

MINUTES
of the **MEETING** of
FROYLE PARISH COUNCIL
held in the Village Hall, Lower Froyle,
on Tuesday **7th July 2014** at 8 pm

Present:

<i>Parish Council:</i> Mr. I. Deans Miss Gove Mr. M. Wells Mr. N. Whines	<i>Clerk:</i> <i>Others:</i> 0
---	---------------------------------------

ITEM 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mr. M. Cray Mr. A. Goodsell, Mr. S. Lloyd, Voluntary Auditor Mr. P. Elliott

ITEM 2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

17 14-15 It was **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 27th May 2014 be accepted as a true record.

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

27th May

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

32 27.5.14 Grayshott PC Agreements: GPC HCC, GPC pc, GPC lengthsman
36 28.5.14 Grayshott PC Response re lengthsman agreements
70 16.6.14 Grayshott PC Lengthsman update
See item below.

All items had either already been reported, dealt with, pending or were discussed below.

ITEM 4 FINANCE

4.1 Approval of payments

18 14-15 It was **RESOLVED** to approve the following payments, which had been made since the Agenda for the meeting of 12th May 2014 was prepared: £

5.6.14	Southern Electric	Sports hut	1144	13 14-15	59.05
5.6.14	Charles Aldred Ltd.	VH car park	1145		2838.00
13.6.14	CPRE	Subscription	1146	13 14-15	36.00
13.6.14	Playsafety Ltd.	Play equipment inspection	1147	13 14-15	88.80
27.6.14	OCS Group UK Ltd.	Rec mowing	1148	13 14-15	170.38
27.6.14	Ricoh UK Ltd.	Photocopier maintenance	1149	13 14-15	18.17
27.6.14	Four Seasons Marquees Ltd.	VH marquee hire	1150		2507.76
	cancelled		1151		0.00
27.6.14	MJ Wells Garden Services	Grass cutting	1152	13 14-15	874.00
27.6.14	Treloar Trust	Magazine printing	1153	13 14-15	110.00

4.2 Parish Council Accounts

19 14-15 It was **RESOLVED** to approve the receipts and payment accounts 2014-15 as at 30th June, a copy of which had been enclosed with the agenda.

4.3 Appreciation of Grant

50 3.6.14 Mr. Saunders Appreciation of grant had been enclosed with the agenda. Noted.

4.4 Finance Miscellaneous

4.4.1 51 3.6.14 EHDC Consultation on **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)** charges for new development, previously circulated to councillors.

43 30.5.14 EHDC Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule. Noted.

4.4.2 Assets: Figures for audit.

The Voluntary Auditor had recommended that the proxy value for “assets” should be based on the current insurance value to remain the same value in perpetuity, and it was **agreed** that the External Auditor should be notified of these figures.

4.4.3 Village Hall, marquee hire etc account had been enclosed with the agenda. It was **agreed** that Mr. Findlay would be asked to explain the table summarising the account in layman’s terms.

ITEM 5 PLANNING MATTERS

5.1 Planning Applications (previously notified to councillors (pntc))

28 **20107/065 Froyle House**, Upper Froyle, TWO DWELLINGS AFTER DEMOLITION OF GARAGE/OUTBUILDING (AS AMENDED BY PLANS RECEIVED, 30 APRIL 2014 and 22 MAY, 2014). Consultation expired. FPC had objected.

Mr. Whines reported on the EHDC Planning Committee meeting of 26th July at which this application was considered. Mr. Whines and Dist.Cllr. Glynis Watts spoke against the proposal. The EHDC committee voted against their officers’ recommendation for approval of the application on the grounds that it would do harm. The agent for the applicants said that they would re-apply for permission. Mr. Whines raised the following issues:

- the strong EHDC officer recommendation,
- the role of the EHDC Conservation Officer,
- misunderstanding of the input of the English Heritage inspector,
- the officers’ report that because the three houses fronting Ryebidge Lane had not been specifically objected to in a previous Walled Garden application, this created by default permission for a house on the Froyle House site larger than that in the 1965 permission.

It was **agreed** that in future responses to planning applications, FPC would refer to the entirety of the application to avoid piecemeal acceptance of applications.

