

**FOUR MARKS PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee  
Held on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022, commencing at 7.30pm  
At the Benians Pavilion, Uplands Lane, Four Marks**

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	<b>Cllr Mike Sanders (Chairman), Cllrs Janet Foster, Shaun McCarthy and Anne Tomlinson</b>
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<b>Sarah Goudie, Executive Officer (EO) 5 members of the public Cllr Reg Pullen Cllr Bryan Timms (part)</b>
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	<b>Cllr John Hammond</b>

**22.22 PC APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

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

**22.23 PC OPEN SESSION – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan steering group secretary wished to highlight that Policy 6 of the neighbourhood plan includes the site contained within planning application reference 23291/029. They also referred to the transport statement, which is dated 2019, and pre-dates the change of priorities at the bridge on Lymington Bottom Road. Also raising the spot levels, drainage concerns in Lymington Bottom Road, and outside Clementine's Fruit and Vegetable shop, and that application 58788 is outside the settlement policy boundary and therefore against Policy CP19.

Cllr Timms, firstly wished to pay tribute to the heroics and bravery of the Ukraine people amidst the current destruction and devastation, which was acknowledged by all attendees. He also, referring to planning application 58788, although in Medstead, should the application be granted permission, Four Marks should benefit from planning gain.

A second member of the Neighbourhood Plan steering group, and resident representative, wished to raise the following with reference to all the Medstead sites under discussion, and ask the committee to note.

- Since Oct 2016 all 23 greenfield speculative applications in Four Marks and Medstead have been refused by EHDC and all subsequent appeals dismissed by Planning Inspectors
- Application documents can be persuasive and compelling, but often conflicting and inaccurate.
- Bringing forward these premature speculative applications as a contingent in parallel with the Local Plan Large site allocations is confusing, misguided and attempt to bypass the planning system.
- The planning officer's pre-application report confirms a 5YLS with buffer which has been supported at recent appeals. The area has already over delivered by 130% on the JCS to 2028 housing target of 175. Local Plan policies still carry full weight.
- Other points; the housing mix is wrong, the affordability need is unproven, poor design layout,. DPH at 25 is too high, serious drainage concerns, and access issues. The development is unsustainable.

Cllr Sanders agreed to close the meeting as appropriate to allow members of the public to speak during the discussions with reference to the Medstead applications, upon request.

There were no further items to raise under the Open Session therefore the meeting commenced at 7.45pm.  
**Standing Orders were applied.**

**22.24 PC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest, however Cllr Sanders advised the Committee that the application 57451/002 was from his neighbour.

**22.25 PC COMMITTEE MINUTES**

It was RESOLVED to approve the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2022, following proposal by Cllr Foster, seconded by Cllr McCarthy, and agreed by all Councillors as a true reflection of the meeting and were duly signed by the Chairman.

**22.26 PC PLANNING MATTERS – NEW APPLICATIONS**

<b>NEW APPLICATIONS</b>				
<b>Date received</b>	<b>Ref. No:</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Comments by:</b>
21/02/22	<a href="#">53647/004</a>	Land at Tawny Grove, Four Marks	T1-Hornbeam-Crown lift to 3.5m. T2-Beech-Reduce crown height by 1m, leaving a crown height of 5m. Reduce crown width by 2m, leaving a crown width of 4m. Crown lift to 3.5m. T3-Cherry-Reduce crown height by 2m, leaving a crown height of 6m. Reduce crown width by 2m, leaving a crown width of 5m. Crown lift to 3.5m	21 <sup>st</sup> March 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>However, with reference to this application, the Council defer to the planning officer's decision in this regard.</p>				
22/02/22	<a href="#">57451/002</a>	The Haslemere, 37A Telegraph Lane, Four Marks	T1 Ash Fell, T2 Ash Fell	22 <sup>nd</sup> March 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, although acknowledge that there is an issue with Ash Dieback, there is no arboricultural report to confirm that the trees are diseased or infected, therefore defer to the planning officer's decision in this regard.</p>				
09/02/2022	<a href="#">39009/008</a>	Land to the North of the Telephone Exchange, Lymington Bottom Road, MEDSTEAD	Up to 1525sqm of Class E uses, including provision for a flexible working facility, including means of vehicular access. All other matters (layout, scale,	8 <sup>th</sup> March 2022

			appearance and landscaping) to be reserved for future consideration.	
--	--	--	--	--

The Parish Council strongly object to this application.

