

MEDSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 8th November 2017 at 6.30pm at Medstead Village Hall.

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

Also present: One member of the public and Peter Baston (Parish Clerk).

	Action
17.86 OPEN SESSION i. The member of the public expressed concern that the appeal for case reference 35561/008 which had been upheld by the Planning Inspectorate could open the floodgates to similar appeals in the future. ii. Cllr Fenwick mentioned that similar to other local schemes, a condition of the Miller site was that an apprenticeship scheme be put in place and it was not clear whether this had occurred. iii. Cllr Pullen mentioned that two applications had been received from EHDC after the deadline for being heard at the planning committee meeting and no extension was being allowed. It was suggested that Medstead parish council write to EHDC and state that it would appear that Medstead parish council are unable to comment due to being overlooked by perhaps inexperienced EHDC case officer(s). These two cases will however still be discussed at the next Planning committee meeting with any comments forwarded on to EHDC	
17.87 APOLOGIES. None	
17.88 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no statutory declarations.	
17.89 MINUTES i. The minutes of the meeting held on the Wednesday 11th October 2017 , previously circulated were agreed as a true record . They would be signed by the Chairman at the next meeting. ii. No Matters Arising.	
17.90 CHAIRMANS REPORT Yet another quiet month on the Planning front in terms of new applications with little to report.	
17.91 STREET NAMING – LAND NORTH OF BOYNESWOOD LANE. It was felt by the Committee that the continued use of suggested names from the Medstead war memorial would not be suitable as in some cases there are immediate relatives still living in the area and also, that each development should have its own distinct identity. The Committee suggested therefore, that local wildlife names be used (e.g. badger, hedgehog, muntjac, otter, squirrel, dormouse etc.). The clerk would advise EHDC accordingly.	Clerk
17.92 PLANNING APPEAL(S) NOTIFICATION 35561/008 - Bakkehuset, 68 Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead. Retention of detached double garage to front. The decision was noted by the Committee.	

17.93 EHDC DECISION NOTICES

Reference No:	25988/004	PARISH: Medstead
Location:	Holly Lodge, Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JF	
Proposal:	Detached garage and store to front (amended plans received 27/09/17)	
Decision:	PERMISSION	Decision Date: 2 October, 2017

Reference No:	21728/005	PARISH: Medstead
Location:	Little Ease, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5DY	
Proposal:	Pitched roof on garage	
Decision:	PERMISSION	Decision Date: 2 October, 2017

Reference No:	27941/006	PARISH: Medstead
Location:	Plum Cottage, Hattingley Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5NQ	
Proposal:	Certificate of lawful development for existing use - land to the west of our drive has been used as a garden for over 10 years	
Decision:	WITHDRAWN	Decision Date: 13 October, 2017

Reference No:	56852/001	PARISH: Medstead
Location:	1 The Crescent, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EG	
Proposal:	Retention of Fence	
Decision:	PERMISSION	Decision Date: 23 October, 2017

17.94. Planning Application 56082/001 OUT Mount Royal, 46 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5AH

Although this proposed development lies within the neighbouring parish of Four Marks, it is situated in the planning area known as Four Marks and south Medstead and within the designated area of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan. Medstead Parish Council, therefore, consider it appropriate that they comment upon this planning application.

We fully support the pre-application advice given by the Principal Planning Officer in his letter dated 13th September 2017 and do not wish to repeat his cogent advice.

However, we have the following observations to make which we believe are supported by recent refusals by the Planning Inspectorate arising from appeals against EHDC planning decisions for applications within Medstead Parish.

The Joint Core Strategy designates Four Marks and south Medstead as a *Level 3 Small Local Service Centre* and required provide a minimum of 175 dwellings over the plan period to 2028. To date in excess of 316 approvals have been granted, all of which are currently under construction.

Both parishes share a number of essential facilities that are already under great strain, for example schools and doctor's surgeries. Until these and other necessary infrastructure inadequacies are rectified then no additional development of this size should be considered. We consider that any further approvals would put undue pressure on the infrastructure and facilities of the community. The Planning Inspectorate agree:

Application 39009/005

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/15/3134150 Land to the North of The Telephone Exchange, Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Hampshire GU34 5EP

9th February 2016

23. Four Marks/Medstead has an identified allocation of a minimum of 175 new dwellings; the Council have provided evidence to confirm that there are permissions which bring the housing provision in the area to well in excess of this figure, in the region of 316. On this basis neither the Allocations Plan nor the Neighbourhood Plan are proposing allocating additional sites or extending the settlement policy boundary to provide additional sites.

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.

Appeal refused

We believe that the linear character of Lymington Bottom which is on the edge of the settlement should be protected and the cul-de-sac development should be resisted.

