recommended in the Council's guidance on accessibility. It has always been understood that the existing steep slope between Victory Hill and the CWW site precludes a pedestrian or cycle route directly between these two sites that can meet 'adoptable' standards (at least without significant engineering works, land take, and/or mechanical facilities that would impose significant costs for construction and future maintenance). The provision of steps down from Victory Hill towards Victory roundabout was always on the understanding that this could not be adopted by the Highway Authority but may at least be usable to the able-bodied.</p>	<p>The developer for Victory hill drew an acceptable solution. This matter is well documented and still leaves a sour taste in the mouth. The BCA fought hard to get proper access and now the fact that the council backed off is being used to further deny proper access for all.</p>
<p>A7</p>		<p>However, the urban design guidance for the CWW site placed importance on the ease of movement, particularly to and from the town centre and along the frontage of CWW itself. The principles of planning for pedestrian movement within and beyond the site were also set out in the TA, and suggested measures for a new pedestrian route alongside Alencon Link to provide access to the station and to Victory Hill. As part of the detailed design and planning process the Council would seek to ensure that this guidance is followed.</p>	

A8	8. Disabled access to be linked with Victory roundabout , Alencon link improvement scheme and the rebuild at Brook House will also have to be integrated, including the proposals for an external lift to overcome the gradient issues	The problems of pedestrian and cycle access across and under the Victory roundabout pre-date the allocation of the CWW site. However, the development of site could contribute to resolving some of the problems and the TA recommends specific improvements local improvements to the footpaths and cycle ways around the site and wider improvements to the footpath networks, including “ <i>a contribution towards general footway / cycleway and streetscape improvements through the Victory Hill subway system and links to town</i> ”.	request councillors and planners keep an integrated view of aiming for the highest quality of access for all at all times.
A9	9. Emergency access in Phase 2 will be prevented by parked cars	Any future planning application on the site will have to satisfy the planning and highway authorities that it has satisfactorily met requirements as regards parking, access and movement. One of the issues specifically considered by the Highway Authority in determining any planning application is the ability for emergency and service vehicles to reach all necessary parts of the site and the impact that parked cars or other matters may have on this. The Council’s adopted design guidance on parking is set out in “Places to Live” (paras 6.50 – 74), and promotes parking on dwelling plots, within parking courts, and under buildings; only in very limited circumstances is on-street parking recommended.	The transport assessment has dealt reasonably with the emergency access issues , relevant authorities to approve the scheme before planning approval is given
A10	10. No linkage between Phase 1 ( <i>Victory Hill</i> ) and Phase 2 ( <i>CWW</i> ) and Brookvale, community centre not recognised in the plans	The TA proposes a number of improvements including a new footpath link on the northern side of Alencon Link, providing a link to Chapel Hill and Victory Hill (see 7 above). The developers will also be required to provide a connection from the CWW footpath to the newly constructed access steps from Victory Hill down the embankment (see 7 above). One of the main factors in determining the location of the new junction on CWW is to align the light-controlled pedestrian/cycle crossing with May Street to allow safe access to the Brookvale Community Centre.	Ref BDB59783 and the unsatisfactory solution of the dangerous and impractical steps, this matter hotly debated and BCA concerns ignored by planners resulting in a failure of planning. Access for cyclists and pedestrians required at western end of Victory hill into CWW. No pedestrian access at May Street thank-you. A bridge access next to the Community centre should be considered, this bridge could mirror the bridge at the other end of Churchill way serving Crown heights..

