

MEDSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL

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

PRESENT: Councillors Roy Pullen (Chairman), Peter Fenwick & Mike Smith.

Also present: Member of the public (Mrs G Fuzzard) and Peter Baston (Clerk).

16.78 OPEN SESSION

- i. Cllr Smith highlighted the issue of mud on the road at Lymington Bottom as a result of building activity on the nearby sites and Cllr Pullen confirmed that the Clerk had contacted the developer to address the problem. It was also reiterated that issues involving vehicle parking and speeding were a matter for the police and any issues should be reported on the non-emergency number 101.
- ii. Cllr Pullen reported that there were difficulties in getting a suitable venue and time for the Liaison meetings with the developers and this was still being pursued through EHDC.
- iii. Cllr Pullen reported that the date for the appeal for case number 55460) being land at Mansfield Business Park would be heard on 6th December 2016 at Penns Place Petersfield.
- iv. Cllr Pullen further reported that a local ecological expert had raised concerns over the routing of the drainage from the proposed Bargate site and in particular possible damage to tree roots and her concerns have been passed on to the EHDC tree officer.

16.79 APOLOGIES

None.

16.80 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no statutory declarations.

16.81 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 12th October 2016, previously circulated **were signed and agreed as a true record.**

16.82 CHAIRMANS REPORT

Still very quiet in terms of new applications although we are awaiting the Inspector's decision for the appeal on 68-70 Lymington Bottom Road. EHDC have managed to exceed their normal level of disorganisation by not sending a Planning Officer to the site visit.

We will have discussed the two appeals earlier this evening – Station Approach and The Haven, Boyneswood Road – and will submit our comments within a few days.

16.83 SHLAA SITE APPRAISAL

Cllr Pullen reported that EHDC appear reluctant to allow Medstead Parish Council to become too involved. However, it was noted that the Neighbourhood Steering Group are consultees and that the two Chair(s) of Medstead and Four Marks Planning Committees are representatives on that Group.

16.84 PLANNING APPEALS

- i. **Appeal by Country Estates Group. Site Address: Land to the North of Station Approach, Four Marks, Hampshire, GU34 5PZ. Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: APP/M1710/W/16/3154233. East Hampshire District Council Reference Number: 55460.**

Medstead Parish Council in addition to its views submitted to the Planning Authority May 2015 wishes to draw the Inspector's attention to its comments made to the Planning Committee when this application was first considered in October 2015.

The minute records state:

"Medstead Parish Council had major concerns with this outline planning application and strenuously urged the committee to refuse it.

The definition of planning was the process of thinking about and organising the activities required to achieve a desired goal. It was time to stop looking at every application in isolation - the future and any cumulative effect must be considered. Since July 2012 there had been a huge increase in approved applications for housing in south Medstead and Four Marks, both within and outside the SPB. In excess of 375 approvals had been granted and, with a further 110 currently under construction, meant that approximately 1800 new residents would be arriving in the very near future. There had been no commensurate increase in employment opportunities and this site was ideally situated to help meet this need.

This application was for housing, on land in the centre of a business park, and the location was therefore totally inappropriate. Would you allow an industrial unit to be built in the middle of a housing estate, knowing that in a few years' time you would need more houses and then end up having to build them on a business park?

Having attended many previous meetings of the Planning Committee, the committee had often said that EHDC had specialists on various topics of planning, etc. and that it should follow their advice. Well, in this instance EHDC's own Economic Development Officer had prepared a damning report objecting to this application on numerous policy grounds. In the light of the above professional advice, to simply apply S106 contributions because of the loss of employment land would be farcical – where would you provide the replacement land.

EHDC's Planning Policy Department also objects, as did the Drainage Department. The Environment Agency likewise had several concerns, suggesting stringent conditions and stating that it may not grant a permit to discharge the outfall from the treatment plant. The proposed development would increase surface water run-off and it was not clear that all of this could be controlled on site, therefore, possibly adding to the already heavy runoff that contributed to the flooding in Lymington Bottom Road.

This application should also be refused because it was contrary to the policies contained within the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan, which had been submitted and was expected to go to the examiner next week. It was not in accordance with the adopted Development Plan or the emerging Site Allocations Plan.

Finally, Station Approach was clearly signed as a 'Private Road', yet there was no statement within the application which clarified the rights or obligations of future residents."

At the second Planning Committee meeting in February 2016, the minute records state:

“Once again the case officer had repeated their mistakes of the previous committee meeting and with a reprehensible, cynical disregard for the democratic process placed before you a procedurally deficient application.

The officer had failed to place in the public domain:

- *Material information provided by the applicant;*
- *An independently commissioned professional review;*
- *The written opinion of EHDC’s Economic Development Team; and*
- *Had failed to consult with Hampshire County Council (HCC) Highways Authority regarding traffic impact in the light of the results of the latest HCC commissioned study which had been shared with the Planning Authority.*

There has been no opportunity for any independent public scrutiny. They had failed to consult.

