

MINUTES
of the EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of
FROYLE PARISH COUNCIL
held in the Village Hall, Lower Froyle,
on Wednesday 27th February 2013 at 6.30 pm

Present:

<i>Parish Council:</i> 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> 2 members of the public Mr. D. Jobbins, NJG Dist. Cllr. Glynis Watts
--	--

ITEM 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mr. D. Collingborn

ITEM 2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

069 12-13 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 18th February 2013 be accepted as a true record.

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS (pntc)

4th December 2012

ITEM 9 MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

9.1 hedge at 41 Westburn Fields HH: requires action. It was reported that the hedge had been trimmed.

4th December 2012

ITEM 10 MATTERS RAISED BY RESIDENTS

10.3 Disabled bay, Westburn Fields: Resident's response had been enclosed with the agenda. **Miss Gove** agreed to respond to the resident.

11th February 2013

ITEM 7 MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

7.2 doors for the football hut: 428 Mr. Whines: new doors ordered. Noted.

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

ITEM 4 PLANNING MATTERS

4.1 Planning Applications (pntc)

4.1.1 326 20107/063 Treloar College, Ryebidge Lane, UF, DEMOLITION OF FORMER SCHOOL CLASSROOMS, STUDENT ACCOMMODATION, VARIOUS EXTENSIONS, OUTBUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED STRUCTURES. *Consultation expiry 28.2.13*

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. *Consultation expiry 28.2.13.*

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. *Consultation expiry 28.2.13.*

The draft response to these applications was examined and discussed.

070 12-13 It was **RESOLVED** to not object to the applications 20107/061/062/063 in principle, but to comment that given the scale and complexity of the application there are a number of serious concerns which the EHDC Planning Department should take into consideration in making their recommendation and the EHDC committee in making their determination.

FPC's main concerns are as follows:

- 1 Overall impact of the development on the existing community (increase in population, noise, lighting, views and traffic);
- 2 Overall impact of the development on heritage assets within the conservation area (Church, Froyle Place and various historic walls);
- 3 Overall impact on local infrastructure (roads, transport, education and village hall);
- 4 The density of the development;
- 5 The operation of the hotel;
- 6 Parking within the development;
- 7 Plot 13 and servicing Froyle Place;
- 8 Plots 14-19 and parking design;
- 9 Plots 31-32 and size and use of the 'Village Green';
- 10 Plot 35 and impact of dwelling on historic wall;
- 11 Plots 40-41 and intrusion on view and permeability (pedestrian link to overflow car park).
- 12 Plots 8-13

INTRODUCTION

The proposed development represents the biggest change to the village of Froyle in its very long history. It will inevitably have a dramatic impact, doubling the size of Upper Froyle and will irrevocably change the social and physical character of Froyle as a whole.

FPC appreciates the interest and long term commitment of the Nicolas James Group (NJG) to the site, the huge amount of work that they have put into their application and the exemplary manner in which they have engaged with the community.

FPC recognises NJG's commitment to high standards of design and construction, to preserving the site's heritage assets, enhancing the site's ecology and to providing facilities for the community.

FPC also recognises that this is a business venture and must be viable to be successful. A balance therefore needs to be struck between the profitability of the scheme and the (negative) impact on the existing community.

Community concerns

FPC is aware that residents' view of the development varies widely.

While most residents would agree that something must be done with the site there is a body of opinion that considers the development too dense, that the impact on the conservation area is too great, that the infrastructure is inadequate to sustain the development, and that the sheer number of incomers will overwhelm the existing community.

For other residents the main concern is that the impact of the development will be to split Froyle into two villages whereas in the past the parish has always considered itself to be a single community based round the Church in Upper Froyle and the Village Hall in Lower Froyle.

Other residents welcome the opportunities the development will provide: a small shop, the option to make use of the dining hall, the provision of new wildlife habitats, the restoration of the listed buildings, the energy and vitality that new residents will bring to the community and the facilities and employment opportunities that will be provided by the hotel.