The site is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary, and therefore without proven need, development would be contrary to policy CP19 of the EHDC Local Plan Joint Core Strategy. The current Settlement Policy Boundary is not part of 5 year housing land supply policy, and remains in force until redrawn by an updated and adopted local plan, and is there to protect the countryside.

**Drainage**

There is historical flooding in this area, which the additional hard surfacing due to the topography of the site would only exacerbate in an area largely comprised of an impervious clay cap overlaying chalk. There is a watercourse running along the rear of the site offering further concern that during periods of heavy rainfall this would overflow and cause overwhelming of the foul water treatment area and bring foul water into the community. There are no drainage mitigation proposals included with the application.

**Need**

There is a recent proven case that this type of development is not required (planning application 20253/023 conversion of unused office buildings to dwellings) recently refused by EHDC. In Four Marks, a recent application received (26233/022) to determine if prior approval is required for a change of use from Commercial, Business and Service to dwelling houses. Given that there are currently unused commercial buildings in both parishes, there is no need or requirement for this type of commercial building and there are provisions within the Neighbourhood Plan for other commercial locations. This proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CP3 of the Local Plan Joint Core Strategy.

**Climate change**

The additional traffic by both domestic and commercial vehicles that would be generated by this commercial development would be against EHDC's own current climate emergency policy. The development is not within walking distance to local services, therefore only increasing the daily traffic movements.

**Design**

The Council determined that the two storey proposals for the units was out of keeping with a countryside location where it would be more appropriate for the upper floors to be in the roof space with dormer windows.

**Contamination**

The site will be contaminated due to its current use as pig farm, apart from the heavy metal element of pig slurry, the site has many other types of dumped waste metals and potential contaminants. There is no reference to this issue or mitigation proposals contained within the application.

The information contained within the planning and transport statements are assumptive and based on conjecture rather than fact. This is a speculative application that conflicts with Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan and Policies CP3 and CP19 of the EHDC Local Plan Joint Core Strategy, and therefore respectfully ask the planning officer to refuse this application.

17/02/2022	<a href="#">58788</a>	Land to the West of Longbourn Way, MEDSTEAD	Development comprising 112 new homes with associated access and landscaping	17 <sup>th</sup> March 2022
------------	-----------------------	---	---	-----------------------------

The Parish Council strongly object to this application.

The proposed site is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary which remains in force until redrawn by an updated and adopted local plan and is there to protect the countryside. EHDC have a proven 5yr HLS and the planning area South Medstead and Four Marks has already over delivered by 130% in the current plan period.

**Drainage**

The topography of the site is such that there will be increased surface water run of with no mitigation proposals submitted. Lymington Bottom Road already floods in places after heavy rainfall, any additional development in this location will only exacerbate the issue.

**Access**

There is only one access to the proposed site and the site can only be accessed through the Austen Fields development via Longbourn Way, which is already restricted with pinch points and shares an access with the local doctor's surgery. The Council are concerned that, with only one access, how would emergency vehicles access the site if any part of the one access is blocked? How would the single access cope with the additional daily car movements? The health and safety implications must be considered in this regard. Pedestrian safety should also be considered if encouraging residents to walk to local facilities.

Is the parking provision adequate to negate the need for on street parking, and further access obstruction?

Moreover, access to the A31 from the proposed site is restricted due a single lane bridge on Lymington Bottom Road and the junction with the A31 is already at capacity.

