

MEDSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 9th March 2016 at 6.00pm at Medstead Village Hall.

PRESENT: Councillors Roy Pullen (Chairman), Peter Fenwick & Jean Penny (reserve member). There were no members of the public present.

Also present: Peter Baston (Clerk).

16.16 OPEN SESSION

Councillor Fenwick commented that he hoped that the EHDC Traffic Policy would feed through into planning considerations – see 16.21 below.

Councillor Pullen thanked Councillor Penny for attending the meeting as a reserve member.

16.17 APOLOGIES

Apologies received from Councillors Stan Whitcher & Cllr Mike Smith.

16.18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no statutory declarations.

16.19 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 10th February 2016, previously circulated **were agreed as a true record.**

16.20 CHAIRMANS REPORT

Not a lot to report on this month, relatively quiet one application for 6 houses in place of two on east side of Lymington Bottom Road and yet another application for Northfield Stables, Soldridge Road, this time for an indoor riding school.

Miller Homes have started on the 20 dwellings, sorry, they have commenced with removal of the spoil left on site by the previous land owner, which according to EHDC means that they have not yet commenced development work, thus they are not yet bound by the conditions placed upon the planning permission.

William Lacey were rumoured to be starting this week at Friars Oak but they have not yet fulfilled all of the pre-commencement conditions and this now looks to be more likely to start in mid-April. I am meeting with the planning officer, Ingrid and William Lacey tomorrow (10th March) to discuss the Construction Management Statement for this site. It is our aim to get the same CMS basics agreed as for Lymington Barns and then as CALA, etc. come on line to get them working on the same document as well.

On Friday our Chair and I are hoping to meet with the planning officer to discuss the Northfield Stables application and other matters about this site.

Neighbourhood Plan Report

It was passed by EHDC full committee and recommended to be taken to Referendum. This should be on 5th May but is still to be confirmed by EHDC

Meeting with HCC Highways

After a disappointing start - the meeting should have been two weeks earlier, the detailed report (over 500 pages) arrived on my computer at approx. 10.15 the morning the day of an 11 am meeting in Winchester and when we got there the first thing we (Ingrid and myself) noticed was that they (the experts who are being paid a fortune to prepare this) had missed off the CALA Homes site, things got better.

It does now appear that they are taking this whole traffic thing very seriously and at last have decided that the cumulative effect of ALL the sites needs to be addressed. Also that what they may do at Boyneswood Road for example will also affect Lymington Bottom Road, etc., so not only cumulative but knock on effects.

Very, very, briefly what they have done, or will have when they have adjusted all their figures for CALA site, is arrived at projected traffic volume in 2020 and added another 5 years growth onto that. This means that they are trying to get things at least workable until 2025.

Then they have looked at various options at several points but please bear in mind that this is only the first draft so nothing is decided yet.

So for the junction of Boyneswood Road and the A31 they have looked at a few combinations of traffic lights, no right turn out of Boyneswood and a roundabout. The roundabout they have for the moment decided it probably could not be delivered due to a lack of available space (verges, etc.) and would require some compulsory purchase of land, etc. which is not guaranteed. So further work will now be done on traffic lights to bring forward more detailed possibilities.

Exactly the same process has been undergone for A31/Lymington Bottom Road junction, although this time it looks as though they will probably put more work into a roundabout as it seemed at present to be the preferred option.

With regard to the Boyneswood Road bridge, they are seriously looking at a separate pedestrian bridge, cantilevered maybe off the existing structure. To this end they are making contact with the Watercress Line and doing further investigations into feasibility of construction, costs, etc. So this option has not been ruled out yet. It is likely however that what ever eventually happens some form of pedestrian 'path' across the existing bridge will go in place for now be it a virtual path, kerbed path, etc.

They have also done some investigations into the actual construction of the surrounding roads including Five Ash, Soldridge, etc. and are starting to get an idea together of temporary construction traffic management for ALL the sites including not having both the two major roads closed at the same time.

There is a whole lot more, mostly table after table of traffic surveys, accidents, projections, etc., etc. including one that I spotted that anticipated that to turn right onto the A31 from Boyneswood at peak hour might take 40 minutes! I was assured that once the computer reaches certain numbers it throws out rubbish!

As this is only a first draft for initial discussion the document is not for open circulation and even the initial ideas would be better not publicised until confirmed at the next meeting which is still to be arranged.

