

LOCAL PLAN STEERING GROUP

23rd JUNE 2015

INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING EVIDENCE

INTRODUCTION

- 1 At the January Local Plan Steering Group it was set out that the Council will need to assess the potential infrastructure requirements of the then identified strategic development options (SDO). In the first instance engagement would be concentrated on the following key infrastructure areas and the related providers:-
 - Education
 - Transport
 - Utilities
 - Flood Risk

- 2 This report summarises the results of the engagement undertaken and, in line with the broad objectives set out in the January report, identifies:
 - Whether there are any particular infrastructure barriers to delivery and potential resolutions
 - What major infrastructure items are required and their indicative cost
 - What potential infrastructure funding sources are available in addition to developer contributions

For each infrastructure area the report sets out those issues identified to date that could likely need further work to support the emerging local plan.

EDUCATION

- 3 Following engagement, HCC and HDC Officers have agreed a summary table (Appendix A) setting out for each SDO the potential “yields” (number of pupils) and “needs” (number of classes) for both primary and secondary schools. Appendix A also includes an indication of whether the identified SDO could have potential in terms of land needed to accommodate on-site primary and/or secondary schools

- 4 To date HCC have determined yields in light of the requirement set out in their Developers Contribution Policy (0.3 children per dwelling for primary schools and 0.21 children per dwelling for secondary schools). In Appendix A, these are the lower figures (black text) in the Primary and Secondary yield column.

- 5 However, in this instance, HCC has also additionally set out a higher yield based on increasing the requirements to 0.4 and 0.28 respectively (the red text in the primary and secondary yield columns).

- 6 The higher yield figures have been provided by HCC in light of recent analysis they have undertaken which suggests that Hart has a higher proportion of school age children per dwelling than some other districts. Both yield figures illustrate that there will be a need to provide significant additional primary and secondary school place capacity in Hart in the period to 2032 irrespective of which strategic development options are taken forward.
- 7 The potential needs arising are expressed in terms of “Forms of Entry” (FE) i.e. the number of classes per year group and relate to the higher yield figure only. The identified need is generally in excess of the development option yield given the obvious requirement to provide whole classes.
- 8 How HCC intends to accommodate the potential future needs identified in terms of either expanding existing schools, providing new schools, or both, is to be determined. However, several potential implications for the emerging local plan can already be discerned.
- 9 Firstly, if any of the SDO at Hook are bought forward then it is likely that a new primary school in Hook will be required given the possible scale of development and the limits to increasing the capacity at Hook Infant and Junior School beyond that current being considered. Further work will also need to be undertaken by HCC to determine if Robert Mays could realistically be expanded beyond that needed to accommodate existing identified growth.
- 10 If the Lodge Farm SDO is bought forward then it could need two primary schools. Work will also need to be undertaken to determine if it has both the critical mass in terms of needs and capacity to accommodate a secondary school.
- 11 It is questionable whether any of the SDO at Fleet, with the exception of Pale Lane, could accommodate an on-site primary school. It is understood that HCC are currently reviewing the capacity of the existing schools in Fleet for further growth but that it is unlikely that significant additional capacity could be accommodated. If a new primary school were to be provided in Fleet, and located on land unrelated to housing growth, this would have a likely cost implication.
- 12 Given this, it is therefore unlikely that an SDO at Fleet could potentially accommodate a new secondary school. If a new secondary school were to be provided in Fleet it would likely need to be located on land unrelated to housing growth, which again could have a significant cost implication.
- 13 As such, it is considered reasonable to conclude that (as of June 2015) both future primary and secondary school places needs at Hook and Fleet currently represent a significant infrastructure barrier to delivery. Identifying potential resolutions to these issues are likely to be long-term projects.
- 14 Given their likely scale, both Murrell Green and Winchfield SDO would each appear to have capacity to accommodate new primary and secondary schools. However, whilst not in itself considered to be a significant barrier to delivery, HCC are clear that any secondary school site here would need space from the outset to grow to an eventual 12FE school.