A11	11. Needs footway/cycleway skirting both Phase 1 and 2 (Wintethur Way to College Road) Existing footway/cycleway being "walled in"	See notes in 8 above.	see 10 above
A12	12. No elderly/disabled bungalows in any of 5 tenders, BCA suggested that the position of these to be as close to the town centre as possible (car-less residents)	The Tender documentation did not provide any specific detail on the type of units to be provided, although guidance was provided on the mix of affordable units. There was no specific requirement to provide bungalows but the submitted schemes provide a mix of dwellings. Bungalow development has extra costs, grant funding issues and density implications. In terms of affordable housing provision, bungalow provision needs to be based on specific housing needs taking into account the extra costs, There are good examples where appropriately located and designed ground floor flats can fulfil the same basic requirement for level access accommodation. The requirement to meet supported housing needs and the provision of accessible units can be taken into account in discussions with the developer and the affordable housing partner once a developer has been selected and if a specific need in the area can be demonstrated.	Agreed
A13	13. Selective not universal undercroft parking	Selective use of under croft parking is in accordance with the Council's adopted design guidance in "Places to Live", however from a housing management perspective it is important that where undercroft parking is proposed adequate surveillance and security is provided.	Agreed

A14	14. Cheap flats provided unworthy of a town gateway. Doorways opening directly onto public paths noted, ref. crime issues.	The Council's vision for the development of this site is to create an attractive living environment with its own sense of place in a sustainable location. Flats should not be automatically assumed to have a lesser design quality when compared with other forms of housing provision but the selected developer will need to demonstrate that it will provide a high quality scheme that meets the objectives of the Central Area Action Plan.	Agreed
A14		The principles of "Secure by Design" are now well established and underpin the Council's adopted urban design guidance ("Places to Live"). The Planning Authority and the Constabulary's Architectural Liaison and Crime Reduction Officer will require any new development to satisfy the requirements of S.17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998. Whether doorways' opening directly onto public paths result in crime is not clear; certainly many historic towns and villages exhibit this feature. It is not known if the development of this site will result in doorways opening directly onto public paths, but current practice usually provides a 'privacy' threshold between front doors/windows and the street and this will need to be addressed in the detailed design of the scheme.	

A15	<p>15. No innovation in appearance or design to include wind turbines or photovoltaics. Target should be towards carbon neutral development.</p>	<p>The Design Guidance provided to the tenderers made it clear that the Council would expect the site to be developed to a high standard, demonstrating best practice in sustainable housing design and layout. In line with Council policies the Council will also expect the developer to put into practise it objectives of sustainable design and construction, which include measures to maximise a healthy, comfortable environment and to minimise the environmental impact of building design, water and energy consumption and surface water drainage. Furthermore it is to be recommended to Cabinet that the scheme as a whole must achieve a "Very Good" rating. The developer will need to demonstrate how this can be achieved through the design of the scheme and may well need to investigate innovative ways in order to reach this standard.</p>	<p>Officers to assess and report on the rating of the scheme. To confirm that water tanks will include the provision of pipework for connection to solar hot water and water softeners. Consumer units to include spare ways for the future installation of wind generation and photo voltaics.</p>
A16	<p>16. No calculation of additional trees to counter additional emissions created</p>	<p>Landscaping proposals for the site, including new tree planting, will need to take into account many issues and will be expected to contribute towards the creation of attractive, usable public places and spaces. There is currently no requirement for new residential development to be assessed in terms of emissions offsetting nor is it known whether there is a satisfactory methodology for calculating such factors. The structure planting along Churchill Way will help reduce pollution for residents of the new development and will obviously have a wider impact. However this site should not be seen in isolation and general tree planting and vegetation around the town including on other sites in Brookvale will have a benefit.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
A17	<p>17. Contribution of development to Brookvale/wider town unaddressed</p>	<p>The way in which the development of this site could contribute to the wider town is expressly discussed in the Council's adopted "Central Area Action Plan". This Action Plan is adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance and the developer of this site will be required to meet its objectives.</p>	<p>To be seen if achieved.</p>