Mr. Deans and **Mr. Whines** to draft a letter to Miss Mansi raising the issues above.

45 **55500 The Oast House**, Husseys Lane, Lower Froyle, (T1) Lime tree - Crown reduce by 30% to the points shown on the photos submitted with the application T2) Lime tree – Fell. Consultation expired. FPC had made no comment.

46 **49828/002 1 & 2 Rye Bridge Cottages**, Ryebidge Lane, Upper Froyle, Demolition of 2 x single storey rear extensions and erection of a two storey rear extension. Consultation expired. FPC had made no comment.

61 **35913/011 Old Brewery House**, Husseys Lane, Lower Froyle, (1) Fell one Poplar (2) Coppice one Poplar (3) Coppice one Alder. Consultation expired. FPC had made no comment.

49 **20107/071/072 Treloar College**, Ryebidge Lane, Upper Froyle, Conversion and extension to **Jephson House** to form 5 dwellings (revised scheme to 20107/061).

20 14-15 It was **RESOLVED to object** to this application for the following reasons:

1 Any development that would further increase the population of Froyle will not be sustainable for the following reasons:

The proposed shop is not thought to be viable.

The shop and service station on the A31 is not thought to be secure.

The absence of local public transport.

Lack of car parking at Bentley Station or access to the station by public transport.

Despite cosmetic improvements at the A31 junction, this junction and the carriage way either side is dangerous and should not be subjected to further traffic until substantially improved.

Froyle Village Hall is already too small for the proposed increase in population and there are no funds available to enlarge it.

The Parish of Froyle is already faced with the significant challenge of absorbing upwards of 200 new residents. Any proposal which increases that number no matter how slight makes that task more difficult and presents the real danger of damaging a successful community and causing the combined villages of Lower and Upper Froyle to pull apart.

2 The Design and Access Statement offers no design rationale for the increase in units and we assume this arises from commercial considerations. We believe that maintaining the interest of the listed barn is better served by conversion to a single unit as originally proposed and for which permission has been granted.

3 We note the very critical comments of the English Heritage Inspector to the withdrawn application and his reference to a 'gut and stuff' approach to a listed building. We have not yet seen the historical analysis of the building to be prepared by the applicant nor any clarifications to the Design and Access Statement and would wish to comment on these when they are made available.

4 This is a potentially attractive area within the wider conservation area. The proposal appears to erode the amount of public open space within this section of the overall development and this harms the setting of a listed building.

5 Increasing the number of cars parking outside also harms the setting of a listed building.

6 Existing parking arrangements within this section of the overall development while meeting the current EHDC standard appear barely adequate. In a confined area with no on-road parking possible, inadequate parking will almost certainly create neighbour disputes in the future and this should be a material consideration. We believe EHDC should revise its parking standards in the light of the increase in car ownership as a matter of urgency.

7 Access to this section of the development is via a narrow, concealed entrance with poor visibility to the north. Notwithstanding the comments of Highways there should be no further increase in vehicles using this access beyond that permitted.

8 Arrangements for bin collection are not made clear. Bins should not be collected from Ryebriidge Lane as this will damage the conservation area.

9 The council is concerned that by permitting this development a precedent will be created which will make future applications to increase the scale of the overall development difficult to resist.

10 The application is contrary to policies HE1,4, 6, 11 and 12 and conflicts with the supplementary guidelines for the site.

FPC objected to the withdrawn application and would like its previous comments where relevant be taken into consideration.

64 **20473/003 Wykeham House**, Ryebriidge Lane, Lower Froyle, First floor side extension
21 14-15 It was **RESOLVED** to make **no comment** on this application.

68 **20107/070 Treloar College**, Upper Froyle, Amendment to previously approved scheme
20107/061 to allow elevation and internal layout amendments to **plots 36 and 37**
including a new car barn (FUL)

22 14-15 It was **RESOLVED to object** to this application for the following reasons:

We note that this is a second submission for this amendment, and that the applicants have addressed issues of clarity of the submission that were previously raised and some minor material changes. However, there is no fundamental change in the proposals and therefore Froyle Parish Council must Object to this application.