In forming their opinion FPC has considered the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Local Plan (LP), the Adopted Development Guidelines (ADG) and the results of the Parish Plan Survey (PPS) conducted in June 2012. FPC regrets that a 3D model has not been provided to help them envisage the development and reveal views into and from within the completed project.

So while the planning documents are helpful to a degree, FPC believes that a determination of the application will be made by attempting to balance the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal: the benefits and the disbenefits, while accepting that it is impossible to know the long term impact of the development on the place and the people.

FPC believes that 106 Agreements should provide benefits for the whole community and be designed to reinforce the existing links between Upper and Lower Froyle. Road safety would be high on most residents' wish list.

FPC's approach is therefore to try to ensure that as far as possible the design of the new development ensures that future residents of Upper Froyle will live happily and harmoniously, and that everything that can be done is done to assist the integration of the existing community with the new one while preserving or enhancing the key heritage assets of the conservation area.

PART 1 INFRASTRUCTURE

Traffic and Transport

FPC notes the transport consultants' report and their conclusion that there will be no significant increase in traffic as a result of the development. FPC has no means of challenging this but believes that there may be a very different pattern of vehicle movement. FPC suggests that the development provides an opportunity for Highways to review a number of safety issues at the Hen & Chicken junction on the A31 and Hen & Chicken Hill. FPC welcomes the inclusion of a permissive footpath in the development which will allow pedestrians to avoid walking on Hen & Chicken Hill. FPC trusts that this footpath would be provided in perpetuity. FPC believes that access to the development via Gid Lane should be actively excluded from any permission.

The Development Guidelines make it clear that the principle and preferred access to the site should be via Hen & Chicken Hill to prevent unnecessary vehicle movements through the village. FPC notes that the application includes three access points to 57 parking spaces that will be accessed from Ryebriidge Lane to the north of the site. While acknowledging the importance of parking for the hotel, in the view of FPC this conflicts with the guidelines. (See note on parking.)

The Parish Plan Survey revealed a number of widespread concerns including the safety of the Hen & Chicken junction, pedestrian safety, the size and speed of vehicles travelling through the village. FPC understand that there will be a Highways 106 Agreement Contribution and suggests that this used specifically towards addressing these issues.

FPC believes that a number of those coming to live in the new development will wish to make use of the Alton – Waterloo railway service. Pressure on parking at Bentley station is noted in the EHDC Draft Core Strategy (CP 29), Development Guidance and in the Parish Plan survey results. The car park is full before 8am. In common with neighbouring parishes FPC believes it is unacceptable and unsustainable for a transport system to exist which cannot be used.

Parking

Much of the success of the new development seen from the point of view of new residents will depend on there being sufficient parking which is easy to access. To put it another way inadequate parking is known to be a major cause of neighbour conflict.

The traffic and transport report tells us that parking exceeds the HCC 2002 policy requirements. Again FPC has to accept that this may be the case but believes that this policy is now out of date given the predicted increase in car ownership.

The concern is that with little public transport everyone who comes to live in the new development is likely to own or have access to a car and possibly more than one. There is a growing trend for young people to stay at home much longer than in the past. It is not impossible to imagine families with three adult children owning at least five cars. Their visitors will almost always arrive by car. Increasingly they will shop online with a consequent increase in courier vehicle movements. In the view of FPC, to underestimate parking requirements would be to prejudice the success of the development. We hope EHDC will examine this aspect of the application rigorously in the light of recent evidence. In particular FPC is concerned that the parking for the hotel/club should be adequate. Plans for valet parking using the car park on Hen & Chicken Hill are noted. Serious consideration should be given to creating additional parking and service area at the rear of the hotel. (See comments on plot 13.)

Education

FPC notes that there is already pressure on places at the surrounding primary schools. The development is likely to produce a significant increase in the number of children and some indication how they will be absorbed into the school system would be welcome. FPC understands that the necessary facilities could be constructed at Bentley School if funding is available.

Social Housing

FPC would support the idea that social/affordable housing should be provided on a shared equity basis.