**Transport Assessment**

The assessment was carried out on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2019, just 5 school days before end of the Hampshire County Council school term when school traffic will be lighter, and likely that children who can, will walk to school in the better weather. Using their figures from 08:00 to 09:00 they record a total of 572 vehicle movements and if this proposed development generates a 60% use of cars to commute, the extra loading on the junction which Hampshire Highways stated was already at 92 percent capacity, would generate 67 extra vehicles on top of the 572, an 11% increase. Any extra loading should be treated as significant, not as insignificant as stated. This information also needs to be considered with the other two current applications, 39009/008, with 60 car parking spaces and the extra traffic from the Lymington Barns 23291/029 application, where this junction loading applies equally and cumulatively. It must also be noted that the Lymington Bottom Road junction with the A31 can only accept one vehicle in the central reservation to turn right to Winchester, therefore any right turning vehicles (80 were listed) will cause considerable queueing on Lymington Bottom Road itself, which already causes an issue.

**Design and Layout**

The proposal is a high density, urban style development and unsympathetic to the rural setting, when in this location, it would be expected that the density and massing fade to bungalows on the side adjacent to the countryside.

**Environmental**

The topography of the site and single pedestrian access will necessitate the need for additional vehicle journeys to access all the local services, this is against EHDC's own climate strategy. The development would result in the unacceptable loss of wildlife habitat.

**Education**

Can the local primary schools provide placement for the additional residents?

**Interlinked applications**

The planning statement refers to three different applications and not solely relevant to this application alone, though each application should be considered on its own merit. Should the application for this and 39009/008 and 23291/029 have been submitted as one application? Bringing forward these premature speculative applications is confusing and appears to be an attempt to bypass the planning system.

In summary, the proposal is not compliant with EHDC Local Plan Policies CP2, CP10 and CP19 and Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan and in conflict with EHDC's development plan, and therefore respectfully request that the Planning Officer refuse this speculative application.

**If approved**

However, should the planning officer be minded to approve this application, in order to protect the existing residents of Longbourn Way, a detailed and enforceable CMS must be submitted and approved, and although the development is in the Parish of Medstead, due to the proximity to Four Marks and its facilities, would request that any legal agreement acknowledges this and awards some financial contributions towards Four Marks infrastructure improvements.

23/02/2022	<a href="#">23291/029</a>	Lymington Farm Industrial Estate, Lymington Bottom Road, MEDSTEAD	A hybrid planning application which seeks detailed planning permission for: 'the provision of 638sqm of leisure space (Building2) (Class E d), access and parking provision' and outline permission for:	23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2022
------------	---------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------

			'the provision of 916sqm of flexible Class E space and 344sqm of flexible Class E/Public House (sui generis), with details relating to layout submitted in detail and appearance reserved for future consideration'.	
--	--	--	--	--

Although the Parish Council note that the proposed site is included in Policy 6 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan, strongly object to this application as submitted.

**Parking**

The parking provision is wholly inadequate for the proposed increase in buildings in this location, it is currently insufficient now, without control on long stay parking, and without any increase in service provision. There is no provision for bicycles, disabled parking, details of bin storage and associated refuse vehicle collection arrangements. The proposed uses of buildings for sporting activities and a public house will all call on extra parking provision over and above the suggested provision as per the EHDC specifications.

**Design**

The proposed design of the additional buildings is urban in nature and not sympathetic to the existing vicinity and will be viewed in its entirety from the Watercress Line heritage railway above and is over development of the site. New buildings should be in keeping with the existing development, a two storey design but where the flats above are in the roof space with dormer windows, which is more in keeping with the surrounding properties on Lymington Bottom Road.

**Drainage**

There are serious issues already with flooding in this location, and this would need to be addressed prior to any additional development

**Access**

The proposed removal of one of the current two access points will only load the remaining access to the Austen Fields development and doctors' surgery, and if this application is approved in conjunction with application 58788, there would be serious safety issues, and the Council would request a road safety audit prior to any decision being made on this or indeed application number 58788.