This was the third time in less than a year that developers in Medstead had come to the District Council with applications that effectively asked the community to underwrite their poor business judgement when buying overpriced land. Was intervention in failing businesses now EHDC policy?

The case officer’s report considered only financial viability as it affected the applicant. Earlier this month, one of the Planning Officer’s confirmed the Planning Inspector’s ruling in 39646 that financial viability was not a “material consideration.” Why was there no consistency within the planning department?

This application had been referred back to officers due to the complete divergence of opinions between EHDC’s Economic Development Team and its Planning Department. EHDC’s Economic Development Team were indefatigably opposed to this application last year. Where was their argument for a 180 degree about turn; conveniently omitted? Where were the answers to their questions?

- *The impact of housing on the existing businesses;*
- *The increase in the deficit of available employment land in the district;*
- *Where is the justification for additional housing contrary to your Allocations Plan?*

Was the officer seriously suggesting that sandwiched at the back of business offices between commercial and industrial buildings with an outlook onto a railway embankment was an appropriate place to build nine isolated homes?

On the 9th February 2016 the Planning Inspector, in dismissing an appeal for 10 dwellings on a nearby site stated “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.”

Please take note of this senior professional’s independent advice.

Please also be aware that other commercial property owners in Medstead were awaiting the decision with interest in order to capitalise on any change in precedent.

He asked the committee to take a holistic approach and refuse this application”.

Medstead Parish Council would also like the Inspector to note a recent planning application for the revitalisation of nearby commercial buildings:

Planning Ref 56936 Five units for A1, A2 & B1 (office), seven residential units following demolition of existing commercial building, associated landscaping, ancillary space and car parking Lymington Farm Industrial Estate, Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton.

The Parish Council considers this to be a confirmation of not only the need for additional commercial property but also the financial viability.

The Parish Council would like to draw the attention of the Inspector to the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan which was “made” by East Hampshire District Council on 12th May 2016 following a referendum which attracted a 41% and voted 93% in favour. The area under consideration has been designated for employment use.

Finally, The Parish Council would like to draw attention to the appeal decision in Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/15/3134150. Land to the North of The Telephone Exchange, Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Hampshire GU34 5EP, where the inspector stated:

24. 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.....

Should the Inspector be minded to approve we ask that any approval be conditioned to ensure that the foul drainage system is connected to the main sewer in Lymington Bottom Road.

ii. Planning Appeal Ref APP/M1710/W/16/3154870. THE HAVEN, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, Hants. East Hampshire District Council Reference Number 55949/001.

Medstead Parish Council has made comments previously to EHDC on this application and will not repeat these here.

We believe both Four Marks Parish Council and the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan are submitting to the Appeal Inspector a list of inaccuracies, errors, etc. in the appeal documents submitted by the appellants and again we will not repeat those here.

MPC continues to have grave concern over the access of this proposed site being opposite the now constructed entrance into the site for 80 houses on the east of Boyneswood Road forming a staggered crossroads. Using the appellant’s estimated vehicle movements of 85 in a 12 hour period and adding a pro rata figure of 400 in the same period for the estate opposite it is easy to see that there will be a huge impact upon the already busy Boyneswood Road. Coupled to this increase in numbers is the recent alterations to the traffic flow across the bridge to one way which already causes queues of vehicles at peak hours which backs up onto the A31 and stops residents being able to get out of their own drive onto the road. Hampshire County Council commissioned a report which shows that the junction of Boyneswood Road and the A31 is already beyond its safety limit, so to add even more traffic movements to this is wrong. When the inevitable accident occurs someone will have to be held responsible for ignoring the local’s warnings of the dire consequences of not taking into consideration the cumulative impact of all of

the local permissions granted – already some 340 in the parish of Medstead alone without the additional 200 plus in Four Marks. We question the use of the 2.4 x 43m sight line for this development as we believe that it should be using the increased figures that are required for a cross roads. As the Appendix C of the Transport Statement is not on line we question if the road turn in area to the north side of the exit is achievable within the land controlled by the appellant. We would ask that the Inspector times their site visit to one of the two daily peak hours to see for them self the chaos that already exists without the additional traffic movement from these sites.

This summer the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan was ‘made’, thereby becoming part of the development plan. As this is more recent than the District Plan, any conflict between the 2 must be resolved in its favour. The Neighbourhood Plan excludes most of the site from the SPB, so meaning that part is defined as countryside. It states that in the areas outside an SPB the approach of general restraint found in Core Strategy Policies CP6 and CP19 will apply. This development is in conflict with those policies as it is not for any of the circumstances they accept. Therefore the introduction of housing here would detract from the existing pleasing rural landscape, so diminishing its value.