PART 2 DESIGN

Conservation Area

Many elements of the new development do not appear to comply with those policies of the Local Plan (e.g. HE4, HE12 etc) which seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area. Upper Froyle is characterised by linear development with substantial gaps between buildings, where there is little back-land development and where

the mass of the existing buildings and their density is on a very different scale to those proposed. There is a wide range of buildings from barns and small cottages through to substantial dwellings. The effect is organic, of gradual accretion over the centuries. The same is true of individual properties, which have been modified and added to over time. The only jarring note is sounded by the group of executive style houses built 10 years ago in the old wood yard located partly outside the conservation area. These are relatively well screened by an old barn but provide an example of a less than sympathetic development made worse by later extension impacting negatively on the conservation area. To preserve the conservation area, 'suburban style' design should be avoided. This principle is embodied in the Development Guidelines.

Froyle Place

FPC welcomes the renovation of Froyle Place and looks forward to its return to productive use. It will bring visitors to enjoy our beautiful village and provide a meeting place and facilities for our growing community along with employment opportunities.

FPC sees the area between the Grade 2* listed Froyle Place and the Grade 1 listed Church as the most sensitive in the development. FPC is pleased that the NJG intends to service the hotel from the rear. However, the Council notes that there are 32 parking places located in front of and to the side of Froyle Place which intrude into the view of the Church from the south west and of the House from the parkland and surrounding countryside, detracting from both. This seems too many. Parking spaces 16-25 and 31-32 ought to be reconsidered.

FPC notes the replacement of the garages with single storey hotel rooms, and the removal of a number of mature trees. This area could possibly provide well-screened parking for the hotel and would help to protect the setting of the Church.

FPC notes the importance of the south and east aspects in the setting of Froyle Place. The current building (Haywood) is aligned with the southern wing of Froyle Place and is of a long low form that does little to interrupt this aspect. The proposals are taller, sited further east and crowd the views from the south and east. This is exacerbated by the domestic form that presents windows and back gardens to this aspect.

Plot 13 is located very close to the end of the dining hall. If Plot 13 were foregone it would provide more room for servicing the hotel. Additional parking spaces on the plot would relieve the pressure to have so many parking spaces next to the Church. It would provide parking for events in the dining hall. It would create a break between Froyle Place and the row of new buildings on the east of the site. It would open up views into the development towards the clock tower from the gardens of Froyle Place and the parkland beyond and it would improve the gardens themselves by removing the blocking wall of plot 13.

Plots 40-41

FPC objects to the buildings on plots 40-41 next to Froyle Manor House for the following reasons:

The houses will largely conceal the historic malmstone wall (as acknowledged in p.16-18 of the Heritage Statement, and in HE12 – development affecting the setting of listed buildings) which forms a natural boundary between the conservation area and the new buildings to the south. The style and orientation of the building together with the large trees on the far side of the wall will make the living areas relatively dark.

The building intrudes into the long established public view of the Manor House and the Oast Houses beyond from Hen & Chicken Hill. This corner of old Froyle should be retained if at all possible. The characteristic of the conservation is for buildings to be positioned randomly with spaces in between.

The ADG argue that the new development should be as permeable as possible so the new integrates with the existing. FPC believes that if plots 40-41 are developed this will block the possibility of a footpath linking the overflow car park from the main site. As the plan stands, a visitor having parked their car would need to walk along the road on the outside of a right-angled bend, crossing both the access to West End Farm and the Froyle House complex in order to enter the development. Conversely a guest of the hotel whose car has been valet parked and who wishes to return to their car would almost certainly prefer to do this along footpaths through the site rather than along the road.

Walled Garden (Plots 34-37)

FPC welcomes the ‘barnyard’ approach to this area but feels that the idea has not been fully followed through resulting in a jumble of styles. The Council shares the Conservation Officer’s concern that the house on Plot 35 is located too close to an important historic wall located at key point in the conservation area. Because of the height of the building it will appear to rear up well above the wall reducing the impact of this heritage asset. The house should be moved further from the wall and its scale reduced to be more in keeping with its walled garden/‘barnyard’ location.

Buildings to the South (Plots 1-7)

This is a particular sensitive site as these buildings are on the perimeter of the conservation area and can be viewed from Hen & Chicken Hill as one approaches Upper Froyle from the A31. These are large executive detached houses and do not relate particularly well to other buildings in the conservation area.

