

**Minutes of the Meeting of Beech Parish Council
held in the Village Hall on Monday 19th January 2018**

PRESENT: Councillor David Woodroffe (Chairman)
Councillor Anthony Duthoit
Councillor Colin Childes
Mrs Louisa Thomson – Clerk to the Council Tony Ransley –
Neighbourhood Plan Working Party

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME – NONE AGENDA ITEMS

Councillor David Woodroffe read a report from Councillor Ruth Duffin as follows:

Community Forum meeting held at the Maltings February 6th 2018

The closing date for applications to District councillors for Councillor Community grant is 9th March 2018 many Councillors have already committed their grant money.

On the 21st March 2018 there will be an Alton Town Council Electors meeting where people can find out more about the proposed new Community Facility on the Moors Coors Brewery site.

The closing date is the 5th March 2018 for the consultation into Alton boundaries.

Run, Hide, Tell: Community Resilience on the event of a Terror Attack or Other Emergencies

A copy of the presentation.

Community Resilience

A copy of the presentation is attached.

Funding for Alton Community Centre has now ceased.

18.17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE – Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors Kevin Lamb, Ian Hardy, David Fazakerley and Ruth Duffin.

18.18 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES – **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED**
The Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22nd January 2018, copies of which had previously been circulated, **Proposed as a true record by Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and signed by Chairman David Woodroffe.**

18.19 DECLARATION OF INTEREST – There were no declarations of interest.

18.20 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

a) PROPOSED POLICIES

Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED: Council agree to the changes (as detailed below) to the working document made so far by the Working Party after consultation with East Hampshire District Council. The document will be subject to further change and development.

Beech Neighbourhood plan policies for comment by EHDC planning policy team associated with the Beech Neighbourhood plan.

Proposed amendments indicated by strikethrough and italics.

POLICY HEADING	COUNCIL DECISION
1 Development outside the Settlement Boundary	Proposed David Fazakerley, Seconded Anthony Duthoit resolved by majority. (Kevin Lamb abstained.)

Land outside the Beech Settlement Boundary will be considered as countryside and the only development that will be allowed will be development that has a need to be located in a countryside location, either in terms of agricultural need or needs for other rural enterprises, or through the residential conversion of redundant or disused rural buildings, essential utility infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere and where the proposal complies with other specific policies within the development plan.
Proposed David Fazakerley, Seconded Colin Childes and RESOLVED BY MAJORITY (Councillors Duffin and Lamb abstained) that the policy is forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment.

1a Development outside the Settlement Boundary The Abbey, Thedden Grange and Wyards Farm	Proposed David Fazakerley, Seconded Anthony Duthoit resolved by majority. (Kevin Lamb abstained.)
---	---

The Neighbourhood Plan recognises and values the unique residential community at Thedden Grange, Alton Abbey and Wyards Farm and recognises that their housing needs are changing. Planning permission will be granted for new residential development within the *area of land immediately adjoining the buildings as curtilage of the buildings, within the area* shown shaded on the PLANS (Appendix A1, A2, A3), specifically to meet the additional housing needs of the respective *existing* communities of *those properties*. Any planning application will be expected to specifically justify evidence of housing need within the *existing* communities of *those properties*, which cannot be met within existing buildings and occupation of the new buildings and the existing buildings will be expected to be restricted by planning obligation to occupation by existing occupants of the community and their dependents. Any new buildings must be carefully designed and sited so as to protect and enhance and not detract from the special qualities of the existing buildings on the site and shall seek to retain the parkland setting of the estate (shown edged on the PLAN B), including using existing access driveways and incorporating appropriate landscaping.

Councillor Duffin left the meeting.)
Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and RESOLVED BY MAJORITY (Councillor Lamb abstained) that the working party look at the policy again and in particular the use of the word 'curtilage'.
 (Councillor Duffin re-joined the meeting.) *Proposed amendments indicated by strikethrough and italics.*

This policy to be referred back to the working party for further development.

