



Medstead Parish Council

Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting 14th May 2025, 6.30pm

Present: Cllrs. Phil Quinlan, Frank Maloney, Mark Brayford, Gordon Mitchell

Also in attendance: Julie Russell (Parish Clerk). 3 members of the public

	ACTION
25.01 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN Councillors resolved to elect Cllr Maloney as Committee Chairman. However, he indicated he will likely only fill the role for the next two meetings as he has recently taken on other personal commitments, and so the situation will be regularly reviewed.	
25.02 OPEN SESSION A resident raised objections over 27000/005 61 Lymington Bottom Road. She also raised concerns over the approval of the Beechlands development, how EHDC use the 'tilted balance' and how they consider cumulative harms, and she asked the Council to help in providing EHDC with information on these two issues. In response Cllr Maloney discussed the council's response to other recent applications and current applications.	
25.03 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE None	
25.04 DECLARATION OF INTEREST None	
25.05 MINUTES The last Planning Meeting was held in full council so there are no minutes to agree.	
25.06 OUTGOING CHAIRMAN'S REPORT There was no report.	
25.07 PLANNING COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE The Committee resolved to re-approve the terms of reference with no changes.	
25.08 PLANNING APPLICATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. EHDC-25-0205-TPO Oak T1 - Crown reduce overall by 4m, to leave a remaining crown spread of 12m. 54 Holland Drive, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5TD Councillors resolved to defer this to the Arboriculture Officer ii. EHDC-25-0171-TPO 1) 4 x Ash - Crown raise, remove 5 x lowest limbs back to main stem 2) 1 x Beech - Crown raise by removing 10 lowest branches back to main stem 3) 1 x Oak - Crown raise by removing 2 x lowest branches back to main stem 12 Wadebridge Rise, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5NZ Councillors agreed to defer this to the Arboriculture Officer iii. EHDC-25-0160-OUT Outline Application - Four new dwellings (All Matters Reserved) 5 Boyneswood Close, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5EB Medstead Parish Council strongly objects to this planning application. The full response is at Appendix A. iv. EHDC-25-0033-HSE First floor side extension 17 Windmill Fields, Four Marks, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5HJ Medstead Parish council has no issues with this planning application and defers the decision to the planning officer. 	

<p>v. EHDC-25-0120-HSE Replacement of existing flat roof to north elevation with double pitched roof. Replacement and alteration to existing windows format to east elevation The Boynes Stoney Lane, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire Medstead Parish Council has no objections to this planning application. However, the council would like the planning officer to note that this building has some historical significance. It was the former home of the sister of JM Barrie, the author of Peter Pan. He spent time living and writing there in the late nineteenth century (and the oil lamps used during that time were an inspiration for the story).</p> <p>vi. 27000/005 46 dwellings with vehicular access from Lymington Bottom Road, and the provision of public open space, landscaping and other associated works, following the demolition of 61 Lymington Bottom Road Fair Winds, 61 Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5EP Medstead Parish Council strongly objects to this planning application and the full response is at Appendix B.</p> <p>vii. EHDC-25-0193-HSE Two storey extension to rear following demolition of existing kitchen/dining room, utility room and pantry Southdown House South Town Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5PP Medstead Parish Council submitted a holding objection to this application, detailed at Appendix C. The Council believes further information is required.</p> <p>viii. Late Application: EHDC-25-0305-HSE Single Storey Side extension and raised patio Firfield Windsor Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5EF Medstead Parish Council has no adverse comments</p>	
<p>25.09 DECISION NOTICES There were no decision notices. Councillors noted that the decision notice for 55318/001, Land West of Beechlands, had still not been issued.</p>	
<p>25.10 PLANNING APPEALS There were no updates or new appeals</p>	
<p>25.11 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT Councillors asked the clerk to write to planning enforcement regarding the Hobby Farm at Land at Dairy Dale Farm, Wield Road, Medstead, Planning Application 60368. The planning permission said that the larch fence had to be removed within three months of the grant of permission, but this has not been done.</p>	Clerk
<p>25.12 ADDITIONAL PLANNING MATTERS Nothing was raised.</p>	
<p>25.13 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP The remaining unspent grant at the end of the financial year has been returned to Locality. The NPSG has applied to the District Councillors for a grant to fund the work until the Locality grant window opens again, and they have all agreed. The NSPG will be looking for a new member and will also need additional supporting in coming months, given the high expected workload. Information is expected to come back in July/August following the call for sites, and there is a public consultation planned September. The NPSG is proposing to ask SMASH and F4FM for help with this.</p> <p>The website will be set up on Medstead and Four Marks Parish Council websites, with one hosting the information and the other one containing links to it, so that there is a single website viewable from both council's sites. There will be a new Medstead-domain email address specifically for the NPSG.</p>	