Further a full swept path analysis will be required for large delivery vehicles including waste disposal and emergency services. Currently delivery vehicles enter the site entrance nearest the railway bridge and exit by the doctors' surgery, thus avoiding the need to try and turn round on the site, which with the proposed arrangement will be very difficult. The extra uses of this site will cause additional traffic, but currently it is difficult to determine unless existing parking can be compared with the finally corrected level of parking. Please refer to planning application 58788 for comments with reference to the transport assessment.

**Need for Class E development**

Is there is a genuine business need for these additional buildings? The only evidence submitted was an estate agent's statement that 20 businesses were interested in 100 square metres of space each. Would they all require the same size and is this still current and valid?

**Interlinked applications**

Why is this application contingent upon the approval of 58788? Although submitted separately, this speculative application should have been submitted in conjunction with 58788 and 39009/008.

Taking the above into consideration, the Parish Council respectfully asks the Planning Officer to refuse this application.

22.27 PC DECISIONS NOTIFIED AND PENDING

DECISIONS NOTIFIED				
Date received	Ref. No:	Location	Proposal	Decision
20/12/21	<a href="#">35811/003</a>	28 Kingswood Rise, Four Marks, GU34 5BD	T1 - Oak sp. Southern canopy to reduce back the laterals over the garden, back to pre-cuts, (1.5m with cuts no greater than 35mm stem diameter), crown lift the lower canopy skirt by 7m up to the fork break, (with cuts no greater than 25mm stem diameter). Works in accordance with BS3998(2010), nearest best practice pruning. Reason: To allow light into the garden, and keep tree management. Cyclical management requested	Consent 31/1/2022  Amendment: <i>Crown lift the lower canopy skirt to 6m up to the fork break, (with cuts no greater than 25mm stem diameter)</i>
808/12/21	<a href="#">59579</a>	38 Chaffinch Road, Four Marks, GU34 5FG	Single storey rear extension to form new dining room. Conversion of existing garage wall to habitable. Removal of existing doors and windows	Permission 28/1/2022
1/2/22	56066	155 Winchester Road, Four Marks, GU34 5HY	Prior notification for single storey development extending 7 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.2 metres and a maximum height of 3.1 metres	Withdrawn 10/2/2022  NB. Not seen, withdrawn before meeting
1/2/22	21049/004	Old Down Cottage, Swelling Hill, Ropley, SO24 0DA	Lawful Development certificate for a proposed use – conversion of existing outbuilding into joinery workshop	Withdrawn 09/02/2022
23/12/21	26233/022	Little Kitfield, Kitfield Road, Four Marks, GU34 5AS	Application to determine if prior approval is required for a change of use from Commercial, Business and Service (Use Class E) to 4 Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3).	<b>Prior Approval is required and is refused</b> 15 <sup>th</sup> February 2022
23/12/21	SDNP/21/05959/LDE	Ashdell Farm, Headmoor Lane, Four Marks GU34 3ES	Lawful Development Certificate for an Existing use - Use of land as residential garden	Approved 10 <sup>th</sup> February 2022

<b>APPEALS</b>				
<b>Date received</b>	<b>Ref. No:</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Status</b>
07/09/2021	58714	Land North of Kia Ora, Lymington Bottom, Four Marks	Detached House and Integral Garage with car parking and new access	Written representations Deadline for comment 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2022

