

MINUTES
of the EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of
FROYLE PARISH COUNCIL
held in the Village Hall, Lower Froyle,
on Monday **18th 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> 11 members of the public Mr. D. Jobbins, NJG
--	---

ITEM 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

ITEM 2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

067 12-13 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on 11th February 2013 be accepted as a true record.

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS (pntc)

4th February 2013

ITEM 7 MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

7.1 Bollards by Manderley in Upper Froyle.

391 Hants Highways: "requires action". 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.

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.

Items 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 were discussed as a whole.

A member of the public commented that the proposals should be rejected because they affect the character of a conservation area. Mr. Jobbins responded that NJG had tried to design in sympathy with the conservation area, including a lower housing density that there might otherwise have been.

Mr. Jobbins added that during construction work, access to the site would only be via the entrance on Hen & Chicken Hill.

A member of the public believed that the developers had taken great care to take the views of the village into account.

The Chairman said that comments by the public on these applications should now be addressed to EHDC.

Mr. Deans reviewed the Draft Response, various points were discussed and agreed:

Introduction

1. Concern in Upper and Lower Froyle about the development that will double the size of the village, the most significant change that the village has, and is likely ever to see.
2. Work of the Community Planning Group (CPG), the Development Guidelines and the Parish Plan.
3. Acknowledge the efforts that EHDC have put into the process
4. Recognise that NJG have expended considerable effort in communicating with the Village and have responded positively to some concerns/suggestions that the community have made.
5. However, this is a considerable change to the village, and although some of the aspects of the Submission are welcomed, there remain some serious concerns.

Above agreed.

Councillors suggested that EHDC should address transport infrastructure.

Effect on the Community

The social implications for the existing Village community, remains the primary concern of most Froyle residents. Some of these concerns may be design issues, some addressed under related S106 requirements, and others fall under the remit of EHDC in their regional planning role. Find policy guidance where possible, use Development Guidelines, Parish Plan data and Conservation Area document as reference.

1. Size of the development. Additional 60 dwellings will irrevocably change the nature of the Village. However, it is considerably below guidelines for new development. Noted.

2. Shop – welcomed, but there was concern as to access and parking. It was noted that there is an Parish Plan action for a feasibility study on the shop. Mr. Lloyd said the room for the proposed shop is small and thus would not be a major competitor to Bentley Stores because it could not accommodate a comparable range of stock. It would be more of a kiosk, perhaps selling local produce. Its viability would depend on the accommodation being rent-free and its staff being volunteers. Mr. Lloyd said that residents had expressed a wish for a shop on the site when the shop at the Hen & Chicken was closed. The proposed room for the shop was also too small to be turned into an additional dwelling, Mr. Lloyd said. It was agreed that the space should be earmarked for community use and retained as such even if the shop fails.

It was agreed that item 1.3 regarding the Village Hall and possible use of Treloar site facilities should be deleted from the Draft Response.

It was agreed that the question of capacity at Bentley School was a Standard S106 issue. It was agreed to include statement in FPC's response to the effect that it had been identified as an issue.

On traffic, Mr. Wells suggested that there may be less than at previous times on Hen & Chicken Hill and at its junction with the A31. It was agreed that Hampshire Highways should be asked again whether it was possible to improve the junction. It was agreed to delete mention of Gid Lane usage from the response.

It was agreed to delete mention of pressure on surrounding footpaths from the response as it was not likely to be significant.

Mr. Jobbins said that the housing survey NJG had commissioned suggested that 4 affordable housing units were wanted at present, but that did not take into account the planned redevelopment of some of the housing in Westburn Fields. The **Clerk** was asked to forward this survey to councillors.

On parking availability at Bentley Station, it was noted that while this was not a matter for this application, it had been raised as a serious concern by residents and undoubtedly will come under further pressure from the development. It was agreed to research EHDC's policy on this issue.

Mr. Deans said that the proposed wildlife area was welcomed.

Design

This section relates to the onsite issues and the integration of the development into the Conservation area and wider countryside setting. All to be back referenced to policy guidance, DG, PP and CA as above:

Effect on the countryside – particularly the South and east views. The 3D before and after views had been very helpful in assessing this. Refer to Development guidelines (item 7.11). FPC felt that the proposals do impact on the countryside setting and that properties should be lower, irregular gaps created, and views of Burnham Clock tower (an existing local landmark) retained from the east and from Hen & Chicken Hill.

Effect on the Conservation Area – whether the proposals ‘preserve or enhance’ the character of the conservation area. PC gave particular consideration to the requirement for any development to preserve and enhance the quality of the conservation area. Upper Froyle was characterized by a dispersed linear settlement pattern, but the nature of this site is very different. Therefore, it was difficult to assess if the proposals comply. The large modern houses are very different in terms of massing to typically small cottages of Upper Froyle, typically one room deep. It would be possible to break up long ridges. It was considered that the denser areas had better character, but plots 8-13 will appear very suburban. This would be improved with more irregular gaps (with views through) more akin to plots 1-7.

There was discussion on whether the ‘green’ should be larger, but decided that this was not necessary, as there is public open space elsewhere. A suggestion that the wall should be continued across this gap was not well received by the conservation officer because it would make the area look like a gated community, he said. It was agreed that the green was acceptable, but to ask for more computer-generated images of it from other viewpoints.