There were no further matters to discuss and the meeting was closed at 7.40pm.

Signed Chairman

Date.....

Appendix A. Response to EHDC-25-0160-OUT

EHDC-25-0160-OUT Outline Application - Four new dwellings (All Matters Reserved), 5 Boyneswood Close, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5EB

Medstead Parish Council object to this application as, amongst other reasons, it considers it to be 'Backland development' and contrary to Policy 1 of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan'

Neither the Planning statement nor the Design and access Statement mention the demolition of the current semidetached dwellings on site. The Planning Statement states the '*development of four sustainable two-bedroom dwellings at 4 & 5 Boyneswood Close, Medstead*' but does not mention if they are to be flats, terraced, semidetached or detached dwellings.

It notes '*The site is well-served by local bus routes*' - there is a bus stop some 870m eastbound and also 1km westbound. Guest parking bays should be provided on site as there will be a minimum of 12 required for the six dwellings on site. The Design and Access statement is an aspiration with no substantive detail, just a wish list.

Compliance to Medstead & Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan:

This is 'Backland' development contrary to M&FMNP Policy 1

NPPF 2024

No information is provided on compliance with NPPF 130, 2021 – Superseded by 5 more recent iterations to December 2024

130. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*

f) *create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users⁴⁹; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.* In the current version it is paragraph 135. The proposed development raises the housing density by a factor of 3 to around 55d/Ha, which is out of keeping with the area. The character of the area is affordable housing. It will change the 'Sense of Place', intensifies the local development by reducing the available green space. It does not produce a high standard of amenity, due to some 1200m from the retail area at Oak Green and no streetlighting. It is to be expected that cars will be used, rather than pedestrian traffic.

174. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;*
- c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;*
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;*
- e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and*
- f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.*

This is now paragraph 187. Most sub paragraphs do not apply (a, b, c, and f).

With regards to paragraph d, it is doubted that any benefit will be generated due to the removal of the footprints from this small, 1 Ha, plot from the eco system. No mitigation has been offered, only 'suggested'.

With regard to d, the noise and air pollution will be increased by the need for private vehicles to be used for commuting to work and large retail needs.

107. If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:

- a) the accessibility of the development;*
- b) the type, mix and use of development;*
- c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;*
- d) local car ownership levels; and*
- e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.*

With regards to this Application:

- (a) the accessibility is dependent on the site layout and no information given.
- (b) Unknown at this stage
- (c) The availability of public transport is some 870 to 1.0 km away, and contrary to the 20 Minute Neighbourhood TCPA design document, and the *National Model Design Code Part 2 – Guidance Notes*, Section M1.ii Public Transport, notes in paragraph 26:

'The distances that people are prepared to walk from their dwelling to reach public transport are determined by the nature and quality of the public transport service, how attractive and safe the

walk feels, and the total length of their journey. Generally, people are prepared to walk further to a railway station or tram stop (10 minutes) than to a bus stop (5 minutes).'

