

FOUR MARKS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee Held on Wednesday 1st August 2018, commencing at 7.30pm At the Village Hall, Lymington Bottom, Four Marks

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cllr J Foster (Chair), Cllrs John Hammond, Shaun McCarthy and Anne Tomlinson
IN ATTENDANCE: Sarah Goudie (Clerk), 2 members of the public
APOLOGIES: Cllr Simon Thomas, Cllr Tim Brake

18.69 OPEN SESSION

Cllr Foster in Cllr Thomas' absence took the Chair of the meeting and welcomed those present and asked if there were any items to be raised under the open session.

A member of the public, who was in attendance the previous month, asked for the Minutes of the Open Session to be amended as the reference to his comment was incorrect.

Diana Tennyson, the local wildlife co-ordinator, wished to speak with reference to planning application 50334/006, the outbuilding on the land to the rear of 4 and 5 Gloucester Close. She gave a brief history of her involvement with the area, advising that on the instruction of a previous Chairman back in 2012 had spent 6-9 months recording wildlife, and her involvement with the ecologist on the HBIC survey in 2015. She had been advised by the applicant that he had intended to keep the area as a wildlife haven and was shocked when looking at the photographs of the amount of clearance work already undertaken and does not believe that this amount of work needs to be carried out, therefore not supportive of the application. Cllr Hammond asked for clarification on a couple of issues raised.

There being no further items, Cllr Foster closed the open session at 19.41pm. **Standing Orders were applied.**

18.70 PC APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Thomas and Brake, apologies were noted and accepted.

18.71 PC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr McCarthy declared a pecuniary interest with the applicant of application number 30065/027, therefore would abstain from discussion and any vote. There were no further declarations of interest.

18.72 PC COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 4th July 2018, previously circulated, were proposed as a true reflection, in principle, subject to the amendment of Minute 18.60 PC, as requested by the member of the public, of the meeting by Cllr Tomlinson, seconded by Cllr McCarthy, and approved by all members. The Minutes would be signed by the Chairman at the next meeting.

Matters arising.

The Clerk referred to the correspondence sent to the District Councillor on the lighting scheme at Land West of Brambles. Although no direct response to the query had been received, the documents were now loaded onto the planning portal. However, although the type of light was detailed, the layout or amount was not, and it was agreed to send a follow up letter asking if there had been a layout plan submitted, or detail of how many were to be installed, as this document was not evident. The amount of night lighting is excessive, and intrusive to neighbours and wildlife, and this is directly in contravention of all guidance in the Village Design Statement.

18.73 PC PLANNING MATTERS – NEW APPLICATIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Reference: 57866
Location: Green Lane Bungalow, 80 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks GU34 5AH
Proposal: Single storey extension to side following demolition of conservatory

No objection.

2. Reference: 25256/045

Location: Land at Friars Oak, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, GU34

Proposal: Outline planning – development of up to 58 dwellings (including up to 23 affordable homes) with access to be determined, including associated garages, car parking, infrastructure, open space and landscaping and potential dedication of land for community use (access only to be considered)

Four Marks Parish Council STRONGLY OBJECT to this Outline application as follows:

1. Planning Statement

The applicant claims in their Planning Statement 6.6 that “the site is clearly surplus to requirements in terms of agricultural land and serves no useful planning function and as such, it is considered that in any future review it would highly likely be incorporated within the settlement boundary”. That is a speculative guess by the applicant and would be for any future review of the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan to change the SPB.

Despite the applicants claim that the 5 year land supply is not met, the 5YLS has been repeatedly tested at numerous Appeals and found proven at both 5% and 20% buffers, including Inspector dismissals of similar under-delivery trends being quoted.

The Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan has been inspected and scrutinised by the appointed Government Inspector, passed and subsequently adopted by the LPA in May 2016 after an overwhelming referendum of 93% yes on a 41% electors' turnout. Therefore, it is a lawful planning document carrying maximum weight until reviewed after 5 years. The extract from the ministerial statement being quoted by the applicant is misinterpreted and taken out of context. Therefore, the applicant's statement at 6.14-6.22 should not be taken into consideration, nor given any weight.

This application proposes 58 dwellings on land outside of the existing settlement policy boundary of Medstead. Development on land outside of an existing settlement, which is not allocated for residential development, triggers an affordable housing contribution that must comply with CP14 of the Local Plan JCS.

2. Pre-Application Advice & Consultation

A formal pre-application discussion should be held with Officers and a Public Consultation conducted, so the developer's 'Statement of Community Involvement' can be produced – as was done in Section 5 of the original Friar's Oak 25256/032's Planning Statement.

The applicant claims in their Planning Statement 4.9 that Officer and Public consultation is unnecessary as the issues are the same and that consultation has therefore already taken place. The Parish Council find this claim unacceptable given the major changes in the immediate area since October 2014 when the original Friars Oak site was approved. These include the Bellway site (80 dwellings) and the Bargate site (51 dwellings) currently being built out, and the traffic congestion caused by implemented traffic control measures at Boyneswood Bridge. In a wider context, two further large sites have been built out in Lymington Bottom Road, also exiting onto the A31 less than a mile to the west, along with a number of nearby windfall sites, which all adds to the A31 traffic flows, and requiring the integration of new residents into the community, which already has a challenged social fabric.

The applicant takes considerable effort in their Planning Statement to try and justify not conducting any such public consultation which is in direct conflict to government Localism and NPPF policies.

