

Draft Minutes

Greywell Parish Council Meeting

Wednesday 4th July 2018 at 6.00 pm in the Village Hall

1	<p>Present: David Millard (Chairman), Sue O'Neill (Vice Chairman), Earl of Malmesbury (arrived at 6.25pm during item 5 d.), Henri Mogg, Mike Barter. District Councillors Ken Crookes and John Kennett, Elizabeth Ford (Clerk) Apologies: County Councillor Jonathan Glen and District Councillor Stephen Gorys.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of last meeting The minutes of the meeting on Wednesday 6th June were approved and signed.</p>	
3	<p>Declarations of interest relating to this agenda: None</p>	
4	<p>Matters arising from previous minutes (in addition to those listed below) None</p>	
5	<p>Planning:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>a. Applications to be considered at the meeting</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">i. 18/01143/HOU, 6 Manor Farm Barns, The Street Proposed first floor rear extension over existing ground floor rear extension The application was discussed and it was resolved to submit the comment to support the application but also to support the Conservation Officer's request that permission, if granted, should include the removal of permitted development rights.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>b. To report the Parish Council comment submitted on planning application ref. 18/00765/FUL, at Dairy Complex, White Lane</i> The Parish Council comment was submitted by the agreed closing date of 15th June and is included in Appendix A. The submission of video footage showing traffic congestion in the village was discussed. It was also advised that as many residents as possible attended the future planning committee meeting to determine the application.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>c. Update on previous applications.</i> - See Appendix A.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>d. Local planning matters</i> The Local Plan had been submitted to the Planning Inspector on 18th June and there would now be a public inquiry lasting 2-3 days, probably at the end of September. The Plan now had considerable weight as an emerging plan. A summary of the responses to the last consultation on the Plan was available on the Hart DC website and included a large body of argument by Hallam Housing in support of a housing development on the Deptford Lane site between Odiham and Greywell. The Planning Inspector would make the decision on which policies were retained including the Local Gap policy. The planning appeal for a major development of 700 houses (Pale Lane Farm, Elvetham Heath) which was not in the Local Plan was still to be decided. The "Deerpark" application was still awaiting the receipt of comments by officers.</p>	
6	<p>Ongoing issues</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>a. Speedwatch</i> Three new volunteers had joined the group and a date would be set for September.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>b. Website – To agree revised quote to construct new website</i> It was resolved to accept the revised quote to construct the new website at a cost of £500 compared to the original cost of £250 which included a large part of the work to be carried out by the Council. HM would replace DM as webmaster for the new website. HM would forward the design statement to the Clerk.</p>	HM

	<p><i>c. Phone box – Defibrillator, CPR training, Village Emergency Telephone System</i> The defibrillator was working with no issues. A meeting of the volunteers for the VETS would be held in the near future when it would be decided whether more training was required.</p> <p><i>d. Parish Lengthsman</i> DM would contact local residents regarding their supervision of the Parish Lengthsman works. The Clerk would provide an update of the works carried out and remaining budget at the next meeting.</p> <p><i>e. Waste bin</i> The Clerk would forward the email to Hart DC regarding the change of location of the waste bin to Cllr Ken Crookes for him to progress.</p>	DM Clerk Clerk								
7	<p>Report from County Councillor The Clerk would forward the links on the HCC consultation with closing date 5th August for circulation using the residents email list and the parish Facebook page</p>	Clerk								
8	<p>Report from District Councillor The transition to the new waste contractor Serco with start date 1st October 2018 was going well. There were difficulties with the back-office contracts shared with other Councils but this had no impact on service levels to residents.</p>									
9	<p>Finance:</p> <p><i>a. To note current financial situation and sign bank statements</i> Bank reconciliations as at 4th July 2018 were approved and signed as correct. Account balances were noted as follows:</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>i. Treasurer's account</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£21,925.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ii. Business 30 day account</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£12.26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Less un-presented cheques</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£50.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reconciled total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£21,887.56</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>b. To approve 2018/2019 payment for The Villager</i> It was resolved to approve the 2018/2019 payment of £348 to The Villager but concern was noted regarding the increasing cost and lack of content on the village. HM would contact the editor to discuss. Councillors would forward material to HM by 20th of each month for inclusion in the magazine.</p> <p><i>c. To approve payment of agreed £100 pledge to RHA</i> It was resolved to approve the payment of the agreed £100 pledge to the RHA.</p> <p><i>d. To consider grant request from local SCAS Community First Responder</i> This was deferred. It was agreed that the Clerk would obtain additional information on the running costs, donations received from elsewhere and number of local call-outs.</p> <p><i>e. To review the payment for grass cutting outside the South East Water pumping station</i> It was resolved to pay an additional £100 for the grass cutting this year and that the payment would be £150 next year.</p> <p><i>f. Payments and cheques for signature</i> Payments were approved as per the schedule below.</p> <p><i>g. To resolve to add Cllr Michael Barter as a signatory to the Parish Council bank account</i> It was resolved to add Cllr Michael Barter as a signatory to the Parish Council bank account</p>	i. Treasurer's account	£21,925.30	ii. Business 30 day account	£12.26	Less un-presented cheques	£50.00	Reconciled total	£21,887.56	HM GPC Clerk
i. Treasurer's account	£21,925.30									
ii. Business 30 day account	£12.26									
Less un-presented cheques	£50.00									
Reconciled total	£21,887.56									
10	<p>To adopt policy on data protection This was deferred and would be circulated for approval at the next meeting.</p>	Clerk								
11	<p>Any other business and items for agenda of next meeting A co-ordinated management of ditches was discussed. The effects would include reduction in the flooding of Hook Road. With some regret, the felling of the failing Scots Pine in the churchyard would be discussed with the tree officer. Noise disturbance due to events at the Public House was discussed. Cllr John Kennett would provide information on planning and caravan licensing requirements. It was necessary to submit a complaint to Hart DC Environmental Health Department for any enforcement of noise controls.</p>	EoM								