EHDC Comments: with JGS responses **Landscape Assessment relevant**

Re 1

- 1) Compliance with CP14? There is dispensation for the development of affordable housing outside development boundaries, per the JCS – if you change the final wording to refer to the development plan rather than This plan that would cover it
- 2) Does this policy constitute reiteration of JCS policies CP19/CP6? Yes it does, but that would not fail a basic conditions test
- 3) Acknowledgement of policies in JCS? Proposals should also conform with relevant JCS policies as well as 'this plan'. See response to 1)
- 4) Clarity re final clause? Does this apply to essential utility infrastructure or to all development outside the Beech settlement boundary? (Probably the latter?) See 1)

Re 1a

Issues:

- 1) What level of residential development would be appropriate?
- 2) Is there evidence of housing need to justify this policy?
- 3) Is it necessary to prove that development cannot be met within existing buildings? CP10 does not require this.
- 4) What is the evidence regarding the special qualities? The policy needs to be clear so that applicants and decision makers know what needs to be conserved/enhanced (not listed buildings or in conservation areas).

I agree with these comments– this is the problem that stems from writing the policies without building the evidence. You need to do a lot more work in justifying the policy, how much development, you need to explain why these communities deserve special treatment to allow development in the countryside that would not ordinarily be allowed. I have not seen that evidence to date. What is the level of development envisaged and why does it need to be new build rather than converting existing buildings. I would recommend preparing a separate background paper that articulates the case, provides evidence of need etc and show what the level of development envisaged is and how it could be accommodated without harming the countryside, the buildings and their setting – why are they special You can say they are – but you need to say why

2 Preventing Coalescence with Alton and Medstead.

Proposed Colin Childes, Seconded Kevin Lamb resolved unanimously.

Development will not generally be permitted outside the Built-Up Area Boundary if, individually or cumulatively, it would result in an increase in coalescence between Beech and Alton or Beech and Medstead or reducing the separate identity of each of these settlements by reducing the openness and visual break between Beech and Alton or Beech and Medstead ~~or by increasing the intensification of development within existing curtilages between Beech and Medstead~~. *This restriction also to apply to any significant proposed building extensions within the area of land immediately adjoining the existing buildings between Beech and Medstead that results reducing the openness and visual break between Beech and Alton or Beech and Medstead.*

Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and RESOLVED BY MAJORITY (Councillors Lamb and Duffin abstained) that the working party look at the policy again and in particular the use of the word 'curtilage'.

Proposed amendments indicated by strikethrough and italics

This policy to be referred back to the working party for further development.

EHDC Comments Landscape Appraisal relevant

- 1) What evidence is there that these areas are under threat of coalescence?- you need to explain threats to the gap – sporadic development, narrowness of the gap and the residents desire to keep the separateness of Beech
- 2) What would be the impact of intensification of development within existing curtilages? Is this likely to increase the perception of coalescence in these areas? (Evidence required). You need to say what you consider to be significant proposed extensions- are there examples where they have reduced the openness of the gaps
- 4) What is the degree of existing openness and visual break between "Beech" and Medstead? (The maps suggest between King's Hill and Medstead) – again you need to be building the justification for the policy
- 5) What evidence can be provided to support the suggested boundaries? You need to set out what criteria you have used for defining the settlement boundaries

<p>3 Recreation Space – Local Green Spaces resolved unanimously.</p>	<p>Proposed Anthony Duthoit, seconded Colin Childes</p>
---	---

The following sites are designated as Local Green Space where there will be a presumption against any built development, except in exceptional circumstance

- Village Hall grounds and adjoining children’s play area
- Recreation Ground

Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and RESOLVED BY MAJORITY (Councillor Duffin abstained) that the policy is forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment.

EHDC COMMENTS

- 1)What are the suggested boundaries of these areas? (Map needed) Agreed
- 2)Do they take account of any need/desire for new community facilities/expanded car parking at the village hall? – do not include land within LGS that you may wish to build upon
- 3) What would constitute an exceptional circumstance in the Beech context? (para. 89, NPPF?)
Disagree – you do not need to say what very special circumstances are , you will not know them until they come along!
- 4) Is there any desire to make improvements that would involve development at the recreation ground? I do not think improving play equipment would be ruled out by LGS designation.