This development is not compliant

With regards to NPPF, Paragraph 8, the Council doubt if this development meets its objectives – Economic, Social and Environmental:

8. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

Economic objective: Apart from the additional Council Tax and the minimal CIL, this development does not add to the economy of the area, the labour and building materials most likely to be imported into the area.

The development does not add to the employment opportunities within the village. It is known that many villagers commute, over 88% residents travelling greater than 5km. The cost of commuting, and that of travelling to towns for their enhanced retail offerings must be subtracted from this economic gain.

The lack of street lighting and the distances to local infrastructure such as schools and retail outlets, will encourage the use of private vehicles, which in turn increases the cost of living in this location.

Social objective: These houses will be offered at market rate and will not be offered as 'Affordable Housing', although it is known that there is a local need within Medstead and Four Marks for 2 bedroom dwellings.

With the EHDC Affordability ratio being around 13.1, it is highly likely that the households will require dual incomes to exist. The viability of village organisations is suffering from the lack of volunteers coming forward from those residents who spend time commuting longer distances.

Due to the lack of street lighting and the distances to local infrastructure such as schools and retail outlets, the development will create an isolated community for new residents with young children who only have access one family vehicle, as it would be reasonably expected to be used by the partner to travel to their employment.

Environmental objective: The Environmental impact of this development is unclear, particularly as the footprint of the dwellings is unknown, and the BNG document has not been published.

Due to its location, the use of private vehicles for travel to work, school and retail opportunities will impact on the local environment, particularly through increase in road use, noise, dust and energy use.

Eco Issues.

- Each dwelling to generate electrical power using 4kw arrays. Thus, each will generate some 1,200 kwh per year. It would be useful to understand the payback periods for these installations.
- With regards to grey water, each dwelling is estimated to collect will generate 33 m³ per year.
- SuDS Features – currently not determined. The council is unsure if vegetable swales will ‘improve water quality’ over and above the existing landscape.
- Although the BNG was mentioned it would have been good to have the document before us to review its recommendations to prove their validity of 75% net gain.

Tilted Balance

With regards to Paragraph 11d(ii) b)

‘any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination⁹.’

The Parish Council believe that with regards to the engagement of the ‘tilted balance’, the approval of this site would be a **significant harm** to the local area on Boyneswood Close, Medstead.

With regards to **Footnote 9**: *The policies referred to are those in paragraphs 66 and 84 of chapter 5; 91 of chapter 7; 110 and 115 of chapter 9; 129 of chapter 11; and 135 and 139 of chapter 12.*

- *Para 66. ... expect that the mix of affordable housing required meets identified local needs,*

The Council believe that this site is contrary to the spirit of Paragraph 66, as it will increase the Affordability Ratio for new homes, currently at 13.1 in the District. Although not required for this site, the houses being put forward for this site are expected to be priced above the median for similar houses in EHDC and therefore increase affordability ratio, and make houses less affordable, and both the site and the area less sustainable than other sites in the locality.

- *Para 84. ... should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside ...*

The council believe that the application is contrary to Paragraph 84. The site is not sustainable and will create residents in car dependant houses, especially if any were young children in the family. Given the walking distances and cycling distances to local infrastructure, and the narrow county road from the development, most journeys will be made by car, as referenced by Councillor Lewison in the November Planning Committee Meeting.

- *Para 91. Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications ... and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.*

The Council assert that this site is contrary to Paragraph 91. Both the Council and the EHDC Planning Development Team are very aware of there are more suitable sites are available in the Parish particularly the site put forward in the Draft Local Plan, 2021 to 2040, Reg 18 document, January 2024, the land at Junipers at the centre of Medstead Village, and the recently approved site on Beechwood Road.

- *Para 110. ... Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. ... However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.*

The site is not compliant with Paragraph 110. This site is not sustainable and is car dependant. There is no streetlighting. There is no daily bus service serving the location. The distance to Medstead Primary School and Village Hall is 1.8km; 2.25 km to convenience store; 2.4 km to the church, and 2.5 km to the public house.