Whilst Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1 has been modified so as not to rule out new housing in residential gardens, it still seeks to resist ‘inappropriate development ... where it would harm local character’. In Medstead Parish Council’s opinion this is an example of such development.

Although the NPPF has its emphasis on promoting sustainable development, this proposed scheme would not protect the natural and built environment. This site is in an unsustainable location in relation to its proximity to services, particularly the schools, and so is likely to result in a reliance on the car. It is reasonable to assume its residents would also rely on the car to access services, schools and so on. As such it would not meet the definition of sustainable development found in the Framework.

Medstead Parish Council’s conclusion is that the proposal would result in development outside the SPB in the countryside, thereby diminishing the value of the rural landscape, while the introduction of houses along a cul-de-sac behind frontage development at right angles to the road would be of a nature and layout that detracted significantly from the character and appearance of the area. As a result, and in the absence of any material considerations to outweigh this harm, it would conflict unacceptably with Policies CP10, CP19, CP20 and CP29 in the Core Strategy and Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1.

Finally, Medstead Parish Council would like to draw attention to the appeal decision in Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/15/3134150, Land to the North of The Telephone Exchange, Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Hampshire GU34 5EP where the inspector stated in section 24. *“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”.*

In recent years this community has already taken 600 plus new residents with an additional 1000 to arrive shortly when the approved dwellings are built out with no improvement in the level of local infrastructure – in fact we have lost both the pub and post office from the area that would serve this development. It is time to let us get the increased facilities to serve these newcomers before we think about adding any more houses.

Should the Inspector be minded to approve we ask that any approval be conditioned to ensure that the foul drainage system is connected to the main sewer system.

16.85 EHDC DECISION NOTICES

Reference No:	52005	
Location:	5 The Oaks, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5PS	
Proposal:	Two storey extension to side	
Decision:	PERMISSION	Decision Date: 4 October, 2016

Reference No:	20732/005	
Location:	Southlea, 67 Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EP	
Proposal:	Side extension to first floor, canopy to rear - Amendment to ref: 20732/003. A new circular window is to be added to the Master Bathroom on the west elevation of the property and the Master Bedroom window is to be enlarged to match existing 3 pane window located on the west elevation of the property (amended description).	
Decision:	PERMISSION	Decision Date: 20 October, 2016

Reference No:	54291/004	
Location:	Overdale, Upper Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5QG	
Proposal:	Single storey lean-to extension to side	
Decision:	PERMISSION	Decision Date: 19 October, 2016

Reference No:	49185/002	
Location:	The Meadows, Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JF	
Proposal:	Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed works - six enclosed porches to front, side and rear	
Decision:	LAWFULNESS CERTIF - EXISTING - PERMITTED	Decision Date: 17 October, 2016

Reference No:	37899/002	
Location:	3 The Oaks, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5PS	
Proposal:	Reformed porch to the front, extension to garage to provide habitable accommodation [amended plans]	
Decision:	PERMISSION	Decision Date: 12 October, 2016

In addition, Cllr Pullen informed the meeting that the Appeal for 68 – 70 Lymington Bottom Road has been refused by EHDC.

16.86 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee made the following comments on the Planning Applications:

a) 22200/014.

Sycamore directly adjacent to the north of the property shown on attached plan as Tree A - crown lift to 6m, remove branch at white line shown on photo, reduce spread by 15-20% as shown by white line on photo.

Sycamore directly adjacent to the north of the property shown on attached plan as Tree B - crown lift to 6.5m, remove limb shown by white line on photo, remove limb over power cable shown by red arrow on photo.

Lime on the northern boundary of the property, shown on the plan as tree C - crown lift over driveway entrance, public path and highway to 5.1m, reduce limb over phone lines back to strong upright shown at white line on photo.

Shipping House, Wield Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5LP. **Medstead Parish Council will leave this to the EHDC tree officer to resolve.**

b) 33039/001.

Conversion of roof space to provide accommodation at first floor level with three dormers to rear and two dormers to front, two storey extension to front and new porch.

Clouds, Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JF. **Medstead Parish Council have reviewed the details of the application and have no objection.**

c) 36404/002.

Detached bungalow and car port.

Tower Hurst, Windsor Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EF. **Medstead Parish Council have reviewed the details of the application and in the light of previous planning approvals have no objection.**

d) 20323/003.

Single storey rear and side extension after removal of conservatory

12 Abbey Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5PB. **Medstead Parish Council have reviewed the details of the application and have no objection.**

e) 39646/019

Indoor riding school, relocation of existing sand school and bund.

Additional documentation - Drainage Strategy.

Northfield Stables, Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JF. **Medstead Parish Council will leave this to the EHDC drainage officer to resolve but concern is expressed over surface water and the possible outflow at the Five Ash Crossroads location in Medstead.**

There were no further matters to discuss and the meeting was closed at 6.46pm.

Signed ChairmanDate.....