- 15 In terms of how much would be needed, a 3FE primary would require a minimum of 2.8 hectares. The areas required for new secondary schools will depend on the size of school proposed but would likely to be in excess of 12ha. In terms of costs, it is clear that all of the potential SDO will require significant investment in primary and secondary school places. For example, the strategic 'Welborne' development (approximately 7,500 dwellings) north of Fareham requires a new secondary school at an estimated cost of £56-60m. The cost of new primary schools are generally in the region of £7-10m each. As such, it is likely that the costs of the primary and secondary school places needed in Hart, irrespective of the final development strategy, will be in the region of £80m-£100m.
- 16 As such, given the likely very significant costs related to the necessary additional primary and secondary school places to support future growth, this currently represents a significant barrier to future housing delivery.

TRANSPORT

- 17 Detailed engagement has been undertaken since January with Hampshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority), Highways England, Network Rail and South West Trains.

Highways

- 18 Hampshire County Council (HCC) have undertaken an initial high level review of the possible implications of the additional vehicular movements generated by the SDO. HCC have concluded that all of the SDO will require significant highways infrastructure to deliver safe and sustainable access without generating severe impacts upon the existing highway network. Appendix B sets out a summary of likely main impacts of each SDO for the road network.
- 19 In light of this HCC recommend that the SDO are investigated in more detail. HCC suggest that use could be made of the recently upgraded North Hampshire Transport Model (NHTM) in conjunction with a detailed assessment of the accessibility of each option. The model, along with detailed site investigations, could highlight constraints that may prevent sites from coming forward.
- 20 After this initial assessment, the preferred SDO could be investigated further using information from the NHTM, along with a detailed assessment of the accessibility of each of the SDO. This further analysis could investigate specific key junctions and highway routes, and potential mitigation measures, which would further test and determine the viability of each SDO.
- 21 Dialogue with Highways England (HE) (formerly the Highways Agency) concentrated on how the highways needs of the Winchfield and/or Murrell Green SDO could be accommodated. Essentially, the clear message from HE is that HDC needs to undertake suitable analysis to determine a deliverable highways solution. The usual method for achieving this is through a Transport Assessment (TA).

- 22 As of June 2015, the two highways options seemingly available for development at the Winchfield and/or Murrell Green SDO are either to upgrade the existing highways network or provide a new junction on the M3. If a TA determined that a new junction on the M3 was needed, this would need to be allocated accordingly in the draft local plan. However, this option would clearly have significant highways implications for both the District and the M3 corridor given the likely changes in traffic flows and as such the Council would need to undertake detailed engagement with both HE and HCC, and other planning local authorities in the M3 corridor.
- 23 As such, it is recommended that HDC undertakes a TA that investigates the impact of the SDO on specific key junctions and highway routes, further tests the deliverability of options and identifies potential mitigation measures and costs. In line with this, as of June 2015, it is considered too early for HDC to determine with any certainty the scope of any costs associated with any necessary highways improvements.
- 24 Therefore, given the need for identifying highways impacts and mitigation currently represents a significant barrier to future housing delivery.

Railways

- 25 Following engagement with representatives from Network Rail (NR) and South West Trains (SWT) it was broadly agreed by all parties that, as far as can reasonably be determined as of April 2015, there were no obvious operational barriers which would preclude further consideration of either the Winchfield or Murrell Green SDO. Likewise, the other SDO would not appear to have any significant strategic implications for rail services.
- 26 The Winchfield SDO would likely require significant engineering works to facilitate new and/or improved vehicular routes sufficient to accommodate the additional movements this option would generate. These routes would either be new or improved tunnels under the existing railway embankment or a new bridge. NR are unable, at this stage to identify, the likely costs of this works, but it would appear reasonable to assume at this time that these costs will be significant.
- 27 Given the potential scale of development at Winchfield, SWT iterated that in principle they would be willing to consider the redevelopment of the railway station in a similar fashion to that recently undertaken at Fleet. As the redevelopment of Fleet station cost in excess of £8m it would appear reasonable to assume a similar cost or more at Winchfield and that the rail providers will seek a proportion from developer contributions.
- 28 A further potential option, suggested by SWT, is that Winchfield station is relocated and expanded, most likely to the west (north of the M3). Potential advantages of this approach would be that the existing station could continue to operate until the replacement station opened and post-relocation would provide an opportunity to redevelop the existing station site and may have other development opportunities. A relocated station would most likely be achieved if the Murrell Green SDO came forward.