A18	18. Open space to include preserved poplars, community woodland, kickabout, play area, sensory garden and pond	The priority on-site is informal recreation space and particularly play space i.e. kickabout space. This is because of the limited distance children are able to travel and the lack of alternative provision on this side of Churchill Way. Accessible natural green space is important and is included in the Local Plan Standard. Such areas can be provided through the detailed design of the landscaped areas within the development, including the open space, to incorporate native species and wildlife links wherever possible and by the use of off site contributions to enhance existing open space such as Victory Park and King George V Playing Field. There is more scope on these site to provide meadow areas, a pond and other wildlife habitats.	BCA to be advised of any request, however small for the developer/builder to change the approved arrangement of trees vegetation etc.
A18		A Tree Survey was undertaken prior to the tender process and the information was included in the Design Guidance provided to the tenderers. No individual trees of major landscape significance (Category A trees) were identified but the report identified various trees along the southern boundary of the site that are of significant collective value and that efforts should be made to retain as many of these trees as possible. However the report also commented that many trees along this boundary are in poor condition and that consideration needs to be given to competition between the better trees and their space requirements to allow further development. Therefore, comprehensive management proposals should be sought for these trees.	

A18		<p>The report notes that most of the trees within the site are fruit species, of poor condition and negligible value but that there are sporadic plantings of maple and Lombardy poplar. Some of the maples are in reasonable condition and could be retained, if compatible with development proposals, but their capacity to self-seed should be taken into account, especially if less formal naturalistic landscapes are planned. The vulnerability of poplars to wind-snap should be borne in mind, if retention of these is contemplated. Detailed landscaping proposals will need to be provided as part of the planning process and the developer will need to address the recommendations of the survey.</p>	
A19	<p>19. BREEAM eco-homes building code voluntary not highest rating so may not result in energy cost savings compared with other developments</p>	<p>To comply with Housing Corporation grant standards the affordable housing units, which represent 40% of the proposed dwellings will need to achieve a Very Good EcoHomes standard and will need to exceed the minimum scores by the Housing Corporations – Housing Quality Indicators. Furthermore it is to be recommended to Cabinet that the scheme as a whole must achieve a “Very Good” rating. This recommendation will, once approved be mandatory and will be incorporated in the contract conditions for the sale of the site.</p>	<p>BCA to be advised that all conditions for sustainability are included in the contract and to be involved in the monitoring of same.</p>

A20	20. Affordable allocation for Housing Co-Operative not Associations. Concerns were expressed for improved lease conditions, service charges / service performance checks.	The Head of Housing Services is not aware of any housing cooperative that exists in Basingstoke or where there has been an approach to set up one in the context of this or any other site in the Borough. The Council uses its Housing Association Partners as the main vehicle for securing affordable housing provision both in terms of development and its subsequent management. The operational standards of housing associations are regulated and performance reviewed by Housing Corporation /Audit Commission inspections and there is an housing ombudsman system in place to deal with tenant complaints. At a local level Housing Services has the Housing Partnership Board /Housing Management Forum to deal with local management issues and a performance monitoring officer. Affordable housing let and managed by housing association is on the basis of "assured tenancies" set out under the Housing Acts with this requirement also written into Section 106 agreements. This is to provide security of tenure and means a tenant can only be removed for specific reasons and by the courts.	The BCA till prefer to see provision for community involvement in the running of affordable housing schemes, at present the H A s tend to have no framework for tenants to be involved in the running of the homes in their area. It was for this reason that we suggested a co-operative. Council to consider this further.
A20		Affordability is an important factor in the provision of both rented and shared ownership accommodation for those in housing need and in seeking to limit service charges either through design measures, adjusting services or by negotiating a lower standard charge.	
A21	21. Needs marketing of properties as being desirable to "want" to live in not "have" to live in an area of definite identity	As stated in 14 above the Council's vision for the development of this site is to create an attractive living environment with its own sense of place in a sustainable location. It might be expected that any marketing of the development will touch upon such positive features.	principle agreed , now we need to put flesh on then bones. Suggests "Very good " rating monitored and pushed together with the sustainable measures to be / actually included; and the future provision for the incorporation of energy collecting/saving/use measures.