<p>4 Development within the SPB</p>	<p>Proposed Ian Hardy, Seconded Colin Childes resolved by majority. (Kevin Lamb abstained.)</p>
<p>Within the Beech Policy Settlement Boundary new residential development including infill* development and redevelopment and new business development will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies in this plan.</p> <p><i>Proposed Ian Hardy, Seconded David Fazakerley and RESOLVED BY MAJORITY (Councillor Lamb abstained) that the working party look at the policy again and in particular define ‘infill’. * Document will be attached to define ‘infill’.</i></p>	
<p>5. Design and Building Character</p>	<p>Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded David Fazakerley resolved by majority. (Kevin Lamb abstained.)</p>

All new buildings, including alterations, will be supported if they demonstrate good quality of design and provided that their scale, density; massing, height, design, layout and materials reflect the [predominant form of development in the immediate vicinity](#) of that particular area as set out in *the Landscape Character Assessment*.

~~The rear wall of any new dwelling should not extend behind the rear elevation of neighbouring properties. For clarity,~~ No new dwelling should be constructed at location above that of the existing building line on the hillside

The roof skyline may not be raised as a result of the height of new buildings/constructions; in general new buildings/constructions should be no higher than a two-storey home to the roof top. The construction should ensure that the new development does not change “the architectural character”; nor raise the built up hill side view of the area.

Sustainable on site drainage for all rainwater should be designed into each newly constructed dwelling.

New plot boundaries will be required to be enclosed and should be landscaped, preferably with hedges. As many as possible existing trees, hedges and landscape features that contribute to the amenity and character of the area should be retained.

Any new external lighting should be designed to minimise light pollution and not to adversely impact on adjacent properties or road safety.

The design of new buildings should ensure the living conditions of adjoining residents (including privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook) are not significantly adversely affected.

Vehicle access to new developments should be designed to be sympathetic to the rural character of the roads in Beech i.e be constructed so as to [pay due regard to the safety of pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists](#); design should ensure that vehicle can leave the plot in forward gear, [to prevent the need for cars to reverse out of drives](#); design should ensure visibility on exit, and take into account stopping distance appropriate for the road; design should allow adequate safe space for gates to be closed whilst the exiting vehicle is parked off road.

Development proposals that generate an increased need for parking must provide adequate and suitable off-street parking in order to minimise obstruction of the local road network in the interests of the safety of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists. All new homes should include a minimum of 1 parking space for each of the first 3 bedrooms within the site. If garages are built, they should preferably allow a minimum size of 3.5m x 6m for each car to be accommodated.

Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and RESOLVED BY MAJORITY (Councillor Duffin and Lamb abstained) that the working party look at the policy again and insert something after Character at the end of the first paragraph and remove the first sentence of the second paragraph and the policy is amended to EHDC Policy when available and forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment.

EHDC Comments:

Re 4

- 1) Acknowledgement of policies in JCS? Proposals should also conform to relevant JCS policies as well as 'this plan'. Suggest refer to policies in the development plan which will be JCS and BNP
- 2) Is this just duplication of CP10? (Is the policy necessary?) – yes but that does not rule a policy out

Re 5 Landscape Appraisal relevant

- 1) Duplication of CP29 in the JCS? NP are encouraged to have strong design policies based on an understanding of their area
- 2) What is the meaning of 'Character' in first paragraph? (Is it an incomplete sentence?) Suggest remove "architectural Character of that particular area" and replace with "the predominant form of development in the immediate vicinity"
- 2) What is the specific meaning of 'design' in list of particulars? I would say that design relates to architectural treatment of the building – no need to change
- 3) Clarity and justification for second paragraph? (Could be thought of as inflexible and unduly prescriptive?) This is a locally distinct policy – are there examples of development that you would not wish to see repeated. What pressure is there for development to advance up the hill – is it views?
- 4) Justification for maximum height? To ensure the development is of an appropriate scale for the area
- 4) Duplication of CP27? (Light pollution, amenity) That is not a problem re basic conditions
- 5) Meaning of 'sympathetic to the rural character'? You need to expand in the supporting texts with good and bad examples of what you want to avoid.
- 6) How can a means of access "support" other road users? Agree clumsy wording – "pay due regard to the safety of pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists" may be better
- 7) What is the justification for the 'forward gear' and stopping distance requirements? (Could be thought of as unduly specific). This is a usual requirement to prevent the need for cars to reverse out of drives
- 8) Parking standards: are these necessary and justified in planning terms? (Consistency with CP29 and CP31; see also draft Parking SPD) – you do need to back this with evidence. car ownership levels in Beech?