We have been told repeatedly in recent developers' applications that each application should be decided on its own merits, and we urge the same is done here, that this site is seen as separate (however named by the applicant) and was not part of the Public Consultation for the 25256/032 site of 3.87 hectares in December 2013.

3. Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Under NPPF 12 this presumption does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, including any neighbourhood plans that have been brought into force, permission should not usually be granted. EHDC has both an up-to-date development plan with a supporting and robust 5YLS, and the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan both adopted in Spring 2016.

In their Planning Statement the applicant William Lacey Group and their planning consultant Wight Young Green have attempted to establish a presumption to develop, with an air of 'precedent' which is invalid, 'retro fitting' the initial Friars Oak planning evidence and decision 25256/032 to this application. This is wrong, as since that approval of the application made in 2013 significant changes have taken place with a robust 5YLS reported, adopted Local Plan Part 2 Allocations, and a made Neighbourhood Plan.

Access. Previous application. The access / traffic considerations and assumptions shown in 25256/032 have subsequently been shown to have been questionable. The initial Atkins Report demonstrated both the Boyneswood Road and Lymington Botton Road exits to the A31 are well beyond capacity. The proposed and implemented traffic measures across Boyneswood Bridge have been shown to be impractical, dangerous, and inappropriate and are now under review by HCC Highways.

4. EHDC Housing Officer Objection

The Parish Council fully endorses and supports the Officer's objection, due to the lack of housing need and non-compliance with CP14.

5. Infrastructure and Sustainability

The 175 minimum dwellings target set by the Inspector for Four Marks and south Medstead in the Local Plan was considered a reasonable target for the facilities within this small local service centre (as defined in 2008, updated 2012). Whilst the term minimum can be deceptive and whilst there is no maximum figure quoted, this target has already been exceeded by over 80% in the first 5 years of the Plan, which means that the reduced infrastructure is no longer sustainable for the agreed figure. With 316 allocated homes either completed or still under construction, plus over 80 windfall dwellings, there is clearly not a demonstrable need for more new homes in within this planning area.

6. Access, Transport and Traffic

The Parish Council questions the selected evidence and statistics presented. They are out of date and assumptive.

There will be major barriers in the access to the site at the construction phase, and for residents after completion through the single road and Boyneswood Road exit, already serving 80 new dwellings.

Traffic accessing the site would stress the new Bellway development road system to the south and finally would further stress access on to Boyneswood Road itself, as well generate further over-capacity to the junction on to the A31.

The railway bridge cannot take even more traffic and pedestrian safety across the bridge using the virtual pavement is already severely compromised.

The statistics used are out of date and assumptive.

CONCLUSION

In summary. the proposed site is outside the defined Settlement Policy Boundary, EHDC has a proven robust Five-Year Land Supply, and therefore the application is against the adopted

4. Reference No: 50075/005 PARISH: Four Marks
 Location: Tedesco, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5DY
 Proposal: T1 OAK - crown lift reducing the lowest branch above garden to approximately 8M. Crown reduction by approximately 4M, removing the uppermost branch. Crown reduce lateral branches by 3 metres to leave a crown spread radius of approximately 3M.
 Decision: REFUSAL Decision Date: 17 July, 2018
5. Reference No: 52149/003 PARISH: Medstead/Four Marks
 Location: High Beeches, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5DY
 Proposal: T1 Norway Spruce-Option 2-Raise canopy to 5 mts from ground level
 Decision: CONSENT Decision Date: 19 July, 2018
6. Reference No: 52149/004 PARISH: Medstead
 Location: High Beeches, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5DY
 Proposal: T1 Norway Spruce - Option 1 - Fell
 Decision: REFUSAL Decision Date: 19 July, 2018
7. Reference No: 52149/002 PARISH: Medstead
 Location: High Beeches, Boyneswood Road, Medstead, Alton, GU34 5DY
 Proposal: T2 Common Beech - Raise South Easterly facing canopies to 5 metres from ground level
 T3 Common Beech - Raise South Easterly facing canopies to 5 metres from ground level
 T4 Common Beech - Reduce lower North Easterly facing primary branch growing over the roof by approx.4 metres, leaving a final length of approx.5 metres. Reduce 3 North Easterly facing primary branches within the upper canopy by approx.3 metres leaving a final length of approx.6 metres. Prune lower canopy away from the South Westerly elevation of the dwelling giving a clearance of approx.4 metres, raise remaining canopy over pergola to approx.4 metres from ground level. Thin remaining canopy by approx. 20%. T5 Common Ash - Fell
 Decision: CONSENT Decision Date: 19 July, 2018

18.75 PC ADDITIONAL PLANNING ISSUES

New Tree Preservation Orders

1. Reference 57826/TP1 TPO no. (EH1099)2018
 Location: Matchbox House, Alton Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5AL
 Trees: T1 Oak, T2 Oak

The Clerk confirmed that the informal meeting with Tim Pointer and Jamie Gargett, from EHDC was to be held on Tuesday 28th August 10.00am at Four Marks, and asked for any further attendees.

Cllr Thomas had sent notification that the deadline for submission of appeal on the Gladman application had passed with no apparent appeal submitted, and with no further reference on their website to the Four Marks site.

18.76 PC NEXT MEETING
Wednesday 5th September 2018, 7.30pm at the Village Hall.

18.77 PC The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.50 pm

.....
Chairman