

Four Marks Parish Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee Held on Wednesday 6th April 2016, commencing at 7.30pm At the Benian's Pavilion, Uplands Lane, Four Marks

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cllr Simon Thomas (Chairman), Cllr John Hammond, Cllr David Mills, Cllr Kellie Knight, Cllr Anne Tomlinson and Cllr Janet Foster

ATTENDING: Mrs Sarah Goudie (Clerk), Cllr Tim Brake and 2 members of the public

APOLOGIES: None

16.17 PC OPEN SESSION:

Local resident, Mr Malcolm Seal, raised concerns, following the release of the Neighbourhood Plan prior to referendum, that there did not appear to be any provision or plans for upgrading the village community facilities, being acutely aware that both the Village Hall and Sports pavilion are in need of upgrading. Cllr Thomas responded advising Mr Seal that there was a working party trying to ascertain how to move forward and attempting to work out what was best for the community, either upgrading both or building a new multi-purpose facility. The working party had currently stalled awaiting clarification on certain issues but would be reformed and work would start again in earnest following the start of the new Council year in May. He added that the 1996/2006 Local Plan 2nd Review had not made adequate provision and Four Marks had, for reasons well known, not benefitted from the last two major developments, so financing any project would be very difficult at this time.

Cllr Brake raised concern over the changeover from the current S106 Developers' Contributions to CIL, and queried what would happen to the 'pot' of money allocated to Four Marks. The Clerk confirmed that we should still have access to that money, and was frequently liaising with EHDC on the balance held on the Parish's behalf. Cllr Brake also raised his grave concerns over the application to be discussed as an Agenda item on the application to the rear of 103 Blackberry Lane, and the disparity contained within the documents over how far the development site was from the A31. The construction traffic would have to negotiate the junction at Blackberry Lane and Telegraph Lane, which is already at saturation point during peak times, and not sustainable. The junction of Blackberry Lane and Lymington Bottom would not be able to take any construction traffic due to its configuration, let alone an additional 100 plus car movements per day.

There was no public consultation, consultation with Ward Councillors or pre application advice, and approval of this application would set a precedent, and open the floodgates.

The 5 year land supply is questioned, but it is sound and Cllr Thomas confirmed that East Hampshire does currently have a proven 5 year land supply under both Sedgfield and Liverpool calculations, with 5% and 20% delivery buffers, and some sites that are questioned by the applicant as undeliverable, construction is already underway.

Mr Frank Maloney (Secretary of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee) commenting on the concerns raised that the Neighbourhood Plan did appear to be more focused on Medstead than Four Marks, but confirmed that both parishes were in the same boat with the lack of infrastructure.

Mr Maloney wished to raise his objection to the 103 Blackberry Lane application and proceeded to read out a prepared document, which summarised his concerns as follows:

The site straddles the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) but only 2 dwellings would be within the current curtilage of 103 Blackberry Lane, with an additional 65 outside the SPB.

The Applicant cites various planning aids to support his application; National Planning Policy Framework, East Hampshire Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (June 2014), Saved Policies of the East Hampshire Local Plan: Second Review. He noted the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Housing and Employment Allocations, in his submission, and noted that the site **had not** been put forward for allocation. However neglected to cite the Report to East Hampshire District Council on the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Housing and Employment Allocations by Jonathan Bore MRTPI, 15th February.

Quoting Mr Boyer with regard to Four Marks/ South Medstead, Mr Maloney said the JCS requires allocations for a minimum of 175 dwellings. Site FM1 Lymington Farm is allocated for about 107 dwellings; FM2, land at Friars Oak Farm, Boyneswood Road, is allocated for about 79 dwellings; and site FM3, Land north of Boyneswood Road, Medstead, is allocated for about 51 dwellings. All three sites have planning permission.

There are additional housing commitments in Four Marks and South Medstead amounting to some 79 dwellings that are not allocated in the plan. The overall JCS requirement is significantly exceeded and although additional sites have been put forward in representations there is no need to allocate further sites. Indeed, any significant further increase could begin to conflict with the JCS in terms of the scale and distribution of development between the settlements.

A Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for Four Marks/South Medstead, but it does not include housing allocations given that three allocated sites and other committed sites already exceed the JCS requirement.

I put it to the Planning Committee that this application is for a significant increase and would be detrimental to the infrastructure of the village

Neighbourhood Plan

No approach was made to include this site at any consultation stage of the Plan thus, we as the NPSC, are surprised by this application

I also note the Applicants comments on the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan Examination report could be considered 'selective'. He correctly reports that the Examiner required Policy 1 to be amended to remove exceptionally onerous conditions on development outside the SPB, but he failed to note that the Examiner upheld the restriction on garden development for example, where such development would harm local character.

Policy 1: A Spatial Plan for the Parishes

The Neighbourhood Plan designates a Medstead Village Settlement Policy Boundary (MVSPB), a South Medstead Settlement Policy Boundary (SMSPB) and a Four Marks Settlement Policy Boundary (FMSPB) as shown on the Policies Maps. Development Proposals on land within the Settlement Policy Boundaries will be supported, subject to accordance with relevant policies.

The inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example, where such development would harm local character, will be refused.

They propose to demolish one house and build two to provide access to the new site. I put to you that this is out of Character.

3.2 Land outside the Settlement Policy Boundaries (SPBs) will be regarded as countryside and Policy CP19⁹ of the Joint Core Strategy will apply. In this policy "the approach to sustainable development in the countryside is to operate a policy of general restraint in order to protect the countryside for its own sake. The only development allowed in the countryside will be that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside

location, such as that necessary for farming, forestry, or other rural enterprises (see Policy CP6 of the Joint Core Strategy)”

The Applicant quotes CP19 Policy CP19 (Development in the Countryside) noting that the approach to sustainable development in the countryside, defined as the area outside settlement policy boundaries, is to operate a policy of general restraint in order to protect the countryside for its own sake. The only development allowed in the countryside will be that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside location, such as that necessary for farming, forestry, or other rural enterprises.

He advises that it could be considered that this policy is unduly restrictive and at odds with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework. By whom the applicant, but certainly not the inspectors of the JCS nor East Hampshire District Local Plan: Housing and Employment Allocations. He also cites Policy H14 (Other Housing Outside the Settlement Policy Boundaries) which states that residential development will only be permitted where it is essential to house a full-time worker in agriculture, forestry or other enterprise. I know we do have some farming in the area, but I put it to the committee is there really a demand for 65 agricultural dwellings made to Hampshire housing for agricultural workers needing to live in Four Marks?

I ask the Planning Committee to object to the proposal in their submission to EHDC.

The Chairman thanked residents and Mr Maloney for their comprehensive and policy based comments and reassured all members of the public that this Application would be discussed in detail and confirmed that the wording ‘access only to be determined at this time’ was misleading and that the members would be discussing all aspects of the application and hoped that awareness would be raised amongst the community of the application and its nature of Policy, Quantum as well as Access.

The Open Session closed at 8.00pm. Standing Orders were applied.

16.18 PC APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

16.19 PC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of absence.

16.20 PC COMMITTEE MINUTES

- The minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 2nd March 2016 were approved as accurate and signed by the Chairman.
- Matters arising.

Cllr Tomlinson asked the Chairman if he had prepared the letter to the District Council concerning the report that the Planning Officer presented at committee with reference to Land to the West of Brambles. Cllr S Thomas confirmed he had prepared a draft but asked the members whether there would be any benefit in sending the letter, confirming the fact that the Planning Officer had subsequently acknowledged the omission of relevant information. Cllr Tomlinson was of the opinion that the letter should be sent as, in her opinion, decisions had been made without the correct information, and if the withheld information had been presented, it was very likely to have affected the vote. Other members supported Cllr Tomlinson and agreed that the decision process had been flawed and the letter should be sent.