16.21 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

EHDC have reported that it is anticipated that work on the CIL Funding Decision protocol will commence in the near future, however at present they are not able to provide any timescales. Following a meeting on Devolution at HCC, Councillor Fenwick reported it was announced that CIL is being referred back to central government for further review.

Following a communication from EHDC, (*Planning Applications – what information should you provide?*) Medstead Parish Council has two observations on this proposed revised document.

Under Traffic policy there is no recognition of the cumulative impact of recent developments, approvals and other applications already in the system. The figures for these should be included with any application.

The overall document is fine but needs to be enforced. What is the point of having legislation such as this and then ignoring it? Many applications that filter down as far as Medstead PC have some of these requirements missing yet are still validated by the busy case officers so we would deduce from this that there are many across the district that do not satisfy these requirements. Examples can be provided if required

16.22 EHDC DECISION NOTICES

The following decisions were noted by the Committee:

- a. **24997/004** - Fairmont, 21 Beechlands Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EQ. Conversion and extension of garage to habitable accommodation, pitched roof to replace flat roof to side. **Permission.**
- b. **56471** – 2 Twinkle Cottages, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EA. Single storey side extension to replace existing conservatory. **Permission.**
- c. **56499** - Marls Row, Trinity Hill, Medstead, Alton. Dwelling with associated landscaping and provision of public wildflower footpath walk. **Refusal**

16.23 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee made the following comments on the Planning Applications:

- a. **25256/034.** Deed of variation to section 106 agreement (as per amended plan received 17/02/2016) | Land at Friars Oak Farm, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton. **No Objection.**
 - b. **35561/005.** 6 dwellings after demolition of 2 existing dwellings and outbuildings | 68 - 70 Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EP.
- The Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan (M&FMNP) has been approved by EHDC at full council to go to referendum on 5th May 2016 and as such must be given significant weight.
 - The Medstead Village Design Statement (VDS) has been adopted by EHDC as a supplementary planning document and is relevant to this application.
 - The appeal decision and inspectors report dated 9th February 2016 in 39009/005 Residential development comprising 10 dwellings, open space, landscaping and associated works. Land to the north of the Telephone Exchange, Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead is particularly relevant in this case.
 - The Parish Council would welcome EHDC's views on CILs and 106 contributions including affordable housing.

We note that this is an application for Full Planning Permission and at a loss to understand why the application has been validated when it appears that the following have been omitted:

- Contrary to National Policy no location plan has been provided.
- No drawings showing visibility splays for either of the proposed entrances have been provided. There is also a wide verge shown/mentioned along the highway which does not exist.
- All correspondence from EHDC reference pre planning advice is missing
- There is no list of items that are required to be Reserved Matter e.g. foul and surface water drainage schemes are not amongst the details submitted.
- The Design and Access Statement is out of date and factually incorrect in several places.

The Parish Council **objects** to this application of the grounds:

- **Policy**
The proposed development is a back garden development contrary to EHDC policy and also contrary to Policy 1 of the M&FMNP. According to the M&FMNP the site lies partly outside the Settlement Policy Boundary and as EHDC can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply (see appeal decision 39009/005)

approval would be contrary to policy. Reference has been made in the application to the two approved sites at the southern end of Lymington Bottom Road both of which are outside the settlement Policy Boundary contrary to the assertion at paragraph 6.2.27 of the Design and Access Statement. The application accepts that the area is NOT considered highly sustainable, a point confirmed by the appeal inspector when dismissing the appeal at the pig farm on Lymington Bottom Road (39009/005) when he stated that that the site was unsustainable. This site is approximately 200 metres to the south.

- Design

The application is not a linear development and as such contrary the VDS and Planning Inspectorate precedent. The proposal has a lack of visitor car parking spaces and five bedroom houses need more than 2 car parking spaces.

There is a lack of variety of houses both in size and style.

- Access,

The absence of drawings showing visibility splays is considered to be an attempt to hide the need that to acquire the necessary visibility splays there would be a need for the removal of the mature hedges which shield the site and would be a significant loss to the “sylvan” street scene. It is disingenuous to say that because existing drives do not have adequate visibility splays then this site should not be required to have them.