Consent was given for the Treloar site after a period of intensive and detailed consultation based on agreed guidelines. We remain concerned that piecemeal revisions such as this will inevitably lead to the erosion of the quality of the agreed scheme. The proposals result in the loss of gardens, more cramped parking, constricted views through the scheme and a dilution of the high quality design principles that informed the consent. More importantly, this will adversely impact upon the quality of the wider conservation area contrary to Policy HE4 of the EHDC Local Plan. Specifically our concerns are:

1. The additional living space we believe would inevitably lead to a greater number of inhabitants, and consequent pressure on local amenities and infrastructure that was one of the primary concerns the community raised in the original planning process. We believe that this would be unsustainable for the following reasons:
 - The low level of local public transport.
 - Lack of car parking at Bentley Station or access to the station by public transport.
 - Despite cosmetic improvements at the A31 junction, this junction and the carriage way either side is dangerous and should not be subjected to further traffic until substantially improved.
 - Froyle Village Hall is already too small for the proposed increase in population and there are no funds available to enlarge it.
 - The Parish of Froyle is already faced with the significant challenge of absorbing upwards of 200 new residents. Any proposal which increases that number no matter how slight makes that task more difficult and presents the real danger of damaging a successful community and causing the combined villages of Lower and Upper Froyle to pull apart.
2. We note the applicant's statement that "the living accommodation fell short of what would normally be required for dwellings for this number of bedrooms", but note that this is what was previously approved. This change offers no wider benefit or improvement to the scheme or the conservation area, we can only assume that it arises from commercial considerations.
3. The displacement of the car parking spaces to the garden areas reduces the amenity space for each of the dwellings, and the potential for storage space inside the footprint of the house. Neither of these will serve to increase the quality of the development as a whole.
4. The addition of the car port at the end of the 'close', together with the additional car spaces, will not preserve the original intention of a 'Manor House Walled Garden' as set out in the original D&A statement. Instead it will appear more as a suburban parking court and, as this space is highly visible from Ryebridge Lane, it will have an adverse impact on the wider Conservation Area.
5. We note that this enlargement of dwellings will change the mix of house unit sizes within the development, making them larger and creating an imbalance for the village as a whole. This is contrary to Policy H4 of EHDC Local Plan, which requires a mix of housing types within settlement boundaries. Froyle as a village has seen a number of permissions for extensions to, and combinations of smaller properties into larger dwellings.
6. The council is concerned that by permitting this development a precedent will be created which will make future applications to increase the scale of the overall development difficult to resist.

FPC therefore urge you to refuse this application.

5.2 Results of Planning Applications (pntc)

41 **54255/003 Blue Cottage**, Lower Froyle, CHANGE OF DESIGN OF GLASSHOUSE AS APPROVED UNDER 54255/002 TO PROVIDE A GLASSHOUSE WITH ADJOINING POTTING SHED. PERMISSION.

5.3 Other Planning Matters (pntc)

75 EHDC Planning Committee re Application 20107/065 Froyle House. Noted.

89 EHDC Planning New Housing Exhibition - Alton Assembly Rooms – 2nd July. Noted.

ITEM 6 VACANCY FOR ONE PARISH COUNCILLOR

39 Mr. Collingborn: resignation as parish councillor had been enclosed with the agenda.

EHDC Electoral Services advised that the vacancies may be filled by advertising the vacancies and co-option of new members at a subsequent meeting of the Parish Council. The notices advising the vacancy were posted on the notice boards on 30th May 2014 and a copy sent to the Returning Officer. At 2nd July, the following people had come forward as candidates for the vacancy:

73 Mr. John Sexton: application for parish councillor vacancy had been enclosed with the agenda.

90 Mr. Ian Macnabb: query/reserve application for parish councillor vacancy, had been enclosed with the agenda.

http://www.hampshire-alc.gov.uk/Advice__Information/NALC_Legal_Topic_Notes.aspx
LTN08NALCElections07022014

February 2014: 43. If no by-election is called the council must as soon as practicable after the expiry of the 14 day period fill the vacancy by co-option. If the vacancy falls within the six month period the council may but need not, fill the vacancy. It must, however, in the latter case, give public notice of the vacancy. 44. The council may co-opt whom it pleases (see the Legal Briefing L15-08 referred to in paragraph 32 above) to fill a vacancy, provided the person is qualified to be a councillor (see paragraph 7) The person co-opted must receive a majority of the votes of those councillors present and voting at the meeting where the co-option takes place.

