

MINUTES
of the EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of
FROYLE PARISH COUNCIL
held in the Village Hall, Lower Froyle,
on Monday 11th February 2013 at 7 pm

Present:

<i>Parish Council:</i> Mr. D. Collingborn Mr. M. Cray Mr. I. Deans Mr. T. Goodsell Miss J Gove Mr. S. Lloyd Mr MJ Wells Mr. N. Whines	<i>Clerk:</i> <i>Others:</i> 12 members of the public Dist. Cllr. G. Watts Mr. A. Ellis, EHDC Planning Mr. D. Jobbins, NJG
--	--

ITEM 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Others: Ms M. Essenson

ITEM 2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

064 12-13 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 4th February 2013 be accepted as a true record.

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS (pntc)

4.2.13

Item 4 Planning Matters

383 Parking problems at Bentley. Noted.

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

ITEM 4 PLANNING MATTERS

4.1 Planning Applications (pntc)

Final response on items 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 (Treloar site) would be decided at a later parish council meeting.

4.1.1 326 20107/063 Treloar College, Ryebidge Lane, UF, DEMOLITION OF FORMER SCHOOL CLASSROOMS, STUDENT ACCOMMODATION, VARIOUS EXTENSIONS, OUTBUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED STRUCTURES.

4.1.2 345 20107/062 Treloar College, Ryebidge Lane, UF, Conversion of **Gaston House** to country club hotel including part demolition of classroom block, demolition of flat roofed single storey outbuildings and replacement with single storey bedroom wing, alteration and extension to **Jephson House** to form three dwellings and village shop following demolition of flat roofed extensions. Internal and external alterations to allow conversion of **Manor House annexe** to dwelling, internal and external alterations to allow conversion of **Manor House Barn** to single dwelling. Single storey extensions to **Manor House North** and **Manor House South**. Internal and external alterations to allow conversion of **Burnham Place** to form fifteen dwellings and two apartments.

4.1.3 354 20107/061 Treloar College, Ryebriidge Lane, UF, 40 dwellings and 1 apartment with associated parking, garaging and access roads; conversion of **Burnham Place** into 15 dwellings and 2 apartments; single storey extensions to **Manor House** North and Manor House South; conversion of **Manor House Annexe** to single dwelling; conversion, alteration and extension of **Manor House Barn** to form single dwelling, change of use; alteration and extension to **Gaston House** to form Country Club Hotel with apartments above including part demolition classroom block and demolition of single storey outbuildings and replacement with single storey pitched roof bedroom wing; conversion alteration and extension to **Jephson House** to form 3 dwellings and village shop following demolition of flat roofed extensions.

Mr. Deans asked Mr. Ellis for a distinction between planning matters and not planning matters in the issues arising from this application. For example, the Parish Plan and Village Design Statement, on development at this site, refer to *social issues* and further impacts because it will approximately double the population of Upper Froyle, resulting possibly in effects on the Village Hall, footpaths, noise, infrastructure, the A31/Hen & Chicken junction, the character of the village, etc.

Mr. Ellis replied that the design brief for developers had been compiled before there was any planning application to be considered, but that highways, environment, and education authorities are consulted on applications, to gauge their impact, but social effects are more difficult to quantify.

Traffic for the site's former use would be compared with likely traffic in its new, mixed, use. EHDC follow Highways' guidance in these matters. Contribution via S106 can be used to alleviate traffic issues, but amount of contribution is proportional to the size of the development, and there would be a contribution to 'affordable' housing.

Mr. Whines asked Mr. Ellis whether EHDC could challenge the *highways authority* on their findings. Mr. Ellis said that their advice is not taken lightly, so has to be accepted unless there is quantifiable evidence to the contrary. If an application were refused for those reasons, EHDC would have to defend its decision. He said that Hampshire Highways are an independent body. Mr. Jobbins said that NJG's transport consultants have looked at the application, and they are independent of Hampshire Highways.

On *school* capacity, Mr. Ellis said that the education authority advise EHDC.