On the setting of listed buildings etc, it was agreed to object to the position of houses on plots 40 and 41, near to the Manor House, and their closeness to the clunch wall would conceal it. Mr. Deans also said that the houses at would be too dark because they would face north and be shaded by trees and the wall. He also noted that the houses on plots 8 to 13 adversely affected setting of Froyle Place, being closer and visually more intrusive than the existing long low lines of Haywood. Mr. Whines felt that car parking at the front of Froyle Place would spoil its setting and that of the church, while he accepted that parking was necessary to make the use of Froyle Place viable. It was agreed that parking at Froyle Place was a concern, and it was suggested that more space be made at the rear, or plot 13 could be used for parking and for access by service vehicles instead of for housing, and that the houses on plots 11 to 13 were in any case too close to Froyle Place. There was concern over plot 35 and its relation to the wall, in a very prominent position in the village. Currently it is too tall and dominates the wall which is one of the defining characteristics of the site and this part of the village. It was suggested that it be removed or remodelled to pull the mass of the building well away from the wall.

On the conservation area, it was noted that some residents believed the development was inappropriate, and in a conservation area it is supposed to be sympathetic and compatible. While most of Froyle is linear, this site would not. It was agreed that the inner areas of higher housing density were more compatible locally, but the houses on the periphery looked too suburban. It was agreed that a flat above a garage was not advisable, and that the new buildings in the inner area should be in proportion to Froyle Place Cottages.

Parking: it was considered that some areas were compromised, and some houses poorly served, but curtilage parking looked adequate. There was concern about the layout of parking for plots 14-26.

Councillors were disappointed that no 3D views had been produced to show massing and spaces. They felt that there are some unsuccessful areas, such as the parking court to rear plots 14-26. This is compromised by the extent of parking and access requirements to Froyle Place.

Plots 14-33: Councillors felt that this area was successful in character terms, but compromised by the associated car parking.

Plots 34-37: PC welcomed the farmyard character area approach, which should be consistent in style.

On lighting, it was agreed that no street lighting was wanted or needed and that bollard lights should be kept to a minimum and should illuminate the paths/roads with downlighting and concealed lamps.

Concern was expressed about parking capacity in the higher housing density area.

It was noted that a method statement is to be used for the demolitions, including access from Hen & Chicken Hill, and there should be no access via Sowcroft Lane and other village lanes. It was agreed that there should be a condition survey of Hen & Chicken Hill before work starts.

Limitations on later changes, eg to boundary treatments, house extensions, parking, PV panels, were suggested. Conditions on the hotel operation, eg re noise and hours of operation, were suggested. It was noted that change of ownership of the site could affect the permissive footpaths, but this would not form part of the response.

It was agreed to delete mention of any requirement to use local tradesmen.

It was **agreed** that Froyle parish council would support the applications, with conditions. *The final form of the response would be resolved at a later parish council meeting.*

Mr. Deans and **Mr. Whines** agreed to finalise the draft response and circulate it to councillors.

Sue and Barry Clark were thanked for their work on biodiversity.

Thanks to the Nicholas James Group for the way that had dealt with local response to their applications were expressed. Mr. Deans and Mr. Whines were thanked for their work in formulating a response to the applications, and to Mr. Whines too for his work on the West End Farm wood-shredding application.

4.1.4 390 50594/001 North Barn House, Froyle Road, Lower Froyle, INSTALLATION OF GLAZED DOOR AND NEW TIMBER CASEMENT WINDOWS, GLAZED LANTERN AND NEW STAIRCASE.

068 12-13 It was **RESOLVED** to make no comment on this application.

ITEM 5 CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

A list of the correspondence received since the agenda for the meeting of 11th February 2013 had been prepared had been enclosed with the agenda. Noted.

ITEM 6 REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

6.1 Mr. Whines reported from the EHDC planning committee meeting that the **West End Farm** wood-shredding application had been unanimously refused. **Mr. Whines** agreed to write to SITA to ask them not to appeal.

Also discussed at the meeting was parking for a new school, which showed that parking was the most important issue.

6.2 Mr. Cray reported that County Councillor Mark Kemp-Gee had secured **funding** for the playground, village hall and map.

6.3 Mr. Whines reported that work was still being carried out on the **village hall**.

ITEM 7 MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

None

ITEM 8 MATTERS RAISED BY RESIDENTS

None.

ITEM 9 MATTERS FOR REPORTING IN VILLAGE MAGAZINE

As follows:

Annual Parish Meeting will be on Monday April 15th at 20:00 in the Village Hall. Please attend if you can.

Grit bins If there is another "winter event" this year, residents are encouraged to use the content of the grit bins in the village to grit roads and pavements outside their homes. The grit is not however to be used on your own premises.

Plus additional reports on the West End Farm decision, Treloar site applications, and completion of playground equipment snagging.

Thanks to the parish council Planning Committee for their work on the Treloar application were expressed.

ITEM 10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 27th February 6.30 pm.

The meeting closed at 9.05 pm.

Date.....

Chairman.....