A22	22. Topography of the site to be used to the betterment of all, architectural consideration for views, aspect, sun path, non intrusion, use of dead space adjacent to the railway for highest buildings. Presentation to the wider population as a pleasant place to be.	The rationale behind the urban design guidance for this site and behind the design approach of the tender submissions took into account such constraints and opportunities.	no comment
A23	23. The BCA prepared a sketch (attached) with indications of ideas that may lead to the provision of a true gateway dev for Basingstoke	The promotion of this site has reached an advanced stage, having passed through the Local Plan process and was the subject of public consultation in advance of the adoption of the Central Area Action Plan. Comments on an overall design vision for the site were explicitly invited. At the time of that consultation (July 2003) the BCA raised issues only regarding vehicular access. Without more information and consideration, it is not clear how far the 'concepts' in the BCA sketch are appropriate or practicable or could in whole or in part be incorporated into one of the tender submissions. .	The BCA consider that the opportunity for a truly gateway development has been missed there is NO wow factor at all. The so called landmark building is nothing more than a 4 storey shed with a tin roof. The special position of this site warrants a scheme of international standing. has the RIBA or the tip been sent a copy?
A24	24. No mention of public art developer contribution/sponsorship with community consultation (VH Phase 1 "artefact" is unacceptable)	The Planning Authority has a requirement for "% for art" to be considered and included in new developments where appropriate.	Details awaited, commitment required prior to planning approval.
Comments subsequent to the meeting 30Jun06 34 points recorded on email 21Jul06			
B1	1. Sketches incomplete, inconsistent and lacking sufficient clarity/detail on the sectional views from the town and allotments perspectives of the site and must not be approved as is		

B2	2. High profile site needs more imaginative design and "active" effective energy saving measures built in above current Borough Guidelines		
B3	3. Monument not Landmark Building		Developers proposals are unacceptable on height and appearance grounds
B4	4. Design details inconsistent and unsympathetic to Brookvale		Why no cills and lintels on the flats, why only one detail on the houses ? What colours are proposed for the rendered facades? Will there be any patterned brickwork on larger areas. Will any contrasting brick coursing be introduced. ? Sash windows ? Recessed porches ?
B5	5. Design doesn't reflect Conservation Area character, needs Victorian style houses and Georgian style flats		see 4 above, where is the reflection of Brookvale styles?
B6	6. High Rise doesn't compliment Conservation Area		
B7	7. Doesn't take into account Brook House redevelopment		A new "Brook house should be the land mark building. The current Landmark building is just a tin shed and will look out of place. More inspiration required.
B8	8. Social Housing mixed not zoned		Prefer no zoning.
B9	9. Residents Gate VH Phase 1 to 2 alongside allotment boundary fence enabling walking/disabled access to Brookvale		Path required at western boundary with vermin / rabbit proof detailing.
B10	10. More "natural" open space needed		Ensure proposed areas are not subsequently reduced in the detailed development of the plane. Measure extent and agree dimensions prior to approval.
B11	11. No Community facilities within the site		Brookvale Village Hall to be accessed via bridge !
B12	12. Site should be left as Nature Reserve		
B13	13. Dangerous for children near high speed road, needs bridge		Have safety issues been addressed ?
B14	14. Disabled access issues with the site linkages		

B15	15. Traffic Lights not necessary for car RHT		NO GAP NO AT GRADE CROSSING
B16	16. Move marketing focus from traffic lights RHT to energy saving desirability		Encourage cycling, walking, jogging - move away from car dependency so close to town centre.
B17	17. Lower Speed Limit		
B18	18. Traffic Lights for Pedestrian Crossing with traffic calming		Safety would be compromised
B19	19. Bridge if no crossing		see A10 above
B20	20. Traffic noise reduction		Road surface materials to assist quieter traffic.
B21	21. Prevent rat runs		No link to May Street.
B22	22. Schooling where?		
B23	23. Poppies?		
B24	24. Slow Worms?		
B25	25. Allotment Shadow		
B26	26. Development generates need for rabbit proof fence for the allotment		Experience at other sites shows that construction works forces vermin and rabbits into adjacent allotments and homes. Suggest a programme of eradication before work starts.
B27	27. Agreement/Provision to publicise allotments within the development to encourage allotment use/uptake		
B28	28. Original allotment soil to be retained for site green areas and communal green space/gardens		
B29	29. Park facilities to be also available for use by surrounding area, especially VH Phase1		See paths issues above
B30	30. No benefit to Brookvale with already overloaded infrastructure		Bridge over by Village Hall see as a major benefit to Brookvale
B31	31. Another development stressing further Brookvale flaky electric, water, sewerage infrastructure.		See comments regarding sewage and flooding experiences.
B32	32. S106 money for Brookvale/VH PH1 infrastructure improvement?		Bridge over by Village Hall see as a major benefit to Brookvale