To the infrastructure in Four Marks, the distance to the to the east bound bus stop is 870m, and the westbound 1km, which is also the location of the Oak Green shops. The distance to the Mission Hall is 1.2km and the Church of England Church and Village Hall is 2.1 km.

The site is not providing any new employment, so it is expected that residents will need to commute to work and travel to other towns to shop.

Parish Council realises that the Officer will be aware of Hampshire Highways direction, recorded in other applications that infrastructure should be within 800m of the site, and also the direction of NPPF 134, which points the Officer, for those LPA's that do not have a design code, to *Whoever prepares them, all guides and codes should be based on effective community engagement and reflect local aspirations for the development of their area, taking into account the guidance contained in the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code. These national documents should be used to guide decisions on applications in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes.*

The Council refers the Officer to *National Model Design Code Part 2 - Guidance Notes*, Checklist for Movement M1 Connected Places, page 16, that notes the distance should be measured from the 'dwelling from (bus) stop', which should also be true for any local infrastructure from the furthest dwelling on a development.

HCC Highways also commented the comment on another site, Application 55318/001 of s similar distance and higher quality setting similar to this application:

'The distance of Medstead Preschool and Nursery and Medstead CofE primary schools exceeds the recommended walking distance in accordance with the ATE guidance and there are no safe walking routes due to the rural location of the school and its relationship to the site. Concerns remain over the suitability of the application site in relation to sustainable travel due to the absence of specific pedestrian infrastructure to the school from the site and would result in a reliance on private car use for these journeys.'

- *Para 115. In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*
 - a) *sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;*
 - b) *safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*

This site is noncompliant to Paragraph 115, particularly as the Officer is aware that:

- There is no sustainable mode of public transport passing the site.
- There is no continuous footway between village infrastructure and the site.
- There is no streetlighting.
- The road is not wide and would not be conducive to use a bicycle for most residential needs.
- The site is not accessible to all, particularly wheelchair users. It would also be difficult to access the school and shop for young families walking with infants or using a push chair, similarly, for older less able residents, walking to local would be an increasing problem.

- *Para 129. Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:*

a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;

c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;

The Council believe that this application is contrary to Paragraph 129, as no infrastructure is being offered to the locality in this development

- *Para 135. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:*
 - a) *will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
 - b) *are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
 - c) *are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
 - d) *establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
 - e) *optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users⁵¹; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

The Council believes that this application is contrary to Paragraph 135 under each sub paragraph:

- (a) It is not believed that the development will add anything significant to the area.
- (b) Although no information is offered by the developer on design at this stage, but on past history of multi dwelling developments in the area, design would have benefited from the user of the *National Model Design Code*.
- (c) The site is 'back garden' Development' and is inappropriate for an area of ribbon development.
- (d) It is considered that this back garden development will down grade the current 'sense of place' of the road.
- (e) The development will not be able to sustain an appropriate green or public open space. It will increase the use of the local road transport network. It might support the local convenience store and school.
- (f) The site is not accessible to all users, as many they must use a car. It is inaccessible for wheelchair users. It appears not to provide any amenity for current and future residents. It is foreseen to become a dormitory location divorced from village life.

- *Para 139. Development that is not well designed should be refused.*

As no information has been provided by the developer this stage, and the council would like to be pleasantly surprised should this application is approved.

Medstead Parish Council ask that EHDC reject this application. It also asks that this is considered fully by the Planning committee, particularly, as the Tilted Balance is engaged, it needs to examine this application and determine any significant harm of this application may, or may not cause to Medstead.

Appendix B. Response to 27000.005

Medstead Parish Council still has serious objections to this Application, which it adds to its previous submission. In fact, these new documents have raised more.

Firstly, since our last submission four applications previously referenced have been granted permission for 264 dwellings.

- 55318/001 land west of Beechlands Road, Medstead
- 58788/002 land to the west of, Longbourn Way, Medstead
- 25256/050 land to the rear of Brackenbury Gardens Medstead
- 60040 Land east of Lanark Cottage, Alton Lane, Four Marks.

