

MEDSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 12th March 2014 at 7.30pm at Medstead Village Hall

PRESENT: Councillor R Pullen (Chairman), Councillor P Fenwick, Councillor M Smith, Councillor S Whitcher and Councillor D Jackson (non-voting) and six members of the public.

Also present: Miss Katie Knowles (Clerk) and District Councillor I Thomas

13.87 OPEN SESSION:

Residents commented on the outline application for 51 dwellings at land north of Boyneswood Lane highlighting a range of concerns including concern about the continued barrage of large scale applications and whether the residents' concerns will ever be heard and listened to by EHDC, specifically relating the application; access to the proposed site, it is out of keeping with the existing properties, there are existing drainage problems, traffic generation etc.

Residents also commented on the pre-decision amendments to **25256/032** now 80 dwellings at Friars Oak which appeared on the District Councils website today and whether the Parish Council would be able to comment due to the limited timescale. The Chairman confirmed that the Parish Council would be commenting of the amendments.

13.88 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

13.89 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

13.90 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 10th February 2014, previously circulated, **were agreed as a true record** and signed by the Chairman.

13.91 CHAIRMANS REPORT

The Chairman updated the Committee and members of the public during the open session on the progress of the joint Neighbourhood Plan and the role of the Parish Council when commenting on planning applications in particular, representing the concerns of the residents of Medstead, highlighting current infrastructure deficits and future requirements.

13.92 DECISION NOTICES

The following decision notices of East Hants District Council were noted:

- a) **37552/002** - RETENTION AND CONTINUED USE OF LAND AS RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE. Harmel, 81 Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EP. **REFUSAL & NOTIFICATION OF APPEAL.**
- b) **26608/004** - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR. Handy Stores, High Street, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5LW. **PERMISSION.**
- c) **22983/008** - THREE DWELLINGS AFTER DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND STABLES (AS AMENDED BY PLANS RECEIVED 13/12/2013). Cedar Stables, Castle Street, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5LU. **PERMISSION.**
- d) **24651/003** – CERTIFICATION OF PROPOSED LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT – ORANGERY TO REAR. Cotleigh, Roe Downs Road, Medstead, Alton GU34 5LG. **LAWFULNESS CERTIF – PROPOSED-PERMITTED.**

- e) **55340** – SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR. Ticehurst, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EA. **PERMISSION.**

13.93 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee made the following comments on the Planning Applications:

- a) **55258/001/25MAR** - OUTLINE - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 51 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED NEW VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS. Land north of, Boyneswood Lane, Medstead, Alton.

Medstead Parish Council has a number of concerns with this outline planning application and therefore, at this stage, must register its **Objection**:

Principle

Firstly we object on the grounds that it is premature pending approval of the JCS and would be prejudicial to the subsequent preparation of a NP

Policy Background and Conflict

This application fails to comply with EHDC's Interim Policy Statement on Housing

Para 2 it is not the appropriate size and does not take into account the cumulative impact of other applications.

Para 3 it does not enhance the landscape.

Para 7 it is not possible to walk easily (safely) to a range of facilities, schools, pubs, dentists, etc.

Para 11 the density is inappropriate.

Para 12 it is constrained by the need for significant off-site infrastructure.

Para 13 it does not demonstrate deliverability within the timescale of 2 years.

Joint Core Strategy Requirement

In view of the outline approvals already given for 107 houses on Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead which contribute about 60% of the required minimum 175 homes planned for the period 2011- 2028 in the soon to be approved Joint Core Strategy (JCS), we consider that there is no justification to build these homes at the present time. To do so would result in virtually all of the houses proposed for Four Marks/south Medstead being built in the early years of the Plan period. This would raise the probability of pressure for further housing in later years, well beyond the figure of 175, which would totally overwhelm the existing settlement. The sustainability of existing communities is, and must remain, a guiding principle of all planning decisions.

No attempt has been made anywhere within the application to take into account the cumulative effect that this and other developments are/will have on the area

Affordable Housing Need

The approvals in excess of 100 Affordable homes already granted at Brislands Lane, Four Marks and Lymington Bottom, Medstead fully satisfy the need for 71 Affordable homes. (see EHDC Housing Officer/Planning Officer documents). Therefore there is no justification for this development to be based on Affordable housing needs, however we do support the need for smaller houses, especially 1 bedroom units, to be included within all developments.

Detail

Coming now to the details of the application:

Layout and house designs

As this is an outline application we will not comment at this point

Drainage and water supply

The application says that foul water drainage will be via connection to public sewer. A connection to the public sewer on the A31 has many problems and these are not addressed within this application. Thames Water has 'identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application'. The applicant has not addressed the very serious engineering constraints of getting the sewer pipe to and across the railway line.

As the application site is 3.64 hectares it very conveniently just falls outside of the scope of the Environment Agency regarding flooding and we consider that as this application should take account of the cumulative effect of recent and proposed developments in the area, especially when considering the contours of the site, the clay subsoil and the known surface and ground water problems experienced by existing properties in the area.

Residents of Beechlands Road have expressed concern that existing ground water runoff, exacerbated by recent developments in the area, is having a detrimental effect on their septic tanks. They fear that the imposition of a further 51 houses in the area will make matters worse.