- 29 As such, subject to ongoing dialogue with service providers, railways do not currently represent a significant barrier to future housing delivery.

UTILITIES and FLOOD RISK

Drinking Water

- 30 South East Water (SEW) have confirmed that, as of March 2015, they will be able to satisfy the forecasted growth in demands in the area. SEW also set out that the source of new water supplies would be from outside Hart – most likely from sources along the Thames such as Bray – and that there is likely to be the need to provide a significant amount of new mainlaying to deliver it to the development areas.
- 31 SEW also reiterated that they review their plans periodically (approximately every 5 years) and as such request that they are consulted appropriately. In this instance, it is considered prudent for HDC to engage with SEW again when the draft local plan is published given the possibility of additional future growth.
- 32 As such, notwithstanding subsequent revisions to the housing numbers, it is considered that the issue of drinking water supply does not pose a significant barrier to future growth delivery.

Foul Water Network and Flood Risk

- 33 HDC has undertaken engagement with Thames Water (TW) and the Environment Agency (EA) on these related issues. TW has provided a detailed initial response, (Appendix 3) which sets out the implications for foul water drainage in Hart in light of the potential SDO.
- 34 As Members will be aware, the local network in both Odiham-Hook-Hartley Wintney and Fleet suffers from overload in times of high rainfall. Surface water is causing service issue within the foul system and local infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to accommodate increased future flows. As such, given the likely future scale of development, significant increases in foul water capacity and infrastructure improvements should be anticipated.
- 35 TW are currently in Asset Management Programme (AMP) for 2015-2020 and have not accounted for the proposed growth related to the SDO. TW are currently developing plans for AMP7 (2020-2025) in the coming months. As such, it is imperative that HDC engages with TW as they develop AMP7 with the aim of ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is bought forward in parallel with the preferred SDO.
- 36 Therefore, the need for programming of likely network and treatment works upgrades currently represents a significant barrier to future housing delivery.

- 37 With regard to a potential new settlement or large urban extension, TW recommends with the aim of ensuring effective engagement between HDC, EA, TW and site promoters that assists delivering sustainable and timely water and wastewater solutions for strategic growth options, an Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS) is undertaken. The IWMS could include detailed consideration of the demands arising from proposed development for both sewerage and surface water drainage and the outline costs and programming of any required infrastructure.
- 38 Whilst a new settlement or large urban extension could provide its own sewage treatment works (STW) is a possibility, in line with national planning policy guidance and EA advice, TW considers that options to connect to the public network should be considered and appraised first.
- 39 TW recommends that for other SDO, the site promoters produce a detailed drainage strategy early in the planning process. A strategy should identify any on-site and off-site sewerage infrastructure impacts, how these will be resolved, at what phases of development they will be constructed, by what means and establish the delivery route for infrastructure. Addressing sewerage and surface water drainage early in the planning process could identify opportunities for limiting the future infiltration of the former into the foul water network through the use of effective surface water attenuation.

Electricity Grid

- 40 It is not anticipated that electricity supply will pose a significant barrier to the delivery of any of the SDO. However, a number of the SDO (North East of Hook; Murrell Green; Winchfield) include existing large overhead power lines which may need to be undergrounded if these sites are to be developed optimally. The cost of achieving this is likely to be significant (given HDCs experience of this issue elsewhere) and will be a contributing factor in determining the viability of future development on these sites.

OTHER MATTERS

- 41 Officers have also recently engaged with the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (E3LEP), setting out the level of both possible future growth and the potential development options currently identified. Whilst in its infancy, there is a realistic possibility of the LEP assisting HDC in accessing additional funds to support strategic growth if the Council determines that its development strategy includes either a new settlement or significantly scaled urban extension. E3LEP has invited officers to engage with them further as the emerging development strategy is refined.