16.21 PC PLANNING MATTERS

New applications:

The Chairman proposed that item number 8 was discussed first due to the nature of the application and the amount of detail that needed to be discussed, and so that the public attendees did not have to sit through other applications when this was the application that was of interest. It was agreed, but the Minute will be left in Agenda order.

1. Reference: 56463/001 Comment deadline 6th April 2016
Location: 32C Penrose Way, Four Marks, GU34 5BG
Proposal: Fell, Acer

The Parish Council defer to the Arboriculturalist's decision on this application.

2. Reference: 56319/002 Comment deadline 7th April 2016
Location: Hanworth, 92 Telegraph Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5AW
Proposal: Roof alterations to form first floor accommodation, single storey extensions to front, side and rear following demolition of existing conservatory.

The Parish Council have no objections in principle to this application, as long as this proposal, together with the former proposals submitted, comply with the 50% rule, as this property is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary.

3. Reference: 56552 Comment deadline 8th April 2016
Location: 139A Winchester Road, Four Marks, GU34 5HY
Proposal: Single storey extension to rear

The Parish Council object to this application. Referring to Planning Application 23761/004, the application to build on this site was agreed following a reduction in size, and removal of proposed garage, from the refused application 23761/003. The original application was approved, even though the Planning Officer conceded it was back land development, but the revised application was considered to be subservient in scale to the existing dwelling (139 Winchester Road), and was granted permission. The property is visible from both Lapwing Way and Winchester Road, and therefore any increase in size to the property will noticeably decrease the spaciousness around the dwelling on an already over-developed plot. As such the Parish Council consider the application to increase the size of the dwelling unacceptable and would respectfully ask the planning officer to consider the previous applications and conditions contained therein and refuse this application.

4. Reference: 26985/006 For info only
Location: Barranca, Swelling Hill, Ropley, SO24 0DA
Proposal: Prior notification for single storey development extending 7.984 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.243 metres and a maximum height of 3.959 metres

This application was discussed in conjunction with 26985/007 and same comments will apply.

5. Reference: 26985/007 Comment deadline: 27th April 2016
Location: Barranca, Swelling Hill, Ropley, SO24 0DA
Proposal: Conversion of a garage to habitable accommodation, single storey extension to front.

The Parish Council have no objection in principle, however have found it difficult to decipher and distinguish between the two recent applications and what has been recently approved, and would ask that both the case officers involved in these applications confer to ensure that there has been no breach of the 50% rule as the property is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary.

6. Reference: 25634/001 Comment deadline: 26th April 2016
Location: Highfield, 32 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks GU34 5AH
Proposal: Conversion of a garage to provide habitable space to include work to the roof on the front elevation. The creation of a porch, and the erection of single storey rear extension.

No objection.

7. Reference: 56612 Comment deadline: 27th April 2016
Location: 99 Blackberry Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5DJ
Proposal: Increase in roof height to provide first floor accommodation, two storey rear extension, attached garage after demolition of existing

No objection.

Late Planning:

8. Reference: 20252/003
Location: 103 Blackberry Lane, and land to the rear of 97,98,101 and 105 Blackberry Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5DJ
Proposal: Outline, up to 68 residential units, with associated access, landscaping and parking (means of access only to be determined at this time)

Four Marks Parish Council would like to strongly OBJECT to this application.

The Application is on three large back gardens outside the Settlement Policy Boundary, therefore a 'greenfield' site.

Whilst it states that 'means of access only to be determined at this time', development of an access road from the public highway, and of a network of streets to access residences within the proposed development is warranted, since their sole purpose would be to facilitate residential development which conflicts with current planning policies **CP10, CP19 and CP29**. These access roads would extend significantly beyond the Settlement Policy Boundary.

Development of the site, *and therefore development of the proposed access road network*, is in conflict with recent planning inspectorate response, following dismissal of a recent appeal for another application in Blackberry Lane. Despite the Applicant's challenges, the Council **can** demonstrate a five year housing land supply using either the Sedgefield or Liverpool methods and with a 5% and 20% buffer. This site is not an allocated site in either the EHDC Local Plan Allocations or in the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan, and although a SHLAA was the public's least preferred site for development at both the Ward Councillor's and EHDC's LIPS consultation meetings. The vast majority of this site lies outside the Settlement Policy Boundary and would encroach into the open countryside, be unsustainable, undesirable, out of character and would result in material harm and appearance of the area.