It is also aware that EHDC, under NPPF Paragraph 70, has provided the M&FMNP Steering Group of an indicative figure of 1,148 dwellings required until 1st April 2043 in the Parishes of Medstead and Four Marks. Currently, 361 of this number have permissions, with 135 on Allocated Sites in the EHDC Draft Local Plan 2024 to 2042, and a further 247 in the system; a total of 743, almost 66% of the total in 18 months!

This site is a windfall site, as defined under NPPF Paragraph 75, and is not part of a Neighbourhood Plan, Local Plan or Draft Local Plan, as are EHDC -25-0313-OUT, 55318/001, 25256/050 and 60040.

The Council notes that NPPF Paragraph 77 indicates that large developments to existing villages and towns, *could be provided* ***they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities (including a genuine choice of transport modes)***. In doing so, they should:

a) consider the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure, the area's economic potential and the scope for net environmental gains;

*b) **ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself***

This development is non-compliant to with this paragraph.

The Council also notes NPPF Paragraph 83.

To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

This development does not enhance the village/ settlement of Four Marks/ 'South Medstead', as no employment it will produce a dormitory development and not add to village life, as the Council have the experience of most residents of the post 2013 developments not engaging in village activities.

When considering 'Promoting sustainable transport', EHDC should be aware that the HCC EHDC LCWP has rescinded its previous LCWiP for East Hampshire with a much downgraded version which recommends no proposals for Four Marks/'South Medstead', thus no guidance is offered to assist with Paragraph 109

e) identifying and pursuing opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use, as HCC, the Lead Authority, in its wisdom, cannot identify any.

Paragraph 111 states that

Planning policies should:

- a) support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities;*

d) provide for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks with supporting facilities such as secure cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans);

Without such infrastructure locally or LCWiP for Four Marks/ South Medstead, this application is non-compliant with this paragraph.

Paragraph 129. Regarding

Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;

d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change;

suggests to the officer that this application is not compliant, particularly as

- the local infrastructure is minimal forcing residents to travel for most employment and retail needs. This development is speculative and adds no new facilities to the settlement
- the housing gross housing density of 17.89 d/Ha density is far higher than Lymington Bottom Road net density, calculated at 7.61 d/Ha over some 61 dwellings

The Council refers the Officer to the Village Design Statement with regards to Paragraph 130 which suggests;

'Area-based character assessments, design guides and codes and masterplans can be used to help ensure that land is used efficiently while also creating beautiful and sustainable places'

It also directs that Officers should

b) the use of minimum density standards should also be considered for other parts of the (Local) plan area. It may be appropriate to set out a range of densities that reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas, rather than one broad density range;

The Council believe that, due to the approximately 70 development sites being speculatively offered to the EHDC LAA around the settlement, the LPA is justified in reducing the housing density requirement to ensure that the sense of place of this part of Medstead is maintained.

The Council notes the NPPF section 12. Achieving well-designed places and relates it to the circumstances of South Medstead and the 'feathering' of development towards Medstead Village, commenting that this application is close to the settlement edge. It is also cognisant of the emerging *Revision of the M&FMNP*, and the comments of the EHDC Council Leader which noted its Steering Group is an exemplar in its cooperation with the EHDC Planning Policy section. The Council is also aware that the Steering Group will be involving it with the production of the Design Code and Master Plan to be included in the final document. As such, it is supportive of the National Model Design Code: Part 2 – Guidance Notes and the references to it within this section to them, particularly Paragraph 134, that directs Officers for those LPA's that have no code of its own:

'These national documents should be used to guide decisions on applications in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes.'

The Council is very concerned that the 'Sense of Place' of 'South Medstead will become lost, by the mass of the development already granted permission. It believe this development will reduce the Sense of Place by moving new development north on Lymington Bottom Road.