12	<p>To confirm date of next meeting The next meeting (at 6pm in Greywell Village Hall) was confirmed as: Wednesday 26th September 2018</p>	
----	--	--

Schedule of cheques and payments for approval/signature on 4th July 2018

Serial	Payee	Services/Goods	Amount	Cheque No	Dated
Retrospective			nil		
Current					
10	E Ford	Clerk salary & expenses (July)	£181.70	521	4 July 2018
11	Hart DC	Election expenses	£56.10	522	4 July 2018
12	ICO	Data Protection Registration	£35.00	DD	
13	S Webb	The Villager 2018/2019	£348	523	4 July 2018
14	RHA	Pledge	£100	524	4 July 2018
15	C Gallop	Grass cutting	£100	525	4 July 2018
		Total	£820.80		

Appendix A – Planning Updates

Parish Council comment submitted on planning application 18/00765/FUL | Partial demolition and conversion of existing agricultural buildings to provide a day health spa facility. Creation of secondary access road, provision of car parking, landscaping and planting. | Dairy Complex White Lane Greywell Hook RG29 1TL

Introduction and summary

The Parish Council has looked at this proposal in depth – attending presentations by the applicant (at Pre-App and full application stages) and studying all the relevant documents - and has unanimously resolved to strongly object. This is based on the significant, negative traffic impact the proposed development will have on the village. It will result in unacceptable harm to Greywell and its residents, particularly in terms of road safety, but also with respect to amenity and enjoyment of living in this small rural village.

Planning Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that local planning authorities should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings; and promotes the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. The Parish Council supports the policies contained in the NPPF and both the 1996-2006 and replacement Local Plans which support economic growth in rural areas. In particular, we favour diversifying the rural economy and finding alternative uses for redundant agricultural buildings. However, we cannot support this planning application as we believe this proposal for a “day health spa facility” in this location would adversely affect the character of the village of Greywell and the safety and well-being of its residents. This objection rests predominantly on one issue : the significant negative impact of increased traffic volumes, the common thread in all the 50 or so objections submitted by the residents, whom we represent. We also have some other concerns with the proposed development in terms of its design and setting.

The ‘saved’ policies of the 2006 Local Plan were quoted at length in Hart’s response to the applicant’s Pre-App in February. GEN1, for example, states *inter alia* that “Proposals for development which accord with other proposals in this plan will be permitted where they:

- (ii) Avoid any loss of amenity to existing and adjoining residential (and other) uses by virtue of noise, disturbance, noxious fumes, dust, pollution or traffic generation (our underlining);
- (viii) Do not give rise to traffic flows on the surrounding road network, which would cause material detriment to the amenities of nearby properties and settlements or to highway safety;
- (ix) Do not create the need for highway improvements which would be detrimental to the character and setting of roads within the conservation areas or rural lanes in the District;
- (x) Do not lead to problems further afield by causing heavy traffic to pass through residential areas or settlements, or use unsuitable roads;”

We would argue that the application breaches all the above policies, despite the Planning Officer’s assertion in the response to the Pre-App that “ Whilst vehicular movements associated with the proposed development would pass predominantly through the village of Greywell, the submitted Technical Note suggest that at peak usage the proposal could generate 167 vehicle movements a day, with the maximum peak hour generation of 6 or 7 movements and it is considered that this level of vehicle movement likely to be associated with the proposed use of the site would be such that it would be unlikely to result in any material impact on residential amenity.”