RECOMMENDATIONS

42 It is recommended that the following key tasks are commenced or continued in due course:

- Identify potential implications for infrastructure provision of the Preferred Housing Distribution Strategy (June 2015) which broadly set out a higher level of growth than hitherto within existing settlements
- Commencement of a full Transport Assessment (TA) potentially utilising the existing HCC North Hampshire Transport Model (NHTM)
- Commencement of an Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS)
- Continued engagement with HCC (particularly with regard to school place provision) and with South West Trains (SWT) and Network Rail (NR)
- Consolidation of information into an updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) to support both the emerging local plan and community infrastructure levy (CIL) at public examination
- Continued engagement with the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (E3LEP)

Robert Thain MATCP MAUD MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Hart District Council
Tel: (01252) 774459
robert.thain@hart.gov.uk

APPENDIX A: Strategic Development Option Sites - Identified Primary and Secondary Education Yields and Needs

Education Strategic Development Option	Likely Scale	Primary Catchment School (2015)	Primary Yield	New Primary Need	Secondary Catchment School (2015)	Secondary Yield	New Secondary Need	Capacity for 3FE Primary School	Capacity for Secondary School
1	West of Hook	600	Hook Infant & Junior	180 (240)	2FE (420)	Robert Mays	126 (168)	2FE (300)	✓ x
2	North of Hook	1,250	Hook Infant & Junior	375 (500)	3FE (630)	Robert Mays	263 (350)	3FE (450)	✓ ✓
3	North East Hook extension	600	Hook Infant & Junior	180 (240)	2FE (420)	Robert Mays	126 (168)	2FE (300)	✓ x
4	Murrell Green	2,600	Hook Infant & Junior	780 (1040)	2x3FE (1260)	Robert Mays	546 (728)	5FE (750)	✓ ✓
5a	Winchfield	2,400	Oakwood Infant & Greenfields Junior	(720) (960)	3FE + 2FE (1050) (2 schools)	Robert Mays	504 (672)	5FE (750)	✓ ✓
5b	Winchfield	5,000	Oakwood Infant & Greenfields Junior	1500 (2000)	2x3FE + 2x2FE (2100) (4 schools)	Robert Mays	1050 (1400)	10FE (1500)	✓ ✓
6	Lodge Farm, North Warnborough	1,700	Buryfields Infant & Mayhill Junior	(510) (680)	4FE (840)	Robert Mays	450 (602)	4FE (600)	✓ ?
7	Land South of Church Crookham	385	Twelsedown Infant; Church Crookham Junior	115 (154)	1FE (210)	Courtmoor	80 (108)	1FE (150)	x x
8	West of Fleet	450	Dogmersfield C of E Primary	135 (180)	1FE (210)	Calthorpe Park	95 (125)	1FE (150)	x x
9	Pale Lane, Fleet	1,000	Oakwood Infant & Greenfields Junior; Tavistock Infant & All Saints Junior,	300 (400)	2FE (420)	Robert Mays; Calthorpe Park	210 (280)	2FE (300)	✓ ?
10	Great Bramshot Farm, Fleet	525	Fleet Infant & Velmead Junior	160 (210)	1FE (210)	Calthorpe Park	110 (150)	1FE (150)	x x
11	East of Hook	1,250	Hook Infant & Junior	370 (490)	3FE (630)	Robert Mays	260 (343)	3FE (450)	✓ ✓

APPENDIX B: Strategic Development Option Sites – Initial Assessment (HCC) of potential impacts

Strategic Development Option	Potential Impacts
West of Hook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access will likely be from Newnham Road • Some Pedestrian access could be integrated with existing development but Old School Road and Newnham Road have very limited space and lack suitable pedestrian facilities with limited space to provide infrastructure • Development traffic using the London Road/Old School road junction will need careful consideration and will need to be studied in greater detail • M3 junction 5 will need to be looked at too as a significant proportion of trips will use this junction • All the other major junctions in Hook will also need to be considered • There are also lots of opportunities for rat running to the east of the site to avoid congested areas and measure to reduce the impact of this will need to be considered.
North West of Hook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential access could be from Green Lane, Hook Road or Reading Road although Green Lane is little more than a single track / country lane and would need significant work to be upgraded for use as access to the development • These roads currently have no provision for pedestrians • The site boundary onto Reading Road is on a short stretch that is on the inside of a curve in the road. Visibility out of a potential access here would be severely limited. To provide for a safe access here a large swathe of existing trees / hedges on the western side of the road would need to be removed. • The site boundary onto Hook Road provides for a greater scope of a possible access, although this would be on the opposite side of the development to Hook itself, although would be a beneficial access for vehicles heading north towards Reading. • A number of junctions heading north and also into Hook would need to be investigated further – notably the roundabout junction of Griffin Way North and London Road within