It also comments that the applicant has still not submitted the required check list under the EHDC Climate Change and Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning document so the Council cannot fully assess the savings to be made. There is no substantiation to the energy saving of the proposed dwellings

The current orientation of the dwellings has taken little advantage of gains that could be made in improving the site layout and the natural ventilation to be gained. The data produced in the report is calculated, surly, as these are stock designs, the Developer could back this up with proven comparative examples.

It asks why no cycle storage has been provided on plots 1, 2, 5, 12, 24, 31, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43 & 46. Garages will be overwelled with 'stuff' and there will be no space for cycles.

It notes that the visitors' car parking spaces have been 'grouped'. These should be spread around the site. The current layout encourages front of house parking as the spaces provided are too far from most of the dwellings. Check NMDC

The Officer is cognisant of NNPF Paragraph 134 and is aware of the statement that *'These national documents should be used to guide decisions on applications in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes.'* The Council notes the recommendation of the NMDC – Part 2, Movement, Checklist M.1 Connected Places, page 16, that consideration should be given to *'The provision of public transport and the distance of all dwellings from a stop.'*

The HCC Officer appears to have mis understood this requirement when he asked for the measurement from the centre of the site, but does comment:

'In addition to the CIHT guidance, Active Travel England (ATE) identify that a site should have a sufficient number and range of local facilities within an 800m (10 minute) walking distance via an accessible walking route.'

The social housing has not been 'pepper potted' across the site as the National Model Design Code (NMDC) recommends. Most of these dwellings are not in eyeline of the LAP. The Council propose that this is moved towards the centre of the site and also is provided with some covered shelter.

The Council reminds the Officer that Medstead is a 'Dark Skies' Parish and street lighting is unacceptable, although the WCHRA recommends street lighting on all routes. It also notes that the HCC publication EHDC LCWIP was approved by HCC on 6th March

The James Blake Associates Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment section on Topography, Hydrology and Geology ignores the winterbourne that runs down Lymington Bottom Road (see EHDC Flood Map) (running over the drainage area?) MPC notes the EA objection to the use of boreholes into the primary aquifer for the drainage of surface water. *39009/008 | Outline application for the construction of up to 1525sqm of Class E uses, including provision for a flexible working facility, including details of the means of vehicular access. All other matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) to be reserved for future consideration. | Land to the north of the Telephone Exchange, Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton.*

In the Conclusion 8.3.7 states 'The effects on the Settlement Character of Medstead will be Minor Adverse at Year 1 and Negligible at Year 15'. This may be true for the development on its own but with the cumulative effects of 3 other sites currently also granted permission in the Parish will be very Adverse on the Landscape, changing the whole ambience of the village from rural to dormitory. Currently, the Council is being consulted as part of the Review of the Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan which is developing a 'Master Plan' for the Plan area.

Should the EHDC be minded to approve this application, the Council would ask for a condition for the reinstatement of the main spine road which routes east to west through the north of the site to the original width, and to highways standards, and to a standard suitable for adoption.

The Applicants Travel Plan, at 3.14, does not reflect the HCC Highways guidance regarding walking distances, and for other Planning Applications, it has also commented that the National Travel Survey: 2022 (NTS) data findings are more for urban areas not rural areas such as 'South Medstead'. It should be remembered by the Officer that there is no streetlighting in the Parish of Medstead.

With regards to Table 3.1 the Council notes that the *20-Minute Neighbourhoods – Creating Healthier, Active, Prosperous Communities An Introduction for Council Planners in England Town and Country Planning Association March 2021* considers that 1.6 km is covered in 20 minutes over level ground along a direct route by an able pedestrian. This extends the 'crow flies' isochrones up to two kilometres are shown from the approximate site centre provided in Figure 3.1.

The site provides no employment opportunities. A recent Survey carryout by Four Marks Parish Council, identified most employment opportunities were fulfilled by commuter into the conurbation as residents could not afford to work in it due to the salary level.

These comments also apply to the Transport Plan.