Access to the application site is at the foot of the hill where there is clear evidence of traffic travelling at speeds well in excess of the 30mph limit. (See HCC traffic survey for volume and speeds dated December 2014. Access is also opposite a very busy commercial site and the area is subject to congestion from commercial vehicles. The developments at the southern end of Lymington Bottom Road are situated several hundred metres back from the road and access is established with clear open visibility and therefore comparison is inappropriate.

- Transport

The Transport Statement is deficient in that it claims that there is a railway service within a short distance. The nearest usable commuter service is several miles away while the local station serves a Steam Heritage Line.

- Traffic

There was a reported accident 24/01/2014 in Lymington Bottom Road, north of the railway bridge and several at the A31 junction. It is accepted by HCC that the junction at the A31 both with LBR and Boyneswood Road will not cope with the increase in traffic produced by the developments already permitted and therefore any further increase will compound this problem.

- Drainage

The area is beset with surface water flooding problems compounded by the development at Wisteria, Lymington Bottom Road (22638). There are inadequate measures to ensure flooding problems do not increase.

- Public Open Space, etc.

The application claims that there is public open space and children’s play equipment nearby when in fact the two nearest are at Four Marks recreation ground and Medstead Village Green both of which are over 2 kilometres away and very dangerous for children to walk to.

- Sustainability

The following extracts from the appeal inspector’s report for 39009/005 **apply equally** to this site

The additional 175 dwellings to be provided across the plan period was the subject of a sustainability appraisal. The fact that this target has been met and substantially exceeded early in the plan period demonstrates the pressure that the settlement is under, and which is likely to continue. The small level of services that are within the village are under significant pressure given the size of the settlement and the pace of increase at this point in time. This adds to the pressure on services and facilities including in terms of public open space, community facilities and education. The Council have identified the policies, CP16 and CP18 in the JCS and supplementary guidance that sets out the requirements.

The Council point out that the Four Marks Primary School is 2 Km away. At the site visit I was requested to visit the primary school at Medstead, this was some distance on country roads, including a number of inclines. Because of the distance and nature of the routes available to access the schools it is unlikely that new residents would access them by foot or cycle and they would be most likely reliant on the private motor vehicle for these journeys.

On balance I conclude that the site is not sustainably located in relation to access to other services and facilities necessary to support the day to day needs of the residents and would be likely to result in residents being reliant on the private motor vehicle.

Should EHDC be minded to approve this application we would ask that the following be included as part of the Conditions.

A Construction Management Statement that mirrors those of other sites currently being developed in the area

No dwelling shall be occupied until the capacity of Four Marks C of E Primary School has been increased to accommodate the likely number of primary school children arising from this and other local developments. **Objection.**

- c. **24469/005.** Extension of existing stable block comprising tack/feed room and additional loose box | Warwick Lodge, Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JF **No Objection.**
- d. **39646/019.** Indoor riding school, relocation of existing sand school and bund | Northfield Stables, Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JF.

Medstead Parish Council has the following observations:

- This is the 13th application since 2005 concerning the development of this site.
- To be of any value, the business plan information contained within the Design and Access Statement needs to be set alongside a full business plan disclosure. At least 2 indoor riding schools have closed in recent years in Medstead, therefore commercial viability must be questioned.

Traffic and Parking

- If successful, traffic movements are considered to be grossly under estimated for both private and commercial vehicles. A professional impact report should be provided.
- There is concern regarding the increase in the number of horse boxes accessing the site and their impact on not only on the track but also on Soldridge Road.
- Parking facilities are considered to be inadequate.

Surface Water

- There is existing run off of surface water which ends up running across the applicants land to Soldridge Road and Lymington Bottom Road and so exacerbating the flooding in that area. This run off seems to come from the south east corner of the site.

Notwithstanding the planned additional soakaway there is concern as to the effectiveness as this development would substantially increase the water runoff by having more areas of impervious surfaces.

Facilities

- Toilet facilities are considered inadequate for the projected number of clients. The use of domestic facilities is considered to be inappropriate.

Should EHDC be minded to approve conditions need to be applied regarding hours of business, light pollution, flood-lighting, noise so as to protect the neighbours' right to the quiet enjoyment of their properties. **Objection**

- e. **25256/036.** Variation of Condition 23 to Planning Permission 25256/032. Land at Friars Oak Farm, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton. **No Comment.**

There were no further matters to discuss and the meeting was closed at 7.05pm

Signed ChairmanDate.....