6. Affordable Housing Mix	Proposed David Fazakerley, Seconded Anthony Duthoit resolved by majority. (Kevin Lamb abstained.)
<p>Any new housing development within the plan area should provide for the identified housing need in Beech. The plan will support development of 2-3 bedroom homes, suitable for starter homes or for local residents wishing to downsize.</p> <p><i>Proposed David Fazakerley, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the policy is forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment.</i></p>	

EHDC Comments There is a confusion as to whether this policy covers affordable housing or all types of housing. I suggest it is the latter

- 1) Is this consistent with CP10?- I don't think the policy breaches CP10
- 2) Is the policy future proof? (What does "the identified needs" mean here?) I would take out "identified" as you have not done a housing needs assessment
- 3) Consistency with CP13? (Would all needs be met?) – CP13 is unlikely to kick in as the national threshold is 11 units before affordable housing is required.
- 4) Consistency with national policy on affordable housing? (The definition does not currently include low cost housing options). Change heading to Housing mix. Again there is a shortage of evidence.

7. Industrial Estate and Village Businesses	Proposed Ian Hardy, Seconded Colin Childes resolved unanimously.
<p>Proposals that would result in the creation of new businesses or would support the expansion of existing businesses within the Settlement Boundary and the site of the Departure Lounge as shown on the Map will be permitted, provided that they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Do not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity; and b. Do not have an unacceptable impact on the highway and provide an appropriate level of parking provision for those working at or visiting the premises <p><i>Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and RESOLVED BY MAJORITY (Councillor Duffin abstained) that the policy is forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment.</i></p> <p><i>The working party is continuing to work on this policy.</i></p>	

EHDC Comment

- 1) Consistency with national policy to support all rural businesses? Don't think it reached national policy – what is a rural business?
- 2) Internal consistency with proposed policy 1? - Policy 1 deals with meeting the needs of rural enterprises

8. Managing the Impact of new development on traffic	Proposed David Fazakerley, Seconded Colin Childes resolved unanimously.
<p>Proposals for new development must ensure that vehicle access to new developments should be designed to be sympathetic to the rural character of the roads in Beech and be constructed so to support pedestrians and cyclist using the roads. Design should ensure that vehicle can leave the plot in forward gear and visibility on exit takes into account stopping distance appropriate for the road.</p> <p><i>Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the policy is forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment.</i></p>	

EHDC Comment This duplicates Policy 5 – suggest delete LA relevant

- 1) What does 'sympathetic to the rural character' mean?
- 2) How can a means of access "support" other road users?
- 3) What is the justification for the 'forward gear'/stopping distances requirements? (Could be thought unduly specific).

9. Planning for Parking	Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Ian Hardy resolved unanimously.
<p>Development proposals that generate an increased need for parking should provide adequate and suitable off-street parking in order to minimise obstruction of the local road network in the interests of the safety of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists and in order to preserve the rural nature of Beech’s roads.</p> <p>Proposals that would introduce a level of on-street parking provision will not be allowed.</p> <p><i>Proposed Kevin Lamb, Seconded Ian Hardy and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the policy is forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment</i></p>	

EHDC Comment

- 1) Can you justify 'must', given JCS policies and the Council's emerging SPD? Suggest “should”

10. High Speed Broadband and Mobile Communications	Proposed Kevin Lamb, Seconded David Fazakerley resolved unanimously.
---	--

Proposals which seek to provide access to a super-fast broadband network or improve mobile phone reception within the plan area will be supported, *providing it is within the terms of the development plan.*

Developers of new houses should provide the ducting and infrastructure to allow the provision of superfast broadband and underground electric cabling when it is delivered to the area.