The Transport Plan also comments on street lighting. **The Council objects to any proposal for Street Lighting, as it is unacceptable in a 'dark skies' Parish,** and do not believe that lighting at the entrance to the development will be supported by the Highways Authority.

The Council welcomes the WHICAR recommendation for contributions to repair and resurface local footways.

The Council notes the HCC Highways comment ‘

‘The limited pedestrian infrastructure combined with the distance from the site increases use of the private car, which is contrary to LTP4. This site would only contribute to the significant levels of private car use and further work is required to establish measures to encourage use of sustainable travel modes.’

And

‘It is understood that the main ‘spine road’ is to be offered for adoption by Hampshire County Council, with the side roads remaining private to be maintained by a management company. Whilst this is the case, it is advisable that the developer ensures that the roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council’s best practice as set out in <https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards>, and that an appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues.’

The Council notes the HCC Highways comment:

‘The proposed 6.75m carriageway width of the ‘spine road’ is considered excessive for the proposed scale of development’

And the Council refers the officer to the EHDC 10 Large Sites Development consultation when this site was offered as part of the Land West of Lymington Bottom Road development. Noting the Government housing requirement, and EHDC’s direction for over 1100 dwellings to be built in Medstead and Four Marks by 2043, the Council believes that the width of this carriageway should remain at 6.75 m.

With regards to the Applicants Flood Risk Assessment & Development Drainage Strategy, the Council is concerned by the statement at 4.23 All drainage is to remain private, as it is understood that all foul drainage linking more than one property was ‘taken over’ by the utility, in this case Thames Water. With regards to 6,7 and the provision of boreholes, the Council refers the Officer to the comment earlier in this document that the site lies over a ‘principal aquifer’ and also to the EA response to Planning Application 39009/008 | Outline application for the construction of up to 1525sqm of Class E uses, including provision for a flexible working facility, including details of the means of vehicular access. All other matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) to be reserved for future consideration. | Land to the north of the Telephone Exchange, Lymington Bottom Road, Medstead, Alton

‘we would not endorse the use of deep borehole soakaways. This is particularly important in this location due to the sensitivity of the underlying chalk and its designation as a Principal aquifer.’

The proposal made in the document is particularly unsuitable due to the contamination that will be ‘washed’ off the road surface water into the boreholes.

With regards to the Foul Water drainage are delighted to note the change of drainage philosophy from the original documentation but are aghast at the proposal to re-route it some m down the centre of Lymington Bottom Road, which will need to be closed for the duration of the works. Lymington Bottom is a major artery for residents of the Parish to reach the A31, a route for the secondary school bus route and a major link for north south traffic between Basingstoke and the A31 and Petersfield.

Tilted Balance

With regards to the ‘Tilted Balance’, the comment in the Planning Statement regarding NPPF paragraph 8, are not competent as they if any at all are minimal. More pertinent is Paragraph 11d (ii) ***‘any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination’⁹.***

And footnote ⁹:

‘The policies referred to are those in paragraphs 66 and 84 of chapter 5; 91 of chapter 7; 110 and 115 of chapter 9; 129 of chapter 11; and 135 and 139 of chapter 12.’

With regards to the paragraphs mentioned in Footnote ⁹

- *Para 66. ... expect that the mix of affordable housing required meets identified local needs,*

The Council notes the provision of Affordable Housing .

- *Para 84. ... should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside ...* **The Council believe that this not sustainable and will create isolated residents.**
- *Para 91. Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications ... and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.*

There are more suitable sustainable sites are available in the area.

- *Para 110. ... Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. ... However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.*

This site is not sustainable and is car dependant. There is no daily bus service passing the site. The nearest bus stop is 900m to the south. It is 2.1km to Medstead Primary School and 2,2 km to Four Marks Primary School, along narrow road without street lighting and 2.3 km to the convenience store in Medstead; 1.4 km to the Four Marks area of Oak Green Parades. No employment so resident will need to commute to work and travel to other towns to shop. Lymington Bottom Road/ South Town is key vehicle link between the A31 and Basingstoke

- *Para 115. In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*
 - a) *sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;*
 - b) *safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*

There is no sustainable mode of public transport passing the site.