This judgement of no material impact is based on an initial set of figures which in themselves are wrong. The total of 167 movements a day gives a mean hour generation of more than 10 movements when calculated for a 16 hour period (6am to 10pm). The “peak hour generation” must be much higher than this, let alone the “6 or 7 movements” included in the Pre-App.

The traffic forecast itself is highly questionable also, prompting the Council’s Highways Engineer to ask for “a deeper analysis” of the highways and transport issues in any planning application.

Traffic Impact

The applicant accordingly included a Transport Statement from consultants RGP in the eventual application followed by a shorter report estimating the % increase in traffic through Greywell. The revised figures now show the proposed development would generate “210 two-way person trips per day” plus a further 16 vehicle movements relating to staff. The Parish Council has studied the revised figures closely and we believe that they are still flawed and that the resultant forecast of traffic increase is seriously underestimated as is the resulting impact of the development on the village.

We take issue with the assumptions in the Statement and subsequent report regarding:

- the forecast numbers of customers and staff (35 customers and 10 staff over the whole day – significantly *underestimated*)

The facility is being called a “day health spa facility”. The facilities on offer are those of a full-on Gym (similar to the Four Seasons which has over 400 members but is also heavily subsidised by its hotel guests) rather than a “day spa”. The required membership numbers to make the provision of these facilities a viable project are unknown and the disclosure of this information not necessary as part of the planning application process, but based on Gyms in the area numbers could exceed 500 members. As the current application includes two studios many members will visit for classes which will create high vehicle movements prior and after each class (of which there could easily be 10 a day) and so aggravate peak flows and traffic congestion in the village. The inclusion of a creche area is also noted. This will require increased staff numbers above that of a spa type facility (legally one staff to three children ratio required) but also indicates that the pattern of use of the facility will similar to a Gym rather than a “day spa”.

- the extent of car sharing (up to 30% - significantly *overestimated*)
- the share of traffic passing through Greywell (60% compared to vehicles using other routes –significantly *underestimated*).

We also take issue with the traffic survey undertaken by RGP to provide a baseline figure against which the % increase of traffic movements could be measured. This was conducted on a single day and can hardly be claimed to be representative of average traffic flows. As traffic impacts are a key consideration of this development a much longer survey period is required. The traffic generated by the proposal, as calculated by RGP using their arbitrary assumptions of car sharing/routing and so suspect methodology, shows a 10 - 11% increase in traffic movements through Greywell. The Parish Council considers that the real figure will be at least 15 – 20% and this is deemed to be an unacceptably high increase of traffic levels through this small rural village for reasons of safety, amenity and convenience.

It is worth quoting the views of just three of the 50 plus Greywell residents who have objected to encapsulate the issues. These comments demonstrate the ongoing highway problems in the village at the existing traffic levels:

“It has become very evident over the past few years that ever increasing numbers of vehicles, including delivery vans and high-sided vehicles, use Greywell as a cut-through, particularly during the rush hour, but also throughout the day. It is not an adequate route for these vehicles, owing to the narrowness of The Street, in particular, which often has an almost unbroken line of parked vehicles along its length. Currently, there are often delays as vehicles reach this bottleneck and have to weave in and out of parked cars, along what effectively has become a single carriageway through the Village. With the majority of its historic period houses and cottages having been built close to the road, long before motorised traffic existed, the increase in fast moving vehicles through our village (often with little or no regard for other road users) has become a cause for great concern; for residents driving to and from their own homes, the many cyclists (individual and increasingly large groups at weekends) and the pedestrians walking though the village (including children and accompanying dogs). “

“The inevitable increase in traffic will impact on residents and visitors' safety. There is only one very short stretch of pavement on the field side of The Street and almost all of Greywell's residents exit their houses both on foot and by car, straight onto the road. The busier the village's roads are, the more compromised their safety becomes. I cannot believe that the need for a new business providing leisure activities for Greywell & the surrounding area is more pressing than the need to protect the safety and welfare of the village's residents and visitors. Those who wish to attend a spa may go to the one at The Four Seasons in Dogmersfield to name just one. Those who wish to attend yoga and pilates classes are already well served by the existing regular classes in the Village Hall (also held in many other nearby village halls) and at The Park gym in Hook. There is ample opportunity for leisure activities already in the village: walking, running, fishing, cycling & riding are continually enjoyed by its residents and visitors alike. A synthetic alternative is entirely unnecessary and unwanted for the reasons outlined above.”