Where there are more than two candidates for one vacancy, this rule means that a person must get a majority of votes over all the other candidates. Thus where candidate A receives four votes, and candidates B and C each receive two, A is not elected because he has the same number of votes as B and C put together and does not have a majority over their combined votes. Where there are more than two candidates it is desirable to eliminate the candidate with the least number of votes, so that the final vote is between two candidates only. Councils may use model standing order 8a on page 187 of NALC's book "Local Councils Explained" (2013) to confirm the voting process for a casual vacancy which is contested.

23 14-15 It was **RESOLVED** that **Mr. John Sexton** be co-opted onto the parish council.

The **Clerk** to ask Mr. Sexton to attend the next parish council meeting.

ITEM 6 OTHER MATTERS (pntc)

6.1 Lengthsman (ptnc)

32 27.5.14 Grayshott PC Agreements: GPC HCC, GPC pc, GPC lengthsman

36 28.5.14 Grayshott PC Response re lengthsman agreements

70 16.6.14 Grayshott PC Lengthsman update

It was **agreed** that as there are too few parish councillors to take on the task of supervising a lengthsman, and considering the amount of work that is required to be devoted to current large planning applications, the parish council must withdraw from this scheme at present, but would perhaps reconsider it in a year's time. Meanwhile they pass on their best wishes for its implementation to the other parishes in the scheme, and their thanks to Grayshott parish clerk for organising it.

6.2 Flag

Mr. Collingborn had agreed to continue putting up the flag.

6.3 Ditch/footpath recreation ground, clearing. Previously notified to councillors.

It was **agreed** that the hedge needs to be trimmed and that Mr. G. Wells would be asked to quote a price for doing so.

6.4 Village Shop

93 Mr. Potter, VS status report had been enclosed with the agenda.

Mr. Potter had reported that several investigations into the viability of the project had been undertaken, and that as a number of potential problems had been identified, there was currently nobody to take on the role as shop project manager.

The main issues were:

Competition - a 'convenience store' was not considered viable due to competition from local shops, and it would not be in the interest of the village to put the commercial viability of local stores at risk;

Clientele – impossibility of assessing demand from new residents, and until the new houses are occupied the most likely clientele would be the builders on the site, with attendant health and safety implications;

Volunteers – it had been calculated that a minimum of 50 individual shifts would need to be staffed per week, and it was considered that to expect this number of volunteers from the village committed for the long term was unrealistic;

Health and Hygiene – the business model favoured was to combine the sale of local produce with a café selling home-made cakes etc. EHDC health inspectors indicated that the premises would need to be licensed and the necessary hygiene certificates obtained. Any kitchen that was used to prepare produce for sale in the shop (including cakes from home kitchens) must also be inspected. Additionally all staff serving in the shop must demonstrate the necessary hygiene knowledge;

Licensed Premises – the business model proposed that wine and beer could be sold at the shop for consumption either on the premises or at home. This would require both the premises and the shop manager to be licensed. All staff in the shop would be responsible for ensuring that no under-age sales of alcohol were made with liability remaining with the licensee;

Set up costs – legal fees would be incurred to set up the trading company or other business structure required to sign the lease agreement with NJG in addition to various set up costs including staff training, licences etc.;

Trading costs – if the shop was not a successful commercial venture then, despite the initial working capital support offered by NJG, the village would have to cover any losses. This raises the question of where the village believe it is most appropriate to spend Parish Council funds;

Competition with NJG Froyle Park facilities – NJG had indicated in the draft lease that they would not allow any trading at the shop which competed with its business. NJG's representative had advised that NJG's Chairman would be disappointed that the village was unable to continue with the shop, and that NJG would now look at how they might be able to develop the premises. He was requested to maintain contact with the village to determine whether some mutually beneficial collaboration could be entered into.