The computer-generated images show them to be more dominant than the existing buildings. Although the layout of the plots is staggered the effect

remains an unbroken row of large modern houses. FPC believe that they would have a less detrimental effect on the countryside setting and the conservation area if no.7 were set further back on its plot, and it should be possible to adjust the layout of the properties to make the grouping more irregular and to retain the view of the Burnham House clock tower in order to create a focal point and a visual link between the new and the existing buildings.

Buildings to the East (Plots 8-13)

These conflict with HE1, HE4, and the Adopted Development Guidelines. Again this is a sensitive site on high ground with distant views across parkland to the countryside beyond. The effect of the development on this aspect was identified in the Development Guidelines as an issue for special consideration.

The proposed houses are generally taller than the building they replace and extend considerably further south and east. Their form and shape do not replicate the massing of the more traditional Froyle farmhouses, which tend to be more modest, with steeper pitched roofs. The arrangement of these 'executive' dwellings along the access road appears very suburban and not in keeping with the conservation area, which is unfortunate given their prominence on the skyline.

FPC believes that omitting plot 13 may have some distinct advantages as indicated above.

There may be virtue in arranging the remaining houses in groups of two and three with a gap in between to ensure the street scene is less suburban.

The Village Green

FPC welcomes the idea of a public green space opening off Ryebridge Lane providing an important link between the existing village and the new development. At the back of the green, access is needed for 10 parking spaces which makes the space less child friendly. The house on plot 32 is built very close to the historic brick perimeter wall.

This wall viewed from inside the development is a significant heritage asset. In the winter sun it positively glows with warmth and reminds the viewer of its original purpose to provide shelter for a walled garden.

At the moment there is no direct route from the Green to the shop. FPC would like the developer to be asked to look at how to achieve this.

Shop

The proposed shop has strong support from the Parish Plan Survey. FPC acknowledges the support from NJG for this project. However, FPC has some concerns as to its size, access through a relatively narrow opening with poor sightlines and parking, particularly parking on the road. In the

event that the shop does not prove viable FPC believes the allocated building should be retained for community use. Care needs to be taken that the shop does not have a negative impact on Bentley Stores and Post Office, the loss of which would have a significant impact on many existing residents.

PART 3

Open Space and Ecology

FPC supports the comments on Biodiversity prepared by members of the community [see appendix *PARISH PLAN COMMENTS – NJG Application Biodiversity 180213*].

FPC welcomes the inclusion of open space on the southern part of the development together with all the measures to create habitats for wild life. The Council believes that the mitigation measures proposed in the application should be conditioned so as to be enforceable in perpetuity.

Lighting

FPC understands that NJG are not to have estate roads adopted and therefore avoid street lighting on the development that would greatly increase the impact of the development on the Conservation and Countryside. FPC welcomes the dark skies commitment although it has reservations about the number of Velux type windows. Some limitation on the use of security lights and garden lighting should be conditioned.

Boundary treatments

FPC is unclear how the boundaries between some individual properties will be treated. More information is required as the treatment of boundaries contributes to the character of the development and establishes links with the conservation area. It is important that these treatments are specified in advance. FPC would welcome use of walls and pet-proof hedges and limitations on residents' ability to change these in the future, for example to create additional parking spaces.

Surface materials

FPC would welcome more information in order to assess the quality of the materials to be used in public areas. The plans show areas of brown/beige paving, but 'tarmac' is mentioned in the D&A Statement. This needs to be clarified and FPC would suggest a palette of materials agreed at this stage, for each element of the public realm.

Operation of hotel

FPC appreciates the importance of the hotel to the overall project but remain unclear as to exactly what kind of venue it will turn out to be. So it is difficult to assess its impact.

Conditions should therefore limit hours of opening and noise levels etc so that the peace of neighbouring properties including the Church is not disturbed unduly. This continues to be a live issue in Lower Froyle in respect of the Anchor Inn where its success as a venue is causing increasing nuisance to residents.

PART 4

Demolition and construction and thereafter

FPC believes that disruption should be kept to an absolute minimum particularly if development takes place over a number of years. The safety of residents should be of primary concern.