ACCESS

It is the Parish Council's understanding that by definition in the Design and Access Statement 'means of access' refers to all parts of the site, not solely the conjunction with Blackberry Lane, and comment as follows:

- Provision for pedestrian (and wheelchair) access to most residential units appears unsuitable and unclear, being apparently via access roads and parking areas with no dedicated,

unbroken footways, despite the Design and Access statement stating that formal paved footpaths are provided within the site, with shared surfaces to some areas of the site.

- No clear regard for the safe crossing of Blackberry Lane, the footpaths along the length of the lane and into Four Marks are on the North side, opposite access to the development.
- Necessary vehicular access, including waste collection and emergency vehicles. The layout does not show adequate turning points, the turning points also appear to be designated car parking spaces.
- The width of the access roads are unclear and do not appear to give the impression they are two way, with the inevitable on street parking this will undoubtedly cause access issues and impede necessary vehicular access (see former point).

TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC REPORTS

- The survey on traffic flows was carried out late October, in a half term period.
- There are inconsistencies in the distance between the development and the A31.
- The conclusion is that the Blackberry Lane/Telegraph Lane junction has plenty of capacity, however this is not the case, at peak times vehicles experience considerable delays to get onto the A31 from Blackberry Lane at this junction.
- The recently modified junction at Blackberry Lane and Lymington Bottom has proved unsustainable for large vehicles and damage has already been caused by school buses and larger vehicles.
- The Lymington Bottom junction with the A31 has now been proved to be beyond capacity by the HCC Highways Amery report.

QUANTUM

- The proposal is for up to 68 dwellings on 1.717 hectares which equals 39.6 dwellings per hectare which is unacceptably high for a rural development and certainly not in keeping with its surroundings densities, or indeed with any other development within Four Marks and South Medstead including both Allocated Sites from the Local Plan 2006 Second Review granted permission under PPG3 30 dph guidance.

LAYOUT AND DESIGN (Policy CP29)

- The proposed layout is of urban design and there is no feathering into the countryside surroundings.
- The proposed screening is a small buffer of existing vegetation, which is not adequate or a good enough transition into open countryside to meet requirements. The landscaping and illustrative designs are inaccurate and show hedgerows and trees that are not there, or proposed.
- The affordable housing is not pepper potted around the development as required by policy, but in one central block.
- The surrounding dwellings are one or one and a half storey, and the adjacent properties in Blackberry Lane and Bernard Avenue (not Bernard Close as the documents frequently refer) are all bungalows and one and a half storey.
- Three new recently built dwellings opposite the development in Blackberry Lane, were restricted to one and a half storeys.
- The indicative layout shows two and a half/three storey dwellings, which are not of rural design, and contrary to local guidance.
- The proposed site is on a ridge, which slopes down to Lymington Bottom, therefore any dwellings are going to dominate the surrounding landscape.

INFRASTRUCTURE

- The development would add even more pressure on the limited and failing infrastructure, as a result of recent approvals and significant level of growth already experienced at 80% over

JCS 175 minimum plus significant windfalls and reduce its ability to absorb additional development.

- Even with an additional classroom now built, available school places are still under pressure.

OTHER MATTERS

- The application heading's wording 'means of access only to be determined at this time' is misleading and confusing.
- There has been no formal consultation with the Local Planning Authority, the Ward Councillors, the Parish Council, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group or local residents.
- In two recent site allocations consultations, this site was the least favoured site in both.
- There are errors, misinterpretations in policies and inaccurate facts throughout the application's accompanying documents.
- There is no proven need for this site, agricultural or otherwise (Policies CP10, CP19 and H14)
- There is no requirement to meet any planned housing targets, as the village is already 80% over-delivering against the Local Plan. Recent approvals and significant level of growth already experienced by this small settlement will significantly exceed the expectations of the JCS over the whole plan period.