The following actions were recommended for Parish Council approval:

- The findings of the various shop project managers be endorsed and NJG advised that at the present time the village is unable to continue its involvement in the development of a village shop.
- Following the Parish Council decision, a status report to be placed in the next village magazine. If another volunteer project manager comes forward from this report then discussions with NJG could be reopened.
- NJG to be advised that the Parish Council wishes to be kept informed of how they intend to develop the shop premises and of any opportunity for the village to become involved in any

subsequent NJG project. Mr. Potter, as chairman of the Parish Plan Implementation Committee, offered to act as the Parish Council contact point with NJG on this matter.

The recommendations above were **agreed**.

Mr. Deans to ask Mr. Tweddle, EHDC, about S106 agreements in relation to this project.

The **Clerk** to write to Mr. Potter to thank him and the team for their work on this project.

ITEM 7 CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

A list of the correspondence received since the agenda for the meeting of 27th May 2014 had been prepared had been enclosed with the agenda. Other matters, including some of which the papers were at the meeting and some had already been notified to councillors were noted below:

- 31 EHDC Joint Core Strategy – Adoption
- 33 D. Hinds MP British Geological Survey on the Weald Basin
- 35 EHAP&TC annual reports
- 47 CPRE East Hampshire JCS Inspectors Report - Brownfield land
- 48 EHAP&TC accounts and SDNP reports
- 56 HALC note on the content of 'The Planning Framework' development session
- 57 Playsafety: Inspection: overall medium risk
- 62 EHDC Increased risk of unauthorised encampments
- 67 Alton Town Council: Alton Neighbourhood Plan Update
- 78 NALC Local Council Review: planning, protecting footpaths, special events etc

ITEM 8 REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

See item 5.1 re planning.

ITEM 9 MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

9.1 End of speed restriction sign on verge near triangle by church in Upper Froyle: **Clerk** to ask Hampshire Highways to put it up again.

9.2 Noise from Froyle Place: very loud drums and trumpets in front drive. **Miss Gove** and **Mr. Wells** to contact EHDC enforcement officer, and **Mr. Whines** to email NJG.

9.3 Jubilee Green tree: Mr. Wells reported that it is dying. **Mr. Wells** to report to Mr. Garside to say it is dangerous and needs removing.

9.4 Jubilee Green furniture: Mr. Whines suggested installing a parish council noticeboard, and benches on Jubilee Green as well as the planned two maps. A deed of variation would be required for NJG funds to be diverted from the transport and shop projects. **Miss Gove** agreed to ask designers for their suggestions for the Green. The residents of the Old Dairy to be asked about use of the small paved area next to the wall. Part of the fence needs replacing.

9.5 Party in September in the Village Hall to thank Mr. and Mrs. Booth for their work devising and running the Meeting Place. **Miss Gove** to book.

9.6 TAG Farnborough: Mr. Deans had circulated a report which said that the UK Airports Commission has opened a consultation which closes on 25th July 2014. It refers to a discussion paper, Utilisation of the UK's Existing Airport Capacity, which refers to TAG Farnborough:

‘Smaller airports serving London and the south east quite often use uncontrolled airspace, given the focus on general rather than commercial aviation in these sites. Where these airports intend to expand into more commercial flights, they will need to include elements of controlled airspace – which will bring more complexity but also could improve the regularity of routings and noise for local residents – for instance the recently closed (12 May) consultation with the local community at TAG Farnborough’.

Mr. Deans said he will report again if he has new information.

9.7 Public Footpath Nedfield/Princes Paddock: Mr. Whines reported that the crop makes it impassable. Miss Gove said the crop will be cleared soon so the footpath will be open.

ITEM 10 MATTERS RAISED BY RESIDENTS

None.

ITEM 11 MATTERS FOR REPORTING IN VILLAGE MAGAZINE

Village Shop status.

Party for Mr. and Mrs. Booth.

Planning: Froyle House refusal, FPC responses to Jephson House and Froyle Park plots 36 and 37 applications.

ITEM 12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Ordinary PC 15th September 2014 (Monday)

The meeting closed at 9.45 pm.

Date.....

Chairman.....