On *parking* at Bentley railway station, said there is no direction evidence of the application having an impact. Mr. Whines suggested the only solution to any increase in travel from Bentley station would be a bus service. Mr. Lloyd suggested there is evidence of worsening of the parking situation because a number of the houses planned for the site are of a size that suggests the occupants would be commuting to work, and the situation would be worsened by the building of the large new town at Bordon. Mr. Ellis replied that it would be a railways responsibility, but any scheme would have to be assessed as to how it would affect Bentley, and as this is not known then focus has to be on current application.

Mr. Deans referred to the impact of the development on the *countryside*, especially the views of the south and east corners of the site. He said that Pike and Heywood houses had been allowed as an exception because of the school use, and as the use was no longer as a school they could have been removed, or, if not, then it could be required that what is built in their place should have no greater impact. Some of the proposed houses are taller and closer to the boundary, so would have a greater impact. Whether the proposed broken profile would have less impact is subjective. The houses will have roofs large enough to put in extra rooms, which would be more noticeable especially *at night*. Mr. Ellis said a balanced view has to be taken, especially as the houses would be near listed buildings and the conservation area. EHDC would take in the opinion of the conservation officer. Mr. Collingborn pointed out that low buildings are less visible in the landscape and at present there is less *light* from them. Mr. Ellis said that there is unlikely to be any street lighting, and lighting would be lessened by curtains, therefore this aspect would probably not be deemed unacceptable. Mr. Jobbins added that NJG do not want street lighting, and their traffic consultant has said it would not be necessary. Lights from houses are unlikely to be on all night. Some of the houses will be higher than existing buildings, but proposed heights vary and there are gaps between the houses. Mr. Deans mentioned security lights on during the night. Mr. Whines said that rooflights would light up the whole area, especially noticeable as the first impact of the village for most people is from Hen and Chicken Hill.

Miss Gove said that the development guidelines state that this is an opportunity to get rid of the modern buildings on the site, but that the opportunity of giving the *listed buildings* more space around them is not being taken. Mr. Ellis said that he is meeting English Heritage this week for them to give an overview of the application, especially regarding Froyle Place.

Mr. Deans said there were no buildings at present on plots 40 and 41, and new houses there would look cramped. Mr. Ellis said he would look at this, and added that the highways authority taken into account whether vehicles can enter and exit in forward gear. Mr. Jobbins said that new houses were planned at that spot because there had been buildings there in the past. They are designed to look like converted barns and would be two metres away from the wall. Mr. Deans said that houses for plots 34, 35, 36 and 37 would be taller than the existing wall. Mr. Goodsell pointed out that the wall probably did not have foundations.

Mr. Deans commented that it is difficult to visualise the *boundary* treatment. Mr. Jobbins explained that they propose having park railings, post and rail fencing, and gravel *surfaces*, but these will not be decided until there is planning permission. Mr. Deans said as these are not trivial issues it would be better to have them decided before, and that though FPC would prefer hedges, when residents move in they might put up fences, as hedges do not keep pets out and hedges would not be tall enough. Mr. Jobbins said the main road through the site would be tarmac. Mr. Ellis said that boundary types can be controlled, and would ask the developer for more details, and for a management scheme. Mr. Whines asked whether these matters could be controlled by covenants on the properties. Mr. Jobbins said the houses would be freehold.

Mr. Deans asked about biodiversity. Mr. Jobbins explained there would be surveys but that they cannot be done until May. They would consult with Natural England.

Mr. Whines said that the area for *servicing* of Froyle Place and its apartments is very small, being approximately three metres wide, that the road alongside is approximately three metres wide, and that perhaps there were too many houses at that point. Mr. Jobbins said their highways experts had said it was acceptable but conditions could be put on those traffic

movements. Mr. Whines said that there are also likely to be many deliveries to the houses and queried whether there was adequate parking. Mr. Jobbins said that it meets the county standard.

Mr. Collingborn asked about trees, and Mr. Ellis said they would expect indigenous local trees etc.

Mr. Ellis said that FPC's comments will be reflected in full in EHDC deliberations.

FPC thanked Mr. Ellis for attending and for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. Ellis left the meeting at this point.

