

FOUR MARKS PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee
Held on Wednesday 2nd November 2022, commencing at 6.00pm
At the Benians Pavilion, Uplands Lane, Four Marks**

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Cllr Mike Sanders (Chairman)
	Cllrs Janet Foster, Frank Maloney, Reg Pullen and Anne Tomlinson
IN ATTENDANCE:	Sarah Goudie, Executive Officer (EO)
	4 members of the public
APOLOGIES:	Cllr John Hammond

22.79 PC APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence had been received from Cllr John Hammond which was acknowledged and accepted.

22.80 PC OPEN SESSION – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Two items were raised by residents in attendance, as follows:

What role will the Council be playing in supporting the residents with reference to the emerging local plan?

Cllr Sanders responded that currently the Council had no information but would be attending a briefing session shortly. He also added the Council had already been involved in some discussions on large site design and densities, but at this stage it is not known what sites, if any, are going to be proposed in the Local Plan. Junction capacities and traffic flow information has also been submitted to the Local Plan team by the Planning Committee.

Referring to the average speed camera in Beech, the Council was asked whether this was something that could be considered for Four Marks.

Cllr Pullen responded that various discussions had taken place on this issue and advised that the police currently do not recognise the data. The Council have been looking at other options, including more speed watch patrols and a new speed indicator sign which shows the travelling speed.

The EO advised that a response had now been received from the head of planning with reference to the reduced consultation period, and advised the Committee that it was to give the case officers additional capacity to deal with the increased caseload of applications. He had confirmed however, taking into consideration the Council meeting cycles, that extensions would always be considered, within reason.

There being no further items to raise, the open sessions concluded at 6.10pm.

Standing Orders were applied.

22.81 PC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interests.

22.82 PC COMMITTEE MINUTES

It was RESOLVED to approve the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 5th October 2022, following proposal by Cllr Foster, seconded by Cllr Pullen, and agreed by all Councillors as a true reflection of the meeting and were duly signed by the Chairman.

22.83 PC PLANNING MATTERS – NEW APPLICATIONS FOR DISCUSSION

NEW APPLICATIONS				
Date received	Ref. No:	Location	Proposal	Comments by:
26/10/2022	58744/001	132 Winchester Road, Four Marks	Two sycamores – Prune	16/11/2022
<p>In line with the Parish Council's Tree Management Policy, recognising the importance and amenity value of trees (and hedgerows) within the environment, would only support work to, and removal of, trees (or hedgerows) that would not be detrimental to the health and stability of any remaining trees, and necessary for reasons of essential maintenance, or health and safety of persons and property.</p> <p>With reference to this application, the Council defer to the planning officer's knowledge and decision in this regard.</p> <p><i>This application has subsequently been withdrawn and resubmitted with an amended description of works.</i></p>				
27/10/2022	23376/007	5 Telegraph Lane, Four Marks	Replacement garden room	17/11/2022
No objection.				
MEDSTEAD APPLICATIONS				
19/10/2022	59143/001	Land to the rear of Watercress Way, Medstead	Construction of 9 dwellings PRE-DECISION AMENDMENT	02/11/2022
<p>The planning officer had confirmed that the pre-decision amendment was due to the receipt of an updated Arboricultural Method Statement and updates to a small number of plans, to reflect the retention of an existing protected tree on the site which had previously be shown to be moved. There have been no fundamental changes to the plans previously commented on. However, it was noted that there were several amendments.</p> <p>It was agreed that the amendments did not change the previous objection comment, it was suggested that a supplementary comment be submitted referring to the Supreme Court Judgement with reference to Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd, the findings of which are relevant to development in the countryside.</p> <p>The EO agreed to contact the planning officer accordingly.</p>				
26/10/2022	25256/049	Land to the rear of Brackenbury Gardens and Boyneswood Close, Medstead	Construction of 45 dwellings associated landscaping and open space with access from Holland Drive	16/11/2022
<p>The Parish Council strongly object to this application, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed development site is outside the Settlement Policy boundary and contrary to policy CP19 of the EHDC Local Plan Joint Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan. ▪ Irrespective of the fact that the LPA can no longer demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, this does not mean that Policies referring to development in the countryside no longer carry weight. Policies are in place to protect the countryside for its own sake and remain in date and valid until replaced or reviewed. The Settlement Policy Boundary is still current and not silent. This is supported by the Supreme Court Judgement, Suffolk Coast District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd (and others) where Lord Carnwath upheld the relevance of policies previously identified as 'silent' in previous judgements https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2016-0076-judgment.pdf. ▪ Development in this location will have a detrimental environmental impact which is even more important in the current climate emergency. The proposed site is the last remaining piece of open green space in this location undeveloped and is a vital green lung and connectivity for wildlife to Chawton Park Woods. ▪ The single lane railway bridge on Boyneswood Road, and the Boyneswood Road junction with the A31 are already over capacity, which is confirmed in the Applicants own planning statement. The proposed junction improvements do not show how they will ease the capacity at this junction and appear to be 				

reliant upon use of additional land. How will the proposed junction alterations attenuate the 'over capacity' at the junction, particularly with the increased vehicular traffic?