	Hook that currently has an obligation for improvement works. A number of junctions in the area are approaching capacity.
North East Hook Extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access will likely be from Reading Road and require significant infrastructure to deliver the access junctions. • The junction at the A30/B3349 would need to be looked at again, as well as junctions through Griffin Way South to M3 Junction 5 which would likely need major upgrade works
Murrell Green, south of A30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment will need to consider access and impacts on A30, key junctions through Hook, Hartley Wintney, B3016 and M3 Junction 5.
Winchfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even taking into account the centrally located Winchfield railway station and the potential for commuting into central London, the impact upon the immediate highway network to reach the A30 to the north, the A287 to the south and the A323 and Fleet to the east would need to be investigated • The junctions onto these A roads as well as the A roads themselves and the wider road network including M3 junction 5 would also warrant further detailed investigation into available capacity and the likely impact of the scale of the development and possible mitigation measures. • B3016 operates as a two lane carriageway but there would be limited scope for improvement without significant environmental impact • Local roads including Station Road, The Hurst and Pale Lane within the area are rural in nature and major concerns would be raised about the impact on them from development traffic • Existing pedestrian infrastructure within Winchfield would need to be upgraded as well as further work on the provision of cycle routes and public transport provision from Winchfield
Lodge Farm, North Warnborough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear what the access strategy could be – given the likely scale of development one vehicular access from the A287 could be insufficient • Would require major infrastructure works to B3016/A287 junction and M3 J5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B3016 operates as a two lane carriageway but there would be limited scope for improvement without significant environmental impact.
West of Fleet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East of Hitches Lane is land that has been subject to a recent planning application for 425 dwellings. Includes mitigation for Elvetham roundabouts. No immediate mitigation for south of Hitches Lane except monitoring of conditions once development has been completed and if necessary then mitigation in the form of traffic calming will be considered. • Elvetham Heath roundabouts, even with the aforementioned mitigation are still predicted to struggle with future traffic so additional traffic from an extra 400 dwellings on land to the west of Hitches Lane may have unacceptable impact and no more scope for mitigation (due to land constraints) so there may be an increased impact of traffic on rural lanes to south of the site.
Pale Lane, Fleet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments regarding Elvetham Road roundabouts set out above are relevant to this site. A323/Fleet services service access would need major realignment. • Limited pedestrian infrastructure on A323 within vicinity would need addressing. • Would need to consider impacts on Hartley Wintney.
Great Bramshot Farm, Fleet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration will need to be given towards the impact of development traffic on junction 4a and the A327/A3013 junctions including the recent signalisation scheme carried out on the Summit Avenue, Minley Link junction. • Access to nearby urban areas will need due consideration due to the main roads that surround the site potentially being barriers for sustainable travel.
East of Hook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment will need to consider access and impacts on A30, key junctions through Hook, Hartley Wintney, B3016 and M3 Junction 5.

APPENDIX C: Strategic Development Option Sites – response from Thames Water



Robert Thain, Principal Planning Officer

Thames Water Utilities Ltd

Sent by email: robert.thain@hart.gov.uk

Contact Katherine Jones
Phone 0118 952 0509
E-Mail thameswaterplanning@tcw.co.uk

8 June 2015

Dear Robert

HART STRATEGIC OPTIONS AND FOUL DRAINAGE NETWORK

Thank you for your email regarding the above.