Proposed Colin Childes, Seconded David Fazakerley and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the policy is amended to include 'providing it is within the planning policy' and is then forwarded to East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) for comment.

EHDC Comment

1) This policy appears vague and capable of supporting inappropriate development. Perhaps you should add: subject to meeting all relevant requirements of other policies of the development plan? Or make it specific to 'proposals for telecommunications infrastructure'?
 Agreed – you may add that developers of new houses should provide the ducting and infrastructure to allow the provision of superfast broadband when it is delivered to the area
 Change planning policy to terms of the development plan.

11. Infrastructure	Proposed Kevin Lamb, Seconded Anthony Duthoit resolved unanimously.
---------------------------	---

In the absence of public stormwater systems, proposals for new development will be expected to demonstrate that the infrastructure for storm water disposal, has been provided for within the development.

Where development allows ~~opportunities~~ for improvement to or creating new rights of way, i.e. footpaths, bridleways or cycle paths the opportunities should be taken. **Such improvements, wherever possible, should form part of the conditions to be met for planning to be granted.**

Proposed David Fazakerley, Seconded Ian Hardy and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the working party look at the policy again and reword to include traffic calming, pedestrian safe area, pavement and storm water

Concerns

- 1) Why require the provision of new infrastructure within the development site, as a default? The location of new infrastructure should arguably depend on technical requirements for the best solution. I agree remove the first paragraph
- 2) Further, many infrastructure requirements are delivered off-site as a matter of course.
- 3) This policy could be inconsistent with policy CP32 of the JCS.

- b) SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY
Proposed Colin Childes, Seconded Anthony Duthoit and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that to look a Beech settlement boundaries and report recommendations.
- c) EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
Meeting with Neighbourhood Plan group and Parish Council – Councillor Colin Childes to attend.

- 18.21 GRANT APPLICATION
Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED to approve the £200 grant application from Citizens Advice East Hampshire.
- 18.22 ANNUAL PARISH MEETING
Proposed Colin Childes, Seconded Anthony Duthoit and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that tea and coffee are provided on arrival.
- 18.23 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ETHICAL STANDARDS CONSULTATION
This item to be carried forward to the March Parish Council meeting.
- 18.24 HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the expenditure of £75 is approved for one Councillor to attend, Clerk to check Councillor availability.
- 18.25 EHAP&TC MARCH MEETING - Clerk to circulate details to Councillors.
- 18.26 PARISH LENGTHSMAN SCHEME – 2018/19 - Clerk to enquire if any local parishes are interested in joining.
- 18.27 ALTON SPORTS CENTRE
Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the following response is sent:
- Beech Parish Council feel that with increased local population it is important to so support the campaign that the current Sports Centre facilities available in Alton are maintained or enhanced.*
- 18.28 LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION - Electoral review of East Hampshire – no comment.
- 18.29 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
Council considered one application: **Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** their comments be forwarded to East Hampshire District Council as follows:
- | | | |
|-----------|--|-------------------|
| 27887/006 | Keepers Lodge, Basingstoke Road | NO COMMENT |
| | Retrospective permission for a timber framed barn for storage use including storage of farm vehicles, materials and use as a maintenance workshop. | |
- 18.30 ANNUAL ACCOUNTS 2017-18 - **Proposed Anthony Duthoit, Seconded Colin Childes and UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED the following payments are approved:**
- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| a) | Salary, Allowance and Administration Expenditure (February 18) | £743.05 |
| b) | Hampshire County Council Pension Contribution (February 18) | £138.73 |
| c) | HM Revenue & Customs – PAYE (January – March 18) | Not Due |
| d) | DCK Accounting Solutions Ltd – Payroll processing | £30.00 |
| e) | Beech Village Hall – Neighbourhood Plan & Parish Council meetings | £32.76 |
- 18.31 MEETING DATES – Confirmed the date of the next scheduled Council meeting as Monday, 19th March 2018 following the Annual Parish Meeting at 7pm time will be made available for public question time.

CLOSURE OF MEETING - Chairman thanked all present for their attendance and closed the meeting at 8.45pm.

signed:
Chairman Beech Parish Council
date: 19th March 2018