Access

No site traffic to come through the village.

Access should only be via the A31 and Hen & Chicken Hill.

Heavy goods vehicles should not cross over but exit and enter the A31 on the north side and if necessary use the roundabouts at Alton and Farnham.

A road condition survey of Hen & Chicken Hill should be conducted before work begins.

Footpath access from Upper Froyle to the bottom of Hen & Chicken Hill should be established before work begins as conditions on Hen & Chicken Hill are likely to deteriorate.

Method statement

This should be approved before work begins, detailing temporary works and weather proofing, access, noise and dust control, storage of demolition materials, site security etc.

Safeguarding the future

Recent experience has made the parish council acutely aware of the way the law of unintended consequence operates in planning matters. The PC notes the apparent ease with which an exemption from policy can become a precedent. We would therefore hope that were permission to be granted conditions would be applied to ensure that all undertakings made by the developer could be relied on in perpetuity and that these undertakings would be transferred to any future owner of the site.

Similarly conditions should preclude further development on the site or any extension or alteration of individual properties to include for example the conversion of loft spaces and garages, and the installation of pv panels. This might be achieved by the removal of permitted development rights (HE8) in such a way that they cannot be restored on appeal.

CONCLUSION

To say the least, FPC have found this application interesting but very challenging. The comments above represent our best efforts to respond to the huge amounts of information with which we have been provided. We do not have access to experts or consultants and can only rely on our knowledge of our community, our experience and our native wit.

We hope our observations will be helpful to both the planners and the applicant and that they will make a contribution to ensuring that we get the best possible scheme both for the applicant and our residents: both those who live in Froyle now and those who come to the village in the future.

The Planning Committee were thanked for their work on this application.

4.2 Results of Planning Applications (pntc)

406 **50512/002 Coombefield Cottage**, Ryebriage Lane, Upper Froyle, FELL ONE CONIFER AND ONE THORN; CROWN CLEAN TWO DAMSONS AND REDUCE TO HEDGE HEIGHT (3 METRES) FIVE CONIFERS, ONE PRUNUS AND A ROW OF 4 IRISH YEWS. ALL ADJACENT TO THE EASTERN BOUNDARY AS SHOWN ON NOTIFICATION PLAN NO OBJECTION. Noted

407 **20107/060 Froyle House**, Ryebriage Lane, Upper Froyle, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO IMPLEMENT APPROVED CHANGE OF USE FROM MIXED USE (260 SQ M OFFICES AND 7 DWELLINGS) TO FORM 5 DWELLINGS (AMENDMENTS TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED 20107/057) CONSENT. Noted

435 **35584/004 Old Dairy**, Ryebriage Lane, Upper Froyle, RE-POLLARD TO PREVIOUS POLLARD POINTS (FINISHED HEIGHT ABOUT 8 METRES) AND CROWN LIFT TO 4 METRES, 5 LIME TREES (1,2,5,6 & 7 IN NOTIFICATION). FELL 2 LIME TREES (TREES 3 AND 4 IN THE NOTIFICATION). ALL ADJACENT TO THE EASTERN MOST BOUNDARY. NO OBJECTION. Noted

ITEM 5 CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

A list of the correspondence received since the agenda for the meeting of 18th February 2013 had been prepared was 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:

431 EHDC: Special Edition Councillor Newsletter: progress of East Hampshire **Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy**.

Dist. Cllr. Watts explained that changes in the Settlement Policy Boundary are not part of the Local Plan, but that the changes to the Local Plan are due to the government demand for extra housing, with some new housing being built in the South Downs National Park.

ITEM 6 REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

None.

ITEM 7 MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

Mr. Deans explained that the **willow by the pond** in Lower Froyle is to be removed entirely because it is rotten and Hampshire Highways believes it to be dangerous.

ITEM 8 MATTERS RAISED BY RESIDENTS

None.

ITEM 9 MATTERS FOR REPORTING IN VILLAGE MAGAZINE

None.

ITEM 10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday 4th March 2013 at 7pm.

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm.

Date.....

Chairman.....