As you will be aware, Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the Hart District and we have the following comments on the strategic location options under consideration as set out in your email:

The strategic location options under consideration for accommodating identified growth are as follows:-

1. **New settlement at Winchfield (1800-2400 dwellings)** - 2400 homes could represent up to 6000 Population Equivalent (PE) which would be a significant treatment load for any small to medium size STW, Fleet Sewage Treatment Works (STW) being approximately 46,000 ~~pe~~. Thames Water met with the developer back in September 2014 to discuss development options in the area. Flows could be both transferred to Fleet and Hartley Wintney STWs, however, both treatment works would require upgrades. No growth funding was allocated to those treatment plants in our business plan therefore these would have to be prioritised against other schemes. Although it's likely that the development wouldn't come online until AMP7 (2020 – 2025) which means we could assess both plants and submit a growth proposal for the next business planning period within the next few years.
2. **New settlement at Murrell Green (1800-2400 dwellings)** – 2400 homes could represent up to 6000 PE which would be a significant treatment load for any small to medium size STW. This would necessitate upgrades to the sewage works.
3. **New settlement at Lodge Farm near M3 junction 5 (circa 1700 dwellings)** – similar to the above 1700 homes this is likely to result in a large

Thames Water Plc
Cleaver Court,
4th Floor West,
Vaslem Rd, Reading,
Berks, RG1 3DB
T 0203 577 8800
www.thames-water.com

Registered in England and Wales
No. 2388523, Registered office
Cleaver Court, Vaslem Road,
Reading, Berks, RG1 3DB

additional treatment load for any small to medium size STW. This would necessitate upgrades to the sewage works.

4. **Urban extension(s) at North or West Hook (600 dwellings)** – Existing foul network in Hook would come under significant pressure if flows from an additional 600 dwellings i.e. around 1,500 Population Equivalent, were to be connected. Hook has both separate foul and surface water systems serving much of the catchment. The foul sewer system in Hook is separated by the topography of the catchment, with the northern area of the catchment draining west to east and discharging in Griffin Way Sewage Pumping Station (SPS). Flows are then passed into Crooked Billet SPS which is the terminal pumping station for Hook and its connected networks. All flows are pumped east and discharge into the Hartley Wintney sewer network. It should be anticipated that significant infrastructure upgrades would be required to accommodate the proposed development. Should the development be situated north of Hook, it could be feasible to convey all flows directly to the Hartley Wintney Sewage Treatment Works (STW) or potentially Basingstoke STW. Further assessment of the available capacity at both STWs would have to be carried out to establish required system upgrades.
5. **Urban extension(s) at West Fleet (600 dwellings)** – The sewerage network in Fleet is storm responsive and tends to be affected by a high groundwater levels. Those factors need to be included in any further assessments and a scale of reinforcement work would have to be confirmed through detailed investigation. This area is drained by the Grove Farm SPS which pumps to Fleet STW via 1 No. rising main after receiving flows from the west of the catchment through several terminal pumping stations, including; Dogmersfield SPS, Browning Road SPS, Brookhill SPS, Winchfield SPS, Station Road (Winchfield) SPS and a Private SPS. This part of the network would not be able to accommodate the proposed flow increase without significant infrastructure upgrades.
6. **Urban extension(s) at East Fleet (600 dwellings)** – As above, the sewerage network in Fleet is storm responsive and can be affected by a high groundwater levels. Those factors need to be included in any further assessments and a scale of reinforcement work would have to be confirmed through detailed investigation. Development in this area could potentially be discharged directly to the Fleet STW through either pumped or gravity connection. Feasibility of this option would have to be further investigated to confirm its viability.
7. **Urban extension(s) at South Fleet (600 dwellings)** – As above, the sewerage network in Fleet is storm responsive and tends to be affected by a high groundwater levels. Those factors need to be included in any further assessments and a scale of reinforcement work would have to be confirmed through detailed investigation. This area drains to the West of Fleet, served by the Grove Farm SPS which pumps to Fleet STW. As mentioned above this part of the network would not be able to

accommodate the proposed flow increase without significant infrastructure upgrades.

8. **Growth within existing main settlements (mostly at Fleet) (750 dwellings)** – As set out above the network in Fleet is storm responsive and tends to be affected by a high groundwater levels. Depending on the actual location of the growth some infrastructure upgrades might be required to accommodate the increase. A scale of reinforcement work would have to be confirmed through detailed investigation.

We trust the above is satisfactory, but please do not hesitate to contact Thames Water if you have any queries.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Mathews', written in a cursive style.

Mark Mathews
Town Planning Manager
Thames Water Utilities Ltd.