“It is impossible to overstate how much Greywell is valued by residents and visitors alike. It is a destination for walkers, cyclists, school parties and others at all times of the week. King John's castle, the Basingstoke Canal, the church, the 16th century pub and buildings with direct connections to Cromwell and the Civil War make Greywell particularly special and much visited with a perpetual impact on road congestion, amenity value and residents. Adding a new commercial, membership organisation with opening hours from 6.30am x 7 days per week will clearly increase the existing transport pressures on the village, increasing the danger to residents and visitors and extending the transport beyond current peak periods. It will also continue to erode the very rural, historical charm that thousands of visitors per year appreciate so much. I feel this character is too delicate, vulnerable and important to be damaged by a predominantly 'members only', new commercial facility. “

In summary:

- Greywell is a small, attractive, rural village valued by residents and visitors alike, particularly walkers, horse riders and cyclists
- the main access to the proposed “spa” runs through narrow country lanes and then through the narrow lanes making up the heart of the village, Hook Road and The Street
- there is already congestion at peak times along The Street due to on-street parking (only a third of houses have space to park off the road)
- most of the houses on Hook Road with off street parking have ‘blind’ access to the road

- there are few pavements and there is no street lighting in the village
- the access to the “spa” is off a blind bend on the Natley Road
- the demand for this kind of facility is questionable given local provision elsewhere;
- traffic impacts from this development will be seven days a week, 360 days per year.

Other impacts

The Parish Council would also like to express concern that the development proposed for the site:

- requires encroachment onto the adjacent agricultural land;
- specifies that foul drainage will be directed to the public sewer. The Hart internal Drainage Consultee has queried this and confirmed that an alternative means for foul sewer drainage is required. Alternative means for surface water management than the proposed discharge to public sewer will also be required. Both management of foul and surface waters require further clarification in advance of granting permission of this “spa”. This is due to the potential for high groundwater levels limiting discharge to groundwater and the nearby watercourse (the River Whitewater), which could receive treated discharges, being part of the Greywell Fens SSSI.
- Prevention of light pollution from the site is important to minimise the night-time visual impact of the development on the “dark skies” village and also minimise the impact on bats. The nearby Greywell Tunnel is a nationally important bat habitat.

Future development of the site

There is also another issue and that is that these “day spa” proposals cover just the first stage of what could eventually develop into a much larger complex. The applicant referred to the present proposals as “Phase 1” at a presentation with Phase 2 for another development in the adjacent farm building - see Greywell Parish Council minutes of the meeting on Wednesday 17th January 2018. Such additional development would further increase the already harmful traffic impacts on the village.

Conclusion

The marginal benefits, due to the provision of a yet another nearby “spa facility” and the limited number of local employment opportunities, are far outweighed by the significant negative effects the proposals will have on the safety and also the amenity and convenience of residents and visitors resulting from increased traffic through the village of Greywell: traffic impacts which will be at harmful levels for *seven days a week, 360 days per year*.

The Parish Council strongly objects to the application and requests Hart District Council to refuse permission. If the Planning Department recommends that permission is granted, the Parish Council requests that the application is heard by the Planning Committee.

Greywell Parish Council, 15 June 2018

Update on other previous planning applications

18/00389/FUL, Garage Adjacent To Hook Road Greywell

Proposal: Replacement of existing garage with new store/workshop to be used in association with Dorchester and Holly Cottage.

Parish Council comment to object. **Status:** Application withdrawn.

17/01800/FUL & 17/01801/LBC. Manor Farm Barns, The Street, Greywell.

Proposal: Conversion and extension of farm buildings to create five dwellings, etc

Parish Council comment no objection. **Status:** Application ongoing. No further info. since 10 November 2017

17/03487/FUL. Land Adjacent to Junction 6 M3 Basingstoke Hampshire.

Proposal: Construction of a new Motorway Service Area to comprise an amenity building, lodge, drive thru coffee unit, associated car, coach, motorcycle, caravan, HGV and abnormal load parking, and a fuel filling station with retail shop, together with alterations to the adjoining roundabout on the M3 and slip roads to form an access point and works to the highway. Provision of landscaping, infrastructure and ancillary works. Validated 2 November 2017.

Parish Council comment to object. **Status:** Application ongoing. Last doc posted was a comment from HCC Flood and Water management Team consultee dated 12th May requesting further info. Agreed expiry date for application is 31st July 2018.

16/00109COU3, P.I. Ref. APP/N1730/C/17/3176640, 8 Dorchester Way

Appeal against: Unauthorised change of use of private land to form garden land and erection unauthorised structures.

Interested party comments due 24 Nov 2017

Appellant/LPA Final comments due: 15 Dec 2017

Status: Appeal undecided (as of 5 June 2018)