Mr. Jobbins said that NJG want indigenous *planting*, and can plant more trees than in the application. He explained that it would be better to start planting soon. He said that their ecological advisors had said not to increase the shade in some areas, and an advisor's report had not supported the application, but the ecological surveys had been done according to Natural England's timing. The bat survey would be done in May. A licence has to be obtained from Natural England, and no development can take place without it. Regarding the setting of *listed buildings*, he said the footprint of buildings on the site was being reduced by approximately 25% overall and some areas were to be more open. On *traffic*, they needed to await the response of the highways authority, but that would be after FPC had made its response to the planning application. If asked for a contribution to improve highways, NJG would provide it.

Images of the *views* of the site from the south east, south west, and east, as they are now and according to the planning application, were examined.

Mr. Goodsell questioned whether a *shop* at the site would be viable, and said there is already a good shop in Bentley. Mr. Jobbins said the development guidelines had referred to the importance of a shop, and this had been reinforced by data from the Parish Plan. He said that NJG would support a shop and it would therefore be in their interests that it succeed.

The Chairman read a note from Ms Essenson, which said she would like there to be acknowledgment that NJG had shown an interest in the Parish Plan and that it was good that things had been included in their plans as a result, such as the shop, additional wildlife area, permissive paths, and an additional footpath/cycle link through the site. Ms Essenson felt that NJG had done an excellent job of communicating their plans with the village. Ms Essenson believed that the EHDC/Glynis Watts-led development guidelines, which had included community involvement, had been a good foundation. She added that the role of the Parish Plan group is to understand village views and help them get heard by developers, EHDC and the parish council. Ms Essenson said she would be looking at the Parish Plan again e.g. re resident concerns about social impact, and would send a copy of her draft to the parish council before sending it to EHDC. Ms Essenson asked for mandatory conditions to be applied wherever possible, and felt that residents do not want the site to lie empty.

380 39628/002 Manor Cottage, Spollycombe Lane, UF REINSTATEMENT OF INGLENOOK FIRE PLACE WITH INSTALLATION OF LOG BURNING STOVE.
065 12-13 It was **RESOLVED** to make no objection to this application.

381 26566/029 Pond on junction Husseys Lane and Lower Froyle Road, T1 WILLOW - POLLARD TO 4M ABOVE GROUND LEVEL, REDUCE LOWER LATERALS TO POLLARDED FORM.
066 12-13 It was **RESOLVED** to make no objection to this application.

4.2 Results of Planning Applications (pntc)

378 24792/007 Sunnyside, Park Lane, LF, CROWN REDUCE ONE WILLOW IN THE GARDEN TO THE SOUTH WEST OF THE PROPERTY TO PREVIOUS POLLARD POINTS LEAVING A FINISHED HEIGHT OF 8 METRES AND CROWN SPREAD (RADIUS) OF 4 METRES. NO OBJECTION. Noted.

ITEM 5 CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

A list of the correspondence received since the agenda for the meeting of 4th February 2013 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:

384 EHS Consultation: **pharmaceutical services**: 'urban'/'rural': Froyle defined as rural

ITEM 6 REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

Mr. Whines reported that the application for wood shredding at West End Farm is likely to be refused, but an appeal is likely.

ITEM 7 MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

7.1 Mr. Lloyd had volunteered re Bentley **parking**.

7.2 Mr. Whines said that the supplier of the doors for the **football hut** had gone out of business and there was some difficulty finding replacements.

7.3 Mr. Cray said that he would be meeting Cty. Cllr. Mark Kemp-Gee re funding for the new **playground** equipment.

7.4 Mr. Whines said that Mr. Kemp-Gee had promised funding for the **Village Hall** and the **map case** and that Hampshire Highways might fund 1/3 cost of the map case.

7.5 Mr. Wells reported that he had met Radian and they will probably clear the **ditch** that runs from Ryebidge Lane to the garages in Westburn Fields, and that it would be done regularly. He has asked them for evidence that they own the ditch, the footpath and the hedge.

ITEM 8 MATTERS RAISED BY RESIDENTS

None.

ITEM 9 MATTERS FOR REPORTING IN VILLAGE MAGAZINE

None.

ITEM 10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday 18th February 2013.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm.

Date.....

Chairman.....