The application does not address the problem of very low water pressure in the area. Mid Southern Water do not appear to have been consulted on this and therefore have not commented.

Electricity Supply

There is no mention of any consultations or proposals regarding the electricity supply. This area suffers from frequent outages, suggesting that there is a problem coping with current demand.

Until all of the relevant Statutory Undertakings have addressed water supply, foul drainage and power this application should be refused.

Highway Safety, Road and Parking Provision

We await Hampshire Highways report on whether the additional traffic will affect the junction with the A31 and whether this report adequately takes into account the cumulative numbers of traffic movements caused by recent developments and applications. We would expect the report to require improvements to junctions, roads, footways, etc.

The Recycling & Refuse department has 'concerns over the access for waste collection vehicles'.

The recommended routes for cyclists and pedestrians to a number of locations are via Boyneswood Lane and Stoney Lane which are bridleways. These are impassable in winter due to their poor state of repair. Hampshire County Council surrendered their responsibility for their maintenance to the residents of those bridleways in about 1953.

The safety of pedestrians and the lack of a proper footway or footbridge over the railway line at Boyneswood Road is of particular concern to the parish Council and reflects the concerns expressed by the local community.

The transport statement accepts that there is an inadequacy of public transport in the area and claims to have made allowance for increased private vehicle movement. There appears to have been no similar allowance for the parking of an increased number of vehicles

There is a shortfall of visitor parking spaces.

Social Infrastructure Needs

There is nothing in this application that addresses the need to increase the already very low opportunities for employment locally.

This application does not address the need for additional infrastructure eg doctors, dentists, a post office, entertainment, a public house, somewhere for the youth of the community to meet within the community to be in place before these proposed dwellings are occupied

The application makes no mention of a Community Project Worker who would be needed for a large project such as this to assist in the social integration of new residents into the wider community.

Open Space

The area of public open space is to be applauded but we would wish to see a legally binding undertaking given by the land owner which provides for the open space to remain as such for in perpetuity. The main area would also need some seating and some suitable play equipment.

Ecology

We are surprised that full ecological survey has not been undertaken as no consideration has been given to the existence of dormice, slow worms, grass snakes, deer, badgers etc , all of which are known to be in the area. The soil report mentions the possible existence of a badger set.

Errors Identified

There are many factual errors, exaggerations, etc. which while not major individually may have a substantial effect when taken as a whole.

By way of illustration the application claims that the development is:

- for a transport link 700metres from Medstead and Four Marks Station (this is a heritage line
- not main line)
- for leisure 800metres from a pub (closed in 2013 and now a shop)
- Post Office in Four Marks – (not been one for a number of years)
- for leisure 650metres from Watercress Lane (location unknown to local community)

Summary

As the major items in the above are dependant upon outside bodies eg Water Companies, Electricity Supplier, Hampshire Highways and they will need to carry out investigations, surveys, plan any necessary proposals, cost them up and then agree with the applicant on cost and the way forward we suggest that this means that the infrastructure improvements off site cannot be executed in time for this development to be completed within the two year time frame required by current planning policy.

Master Plan

It is now time for EHDC to produce a Master Plan for Medstead and Four Marks, albeit two years too late. In the past 2 years the planning area known as Four Marks and south Medstead has had constructed, approved and applied for 650 dwellings with another 250 having been 'exhibited' within the past month. There has not been one single change to the infrastructure made or proposed during that time. The usual list of factors that need addressing are foul sewage disposal, roads, pedestrian safety, schools, doctors surgeries, water mains, electricity supplies, community facilities (pub, Post Office, supermarket), public transport, employment and all of these need to be addressed urgently by the Planning Authority.

Under paragraph 2 of EHDC's Interim Housing policy Statement ; Policy Criteria - adopted 27th February 2014 it states The level of housing permitted in any one settlement under this IHPS should not exceed the level of housing proposed as new allocations for that settlement in the JCS: as follows Four Marks/South Medstead 175 new homes. It does not say about or approximately 175, it clearly states 175. Now is the time that East Hampshire District Council rigorously implements its own policies.

Medstead Parish Council requests that EHDC refuse Planning Permission and in the event of any appeal Medstead Parish Council would offer EHDC our wholehearted support, and it is understood that support would also be forthcoming from a considerable number of local residents.

- b) **22638/002/17MAR - 5 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING (AS AMENDED BY PLANS RECEIVED 23/12/2013). Wistaria, 74 Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EP. Medstead Parish Council repeats its comments previously submitted and highlights the following points: The proposal is an over development of the site, the single point access to the development is out of keeping, the proposed access is on a blind brow of a hill which presents a road safety concern and dwelling number 5 is still too close to the neighbouring property No. 80 which will be overlooked with loss of privacy.**
- c) 54641/002/01APR – Variation of Condition (VOC) application -Variation of condition 13 - change to specification of glazing and insulation. Variation of condition 14 - change to noise survey requirements. Removal of condition 15. Former Engineering Works at junction with Winston Rise, Station Approach, Four Marks, Alton. **Noted.**

13.94 PLANNING COMMITTEE - TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Committee reviewed its terms of reference and agreed to recommend to Council that the requirement that a public speaker must be a member of the electoral register (Meetings .di) is reviewed.

The meeting was closed at 9.05pm

Signed ChairmanDate.....