Summarising all the issues raised, Four Marks Parish Council request that the Planning Officer REFUSES this application on grounds of non-compliance specifically with policies CP10, CP19 and CP29, too high a quantum and density and lack of appropriate access both in Blackberry Lane and the wider village context through to the A31.

9. Reference: 56567
Location: 6 Bishops View, Four Marks, GU34 5HA
Proposal: Conversion of attached garage to playroom
No objection.

Decisions notified:

1. Reference No: 33960/004 PARISH: Four Marks
Location: 2 Lawrenny, Alton Lane, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5AL
Proposal: Single storey extension to rear (AS AMENDED BY PLANS RECEIVED 23/02/2016).
Decision: PERMISSION Decision Date: 26 February, 2016
2. Reference No: 26985/004 PARISH: Four Marks
Location: Barranca, Swelling Hill, Ropley, Alresford, SO24 0DA
Proposal: Single storey extensions to front, side and rear following demolition of conservatory and front part of garage, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and replacement chimney to side
Decision: PERMISSION Decision Date: 26 February, 2016
3. Reference No: 56511 PARISH: Four Marks
Location: Daymer, 9 Lymington Bottom Road, Four Marks, GU34 5DL
Proposal: First floor front extension, changing cat slide roof with dormer window and single storey rear extension
Decision: PERMISSION Decision Date: 4th March 2016
4. Reference No: 55919/02 PARISH: Four Marks
Location: 106 Winchester Road, Four Marks, Alton GU34 5HU
Proposal: T1 Beech (T6 in TPO (EH 710) 2006) Fell
Decision: CONSENT Decision Date: 4th March 2016

5. Reference No:26827/002 PARISH: Four Marks
Location: Iona, 1 Brislands Lane, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5AD
Proposal: Wooden garage to front
Decision: PERMISSION Decision Date: 11 March, 2016

6. Reference No:22160/007 PARISH: Four Marks
Location: Land rear of 1 - 3 Gloucester Close, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5HX
Proposal: Reserved matters pursuant to application 22160/005 for 10 dwellings with associated access and landscaping
Decision: APPROVAL Decision Date: 16 March, 2016

7. Reference No:22365/003 PARISH: Four Marks
Location: Eynesford, 102 Telegraph Lane, Four Marks, Alton, GU34 5AW
Proposal: Lawful Development Certificate for an existing use - The area within Eynesford was used as a residence via a mobile home/static caravan from 1966 to 1998, a garage is now located here.
Decision: LAWFULNESS CERTIF - EXISTING - REFUSED
Decision Date: 15 March, 2016

Planning Appeals:

1. Reference No: 53245/004
Location: Unit 18 Hazel Road, Four Marks, GU34 5EY
Proposal: Car Wash, change of use

Enforcement Notice:

1. EHDC Compliance 53264 001 Land to the North of Whyte Gate Two Oaks and Woodlands, The Shrave, Four Marks, Alton
Re: Alleged development not in accordance with plans - street lighting installed on new development not authorised

16.22 PC PROPOSED PLANNING CHANGES

Following circulation of the email from HALC with reference to the Government's Technical Consultation on Implementation of Planning Changes, it was agreed that comments should be submitted to the Clerk by 13th April for compilation and submission by the closing date of 15th April 2016.

16.23 PC LOCAL AUTHORITY ISSUES:

The issues of Highways responses on planning applications has raised real concern with several recent applications and it was suggested that the Parish Council should prepare a report highlighting their apprehension in the way valid concerns are apparently dismissed because they won't stand up at appeal. It was agreed that this should be an Agenda item at the next meeting. The Clerk has already been asked to prepare an up to date accident report in Four Marks, including 'near misses' and those without injury, to add weight to the report.

16.24 PC NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 4th May 2016, 7.30pm, at the Benian's Pavilion, unless advised to the contrary.

16.25 PC The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.30pm.

.....
Chairman