- Although each planning application should be determined on its own merit, the cumulative effect of the increase in traffic with both this application, and Planning Application 59143/001 for an additional 9 dwellings, currently awaiting decision, must be taken into consideration should permission be granted, as they share the same access/egress points.
- Access to the proposed development site is through Holland Drive, a narrow and meandering residential road, with only one proposed vehicular access/egress point in and out of the existing and proposed developments. Consideration must be given to the health and safety implications with initially, construction traffic, and subsequently an additional 50+ vehicle movements per day, using the one access, and potential restrictions for fire and rescue services.
- The Planning Statement makes several assumptions, and deems the site sustainable, however the very location of the site, and lack of safe pedestrian connectivity, is such that children will not be able to walk to school, and residents will drive to the local services.

Development of this site has already been rejected at both local and national levels (planning application number 25256/045) and refer to the Inspectors' Appeal statement on the previous application in this location, which are still relevant.

"28. Given the recent rate of housing delivery in Four Marks/South Medstead, I consider it unsurprising that MPC, FMPC and residents are concerned about the amount of new housing that has been built and any implications that has for the role and functioning of this area. Those concerns being voiced most particularly in terms of Four Marks/South Medstead becoming a dormitory housing area, with mitigating infrastructure not keeping pace with the rate of new housing delivery. I consider the provision of further housing alone, on what would in effect be an unplanned basis, would not be conducive to the reinforcement of Four Marks/South Medstead's role and function as a small local service centre providing a limited range of services.

29. A consequence of the area's recent rapid growth appears to be mitigating infrastructure provision lagging behind the realisation of the effects it is intended to address. In that regard Parish Councillor Thomas (FMPC) referred to the LEA being "tardy" in providing additional school accommodation¹¹, while Councillor Kemp-Gee (HCC) commented that while infrastructure contributions have been secured "the spend of that money has been slow". This is something that the appellant appears to acknowledge, given the planning obligation that would secure the junction improvement before any part of the appeal development could be occupied. The development's effects upon local infrastructure is something that I comment further on in my reasoning for the second main issue.

30. Against the backdrop of rapid housing growth in the area, from everything I have heard and read, I consider that the appeal development does not find any particular support under Policy CP10, given the minimum identified housing requirement of 175 dwellings for Four Marks/South Medstead has already been greatly exceeded. That minimum requirement I consider to be commensurate with a settlement area, categorised by EHDC as being a small local service centre suitable for some new development when the JCS was adopted. The appellant has not sought to justify the development on the basis of there being a specific local need and in cross examination Mr Stallan, the appellant's planning witness, accepted that the vitality of the area would not be undermined if this development did not proceed. I consider the absence of a need to maintain the area's vitality is unsurprising, given the quantum of house building that has recently arisen in this area."

Planning Application 25256/048 for 45 dwellings was also refused and currently under Appeal.

To date, there have been no infrastructure improvements in either Four Marks or South Medstead, local facilities have not expanded, nor has the local economy been helped. The infrastructure remains strained.

Taking all the above into consideration, and that the development is contrary to CP19 of the JCS Local Plan and Policy 1 of the Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan, Four Marks Parish Council respectfully request the Planning Officer to refuse this application.

However, if the planning officer is minded to approve the application, in order to be reassured that the proposed junction improvements will ease the capacity, the Council would request a Grampian clause to ensure that the S278 works to the Boyneswood Road junction are carried out **prior to the commencement of the development.**

LATE APPLICATIONS

27/10/2022	22160/012	1 Gloucester Close, Four Marks, GU34 5HX	T1. Common Oak, crown reduce by 2-3 metres to leave a finished height of 5-6 metres leaving a finished total height from	17/11/2022
------------	-----------	--	--	------------

			ground level of 16-18 metres	
<p>In line with the Parish Council's Tree Management Policy, recognising the importance and amenity value of trees (and hedgerows) within the environment, would only support work to, and removal of, trees (or hedgerows) that would not be detrimental to the health and stability of any remaining trees, and necessary for reasons of essential maintenance, or health and safety of persons and property.</p> <p>With reference to this application, the Council defer to the planning officer's knowledge and decision in this regard.</p>				
31/10/2022	51273/004	1 St Faith Close, Four Marks, GU34 5AY	T1. Ash. Fell	21/11/2022
<p>In line with the Parish Council's Tree Management Policy, recognising the importance and amenity value of trees (and hedgerows) within the environment, would only support work to, and removal of, trees (or hedgerows) that would not be detrimental to the health and stability of any remaining trees, and necessary for reasons of essential maintenance, or health and safety of persons and property.</p> <p>In this instance whilst not objecting to the removal of the Ash Tree noting the content of the arborist's report, would ask the Applicant to reconsider their proposal to not plant a replacement. Taking into consideration the current climate emergency, and both the District and Parish Council's own policies in this regard, would ask the planning officer to request that a suitable replacement is planted to mitigate the loss of the Ash Tree.</p>				