<b>DECISIONS PENDING</b>				
<b>Date received</b>	<b>Ref. No:</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Status</b>
09/03/21	59143	Land to the rear of 2-4 Willowfield, Watercress Way, <b>Medstead</b>	Construction of 4 dwellings with parking and landscaping <b>Pre-Decision Amendment</b> Amended Plans Construction of 4 dwellings with parking and landscaping	<b>Pre-Decision Amendment</b> <b>06/08/2021</b>
23/07/2021	<a href="#">33606/003</a>	Kingswood, 4 Blackberry Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5BN	Two-storey extension to side, single-storey front extension and a single storey rear and north side extension, following demolition of existing garage and side extension	<i>Registered</i> <i>Awaiting re-submission of plans</i>
04/08/2021	<a href="#">55712/001</a>	The Barn, Alton Lane, Four Marks	Conversion of building to dwelling with associated parking and landscaping (renewal of 55712)	Awaiting decision
17/08/21	<a href="#">25843/008</a>	33a Telegraph Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5AX	Detached dwelling and detached garage	Awaiting Decision Supplementary information provided, new objection comment submitted 2/11/2021
25/10/2021	<a href="#">25256/048</a>	Land to rear of Brackenbury Gardens and Boyneswood Close, MEDSTEAD	Proposed construction of 45 dwellings on land east of Boyneswood Road, Medstead	Registered
15/11/2021	33456/004	Dovecot, Hawthorn Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5AU	Proposed 24 settled gypsy accommodation site	Registered
12 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	<a href="#">26882/003</a>	Lymington Cottage, 28 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks, GU34 5AH	The conversion and extension of Lymington Cottage and its garage building to provide 7 apartments, together with the construction of refuse and cycle store and the	Registered

			provision of amenity space and car parking	
12 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	<a href="#">54835/003</a>	Lyndhurst, 7 Thorn Lane, Four Marks, GU34 5BT	Single storey front extension to form new garage. Conversion of existing garage to a bedroom and ensuite	Registered
13 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	<a href="#">21319/021</a>	Waterloo Cottage, 7 Lymington Bottom Road, Four Marks GU34 5DL	Construction of gazebo in garden to be used as a carport protection for a vintage camper van	Registered
26 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	<a href="#">50977/002</a>	19 Kingswood Rise, Four Marks GU34 5BE	T1 Maple – reduce crown width by 1m leaving a crown width of approx. 2/3m. Crown lift to 3m. T2 Laurel – Reduce crown height to 2m, leaving a crown height of 3m	23 <sup>rd</sup> February 2022
28 <sup>th</sup> January 2022	<a href="#">33522/003</a>	2 Gloucester Close, Four Marks, GU34 5HX	Outline application all matters reserved - the construction of 2 new 3-bedroomed houses	25 <sup>th</sup> February 2022
31 <sup>st</sup> January 2022	<a href="#">26655/023</a>	149 Winchester Road, Four Marks, GU34 5HY	T1-Oak-Reduce lateral limbs on S,W & N sides by 2m, leaving a length of 4/5m.	28 <sup>th</sup> February 2022

## 22.28 PC ADDITIONAL PLANNING MATTERS AND LATE ITEMS

### 22.28.1 To receive any late planning items or decisions notified

There were no late applications for discussion or further decisions notified. However the EO advised of an application that had been received for works to a tree awarded protection, of which the deadline for comments passes before the next planning meeting. It was agreed that the application circulated for any comments and the EO would respond using her delegated authority and ratified at the next meeting. In addition the EO advised that former application number 23617/008 was now subject to a compliance complaint.

### 22.28.2 To discuss additional representation for the Appeal, Land North of Kia Ora, Lymington Bottom

It was agreed to send additional representation requesting the Inspector visits the site during peak times and reiterate the health and strength of the trees following Storm Eunice.

## 22.29 PC EHDC LOCAL PLAN 2017-2028

### 22.29.1 To discuss the consultation response on the large sites workshop

A planning committee working party had prepared the response to the large sites workshop surveys and were ready for circulation for any additional comments to Full Council and further discussion and alignment with Medstead Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. However, following a brief closure of the meeting to allow the Chairman of the Medstead Parish Council Planning Committee, in attendance, to speak, the Committee were informed that Medstead Parish Council had already submitted their surveys, due to a miscommunication. Cllr Sanders asked if a copy could be circulated to ensure that that the two responses were in acquiescence with each other prior to submission.

### 22.29.2 To receive an update on the Draft Local Plan briefing held on 9th February 2022



The EO confirmed that the presentation from the briefing had now been circulated to all Councillors and there were no comments or need for further discussion at this stage.

**22.30 PC NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING**

The next meeting is currently confirmed as Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> April 2022, 7.30pm at either the Village Hall or the Benians Pavilion, to be advised.

**22.31 PC** The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.45pm.