There is no continuous footway between Medstead village infrastructure and the site.

There is no streetlighting.

It would also be difficult to access the school and shop for young families walking with infants or using a push chair, similarly, for older less able residents, walking to local would be an increasing problem.

- *Para 129. Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:*

a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;
c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;

Apart from the statutory provision of the LAP there is no infrastructure is being offered in this development

The Parish Council, taking into account the reasons above, believes that there is more than sufficient Significant Harm created by this development to the area than is required to firmly tip the balance towards the refusal of this application.

The Council asks that this application is rejected.

Appendix C. Response to EHDC-25-0193-HSE

EHDC-25-0193-HSE Two storey extension to rear following demolition of existing kitchen/dining room, utility room and pantry. Southdown House, South Town Road, Medstead, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 5PP

I have grave concerns regarding this application. From the photographs in the Design and Access Statement, the current building is set within a series of heritage Hampshire flint buildings, which look as if they date to early 19th century. There is no elevation drawing to enable evaluation of the effect of the extension nor the building materials that are proposed to be used.

The D&AS notes a Flood Risk Assessment that does not appear to be on the EHDC website.

Design and Access Statement

The D&AS notes *'the project aims to significantly enhance the property by almost doubling its size'*

Materials and Appearance

The proposed materials is carefully selected to complement the existing house and maintain the architectural character of the area. These include:

Brickwork to match or complement the existing dwelling

Roof tiles consistent with the current property

High-quality glazing to enhance natural light and create a contemporary aesthetic

The overall design aims to integrate harmoniously with the existing structure while offering a modern update to the home's functionality and appearance.

I have concern regarding the impact on the property to the north, as from the location map and Googlemaps, the distance from the adjacent property appears minimal and this work could be required to be subject to a Party Wall Agreement. The first floor windows could also overlook Old Southdown Farm House.

There is no evidence of sustainability improvements, it does not reflect the detail that as you would expect to align with the current building regulations. If heat pumps are to be installed further planning approval will be required, to ensure neighbours were not troubled by noise problems. Unfortunately, without the elevation drawings, any proposal for solar panels cannot be substantiated.

Foul Drainage

There is no mention of increasing the private foul drainage system for the property.

Heritage Statement

I am concerned by the content of the *Heritage Statement*. It has no discussion on the design but notes in the conclusion:

'The proposed enlargement of Southdown House has been carefully designed to respect the architectural and historical significance of the existing building and its wider setting. The extension will use materials that match the existing fabric in appearance, texture, and quality ensuring seamless visual and physical integration with the original structure.

The development is modest in scale and subservient in form, positioned to preserve the building's principal elevations and historical character. It avoids disruption to key views and retains the spatial relationships within the historic farmstead layout.

Importantly, the proposed works will not adversely affect the setting of the surrounding listed buildings, including Southdown Old Farmhouse, the wheelhouse and donkey wheel, and the nearby barn. The integrity, prominence, and heritage value of these assets will be fully maintained. The extension has been designed in accordance with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which encourages high-quality, contextually sensitive development within the historic environment.

In summary, the proposal represents a carefully considered and sympathetic enhancement that sustains and enhances the significance of the heritage asset and its context, without causing harm to the listed buildings or their setting.'

No evidence has been offered to either support or refute the statement.

Conclusion

I have a concern over the massing of the property extension together with the proximity of the development to the adjacent property.

There is insufficient information provided to draw a conclusion on materials to be used and the effect of the design on the adjacent properties.

There is no Flood Risk Assessment published.

There are no details published regards Foul Drainage management , especially as the number of bedrooms/ bed spaces have approximately doubled.

I believe that the Council should raise a holding objection until the concerns are satisfied.