22.84 PC TO NOTE DECISIONS NOTIFIED AND PENDING

22.84.1 Summary of Decisions Notified, Appeals and Decisions Pending

DECISIONS NOTIFIED				
Date received	Ref. No:	Location	Proposal	Decision
28/07/2022	53803/001	The Hollies, The Shrave, Four Marks	The replacement of septic tank with modern sewage treatment plant solution. New location allows for simpler access for future maintenance, annual de-sludge/waste removal. New treatment can be installed using plant equipment, that is not accessible to rear garden. New location will also allow for existing system to remain utilised until new works are completed.	Permission 05/10/2022
16/08/2022	59848	Wannock, 32 Winston Rise, Four Marks, GU34 6HP	Single storey side extension, new porch, and boundary wall	Permission 7/10/2022
24/08/2022	54841/005	Beverly, 165 Winchester Road, Four Marks, GU34 5HY	Detached dwelling	Refusal 6/10/2022
30/08/2022	59870	65 Blackberry Lane, Four Marks GU34 5DF	Lawful development certificate proposed – single storey extension to rear to replace existing conservatory and enlarge dormer window of the first floor family bathroom	Permitted 13/10/2022
21/9/2022	51035/001	Jocks Lodge, Alton Lane, Four Marks GU34 5AJ	Prior notification for single storey development extending 8 metres beyond the rear wall of	Permitted 13/10/2022

			the original dwelling, incorporating eaves height of 2.5 metres and a maximum height of 3.9 metres	
LATE NOTIFICATIONS				
31 st May 2022	57749/008	5 Cotswold Close, Four Marks, GU34 5JZ	Two storey side extension	Refusal 26/10/2022

APPEALS				
Date received	Ref. No:	Location	Proposal	Status
07/09/2021	58714	Land North of Kia Ora, Lymington Bottom, Four Marks	Detached House and Integral Garage with car parking and new access	APPEAL DISMISSED 7/10/2022
17/10/2022	25256/048	Land to the rear of Brackenbury Gardens, Medstead	Construction of 45 dwellings	Representations by 17/2/22

DECISIONS PENDING				
Date received	Ref. No:	Location	Proposal	Status
04/08/2021	55712/001	The Barn, Alton Lane, Four Marks	Conversion of building to dwelling with associated parking and landscaping (renewal of 55712)	Awaiting decision
29/03/2022	30572/014	Hawthorn Farm, Willis Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5AP	Change of use of office to residential annex and incorporation of annex into the residential curtilage of Hawthorn Farm	Registered
10 th June 2022	21049/005	Old Down Cottage, Swelling Hill, Ropley, Alresford, SO24 0DA	Change of use from agricultural to B2 (General Industrial). Convert outbuilding to joinery workshop to support interior design business based at Old Down Cottage (retrospective) New block and floor plans submitted 9/9/22	Registered
28 th June 2022	59143/001	Land to the rear of Watercress Way, Medstead, Alton	Construction of 9 dwellings PRE DECISION AMENDMENT	Awaiting decision
29/07/2022	37692/001	21 Kingswood Rise, Four Marks, GU34 5BE	First floor side dormer and internal alterations	Registered
22/08/2022	56176/002	21 Tawny Grove, Four Marks, GU34 5DU	1x Hawthorn, reduce crown height by 2m, leaving a crown height of 9m.	Registered

			Reduce crown width by 2m, leaving a crown width of 5m	
22/9/2022	59851/001	62 Pheasant Close, Four Marks, GU34 5FH	Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation	Registered
27/09/2022	36440/001	1 Badger Close, Four Marks, GU34 5HB	Lawful development certificate proposed – single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory	Registered
29/09/2022	38618/004	Hillside, Hawthorn Lane, Four Marks, GU34 3ER	Retention of tree house platform	Registered

22.84.2 Appeal Response – 45 dwellings, East of Boyneswood Road

It was agreed to send a supplementary response to the comments already submitted with the Appeal paperwork to include reference to the Supreme Court Judgement, as referred to earlier in the Minutes, and reinforce that Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan does carry weight with this application.

It was also suggested that once the hearing date is known that a further discussion takes place on Parish Council representation at the Appeal hearing and preparation of wording for presentation as appropriate.

22.85 PC ADDITIONAL PLANNING MATTERS

22.85.1 Late Items

There were two late applications for discussion, as detailed above, with one late decision notified.

22.85.2 Net Zero Carbon Workshop

Cllr Maloney had sent a summary from attendance at EHDC's recent net zero carbon workshop, which was noted. Cllr Maloney was thanked for attending.

22.85.3 Local Plan Review and Neighbourhood Plan

A brief discussion took place on the status of the emerging Local Plan and the briefing session scheduled to take place in early November.

It was agreed that it would not be appropriate, until the details of the proposed changes under the second version of the Regulation 18 were available, and other relevant information including proposed sites and design codes, to make any decision on updating the Neighbourhood Plan.

Cllr Maloney confirmed that although there was funding available for updating the Neighbourhood Plan under the Locality Funding, until it is known whether the current Neighbourhood Plan will need tweaking or completely revamping, no action should be taken at the moment.

22.86 PC NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 7th December 2022, 7.30 pm at the Benians Pavilion, unless otherwise advised.

22.87 PC The Chairman closed the meeting at 6.55pm.