In a smaller but analogous scheme in south Medstead the Inspector agreed:

Application 35561

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/16/3151088 68-70 Lymington Bottom Road, (Medstead) Four Marks Alton GU34 5E

8th November 2016

Turning to the detail of the scheme, the development would be noticeable from Lymington Bottom Road as much of the front planting would be removed and, although 2 houses would be facing the highway, the relatively wide and formal access road would be apparent and would allude to further development behind. The scheme in general and the houses along the cul-de-sac in particular could also be seen from the surrounding fields and gardens through the trees that bound the site. In these views the limited separation between the dwellings at the rear means that, given their size and form, they would appear relatively suburban in nature. As a consequence of these factors the scheme would be sharply at odds with the linear character of built development on this part of the road and would be in conflict with the semi-rural nature of the surroundings, representing a suburban intrusion into the landscape. It would therefore be a discordant development that would not reinforce the local distinctiveness of the area and would relate poorly to the general locality.

14. 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 my opinion this is an example of such development.

Appeal refused

The site of the proposed development not only lies predominantly outside the Settlement Policy Boundary but has not been allocated for future development, as in the case referenced below and which was subject to an appeal.

Application No 55949

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/16/3154870 The Haven, Dinas and Merrow Down, Land west of Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire GU34 5DY

22nd December 2016

6. The majority of the appeal site is located outside the identified settlement boundary. Policy CP19 of the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy 2014 (JCS) is applicable to development outside of the settlement boundary and generally restricts development in the countryside for its own sake. The

proposal is not one of the stated exceptions in the policy. Policy H14 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review 2006 (DLP) also restricts development outside of defined settlement boundaries to that with a genuine and proven need.

7. Policy CP10 of the JCS sets out the Council's spatial strategy for housing, generally directing new housing to sites within the settlement boundaries where it is consistent with maintaining and enhancing character and the quality of life. Policy CP10 goes on to say that in addition to allocated sites, housing outside the settlement boundaries will only be permitted in accordance with stated criteria, including where it has been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan or has clear community support.

8. The site is not an allocated site for housing and has not been identified for development in the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan (MFMNP) which was formally made on 12th May 2016. Whereas, recently permitted major developments are included within it, the large majority of the site is outside of the settlement boundary defined in the newly made MFMNP and is not included within the proposed changes to the settlement boundary identified in the East Hampshire District Local Plan Part 2: Housing and Employment Allocations (Site Allocations Plan and Policies Map) 2016 ('LPHEA').

9. The Council is able to demonstrate in excess of a five year housing land supply. It is also able to demonstrate that well in excess of the JCS's minimum target of 175 new homes for Four Marks/South Medstead can be provided. The examining Inspector's report on the LPHEA noted that there is no need to make additional land available for extra housing to provide flexibility in case of slippage. The Council points to there being 79 net completions during 2015/16 in Four Marks/South Medstead. Furthermore, there are 410 outstanding permissions with 37 of these currently under construction. Whilst the appellant casts doubt over the implementation of the 'Friars Oak' proposed development, from the evidence before me it appears likely that the Council will achieve its targets for housing delivery on the basis of existing allocations and permissions.

11. Given this background, whilst Part 3 of the Local Plan is not expected to be adopted until October 2019, I am not persuaded at this time that it is certain that the settlement boundaries would be altered to include the part of the site that is not currently within the existing boundary. Whilst the settlement boundary in the DLP dates back to 2006, the recently made MFMNP provides an up to date settlement boundary taking account of current circumstances.

Appeal refused

There are many other examples from Four Marks Parish which we are sure FMPC will include within their comments. Medstead Parish Council object to this application and request that it is refused.

17.95 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee made the following comments on the Planning Applications:

i. 49886/001.

All Weather Riding Arena

Woodstock, Homestead Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5PW

Medstead Parish Council have reviewed the details of the application and have no objection.

ii. 54643/005

Two single storey extensions

Pax, Grosvenor Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JE.

If the extension(s) had been included within the original plans, due to the overall size, would this have exceeded the guidelines allowable? However, Medstead Parish council have no further comment.

iii.	<p>53462/001</p> <p>Conversion of roof space to habitable accommodation with dormer windows to south elevation and Velux windows to north, east and west elevation. La Rhune, Windsor Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5EF Medstead Parish Council have reviewed the details of the application and have no objection.</p>
iv.	<p>56157/007</p> <p>Two storey replacement dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuilding New Clovelly, Homestead Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5PW Homestead Road is a bridleway. Medstead Parish Council consider that the size and mass of this proposed dwelling is out of keeping with the 'street scene'. MPC also consider that approval would be inconsistent with previous decisions in the parish for example Annaliese, Soldridge Road, Medstead (being case ref 56366).</p>
v.	<p>28928/009</p> <p>Extension to covered Riding School and replacement roof covering Broadlands Riding Centre, Lower Paice Lane, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5PX Medstead Parish Council have reviewed the details of the application and have no objection.</p>
vi.	<p>39442/001</p> <p>Single storey extension to rear, first floor extension to side, conversion of attached garage to form habitable accommodation following demolition of existing conservatory. Laburnum Cottage, Soldridge Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5JF. Medstead Parish Council have reviewed the details of the application and have no objection.</p>

There were no further matters to discuss and the meeting was closed at 7.15pm.

Signed ChairmanDate.....