B33	33. No provision for waste recycling or its minimisation		Recycling bin location to be decided.
B34	34. No energy initiatives described in these sketches:		
B34.1	* Line of turbines on railway embankment to contribute off-peak electric back into grid		
B34.2	* Grey/rainwater collection tank(s) for flushing loos in the flatted buildings		Serious consideration to this requested
B34.3	* Solar collectors to help with water heating in the flatted buildings		Including provision of water softening and large hot water storage tanks with min 200litre capacity compatible for and with the provision for connection to solar hot water heating.
B34.4	* Photovoltaic to help with lighting		Provision in consumer units for the retro fitting of input to lighting circuits (also to central heating and fridge / freezer circuits) from local power sources.
B34.5	* Combined heat/power generation for the site gaining economy of scale in energy bills and supply continuity/future proofing		Studies and consideration for use in flatted blocks to be undertaken.
	Preliminary observations on papers submitted with the application.		
	TRANSPORT		
C1	3.6, 3.7 MVA figures used		Over provision admitted. Figures require revision to show true effect of development. Reduced traffic flows negate the need for right turns.
C2	5.3 access via T junction		Insist on "left in / left out" only. Extend deceleration and acceleration lane lengths. See email "Bus pull-ins too short" comment below. No pedestrian at grade crossings.
C3	5.9 Toucan pedestrian at grade crossing		Delete as unsafe - see Fire and Ambulance comments and HCC own guidelines.
C4	Bus stops		Suggest easterly direction lay-by extended by combining pull-in to waterworks with new acceleration lane. Suggest westerly direction bus stop relocated nearer College Road underpass to serve Brookvale and superstore (Morrison's) better
C5	Signalised junction		Unnecessary, risk to life and limb, places council at risk of legal action. High speed dual carriageway integral to ring road should not provide right turns or pedestrian at grade crossings. DELETE WHOLE OF SECTION 7.
C6	Appendices		NOTED Emails from HCC not conclusive.
	DRAINAGE		

D1	1.3 No flood risk associated		Disputed. The discharge of surface water into localised soakaways rather than the current natural dispersal over the whole site, brings with it the high risk of concentrated flows following the chalk folds towards the line of the river. The Loddon river is converted from the eastern edge of Victory park, this restriction forces the surrounding water table levels higher than the subway pavement levels in Victory Roundabout for most of the Autumn and Winter. Standing water is often seen around the BCA Village Hall. The increased discharge in the wet season will increase the height of the water table. It is noted that the soakaway tests were undertaken in the dry season.
D2	1.4 Adequate foul sewer capacity		Disputed. The foul sewer reduces to 300mm diam in Lower Brook street. At this point it is fully charged with the outfall from South Ham, Buckskin, Worting and west Brookvale. Brookvale residents will testify to the incidents of blown manhole covers and raw sewage in Queens Road. Sewage has backed up into the Moose Centre and Anvil on Churchill way ( Anvil fitted screw down manhole covers to prevent cellars being flooded with raw sewage). The increase in size of the town centre, Crown Heights, Victory Hill and the redeveloped IBM building into flats will all add/have added flows into the existing sewer. The 900 mm sewer under the town centre joins a Victorian brick sewer which is in a poor state of repair. Planners to require definite calculations and flow predictions against time to ensure "adequate foul sewer capacity" statement true before granting permission. Replacement programme for brick sewer to be detailed and dated and legally bound into the agreement, new full length sewer beyond Basing to be in place before CWW development occupation begins.
D3	2.4 No major services crossover		Disputed. A high pressure gas main runs along the southern verge of the westerly dual carriageway. All service providers to confirm.
D4	3.2 Soakaway test results		see D1 above