

## **Minutes**

### **Meeting of Ampfield Parish Council Planning Committee**

**Monday 04 March 2024, held in Ampfield Village Hall, 7:00pm to 8:10pm**

#### **Present:**

##### **Members of Ampfield Parish Council**

Chairman Bryan Nanson

Vice Chairman Chris Ling

Cllr Julian Jones

Cllr Jason Reeves

Cllr Graham Roads

Cllr Julie Trotter

#### **Others:**

Kate Orange, Clerk to the Council;

12 residents of the parish;

Ellen Pearce of Inspired Villages

(All members of the public had left by 7:35pm)

#### **Apologies**

260. Apologies were received from Cllr Julian Jones and Cllr Kate McCallum.

#### **Previous Minutes**

261. The Minutes of the Meeting Monday 05 February 2024 were agreed and a copy was signed by the Chairman.

#### **Interests**

262. No Member declared any personal or pecuniary interest in any business for the Meeting.

#### **Public Participation & Discussion On Applications**

263. The meeting was adjourned at 7:02pm for public participation on the amendment to application 23/02385/FULLS.
- a. Ellen Pearce of Inspired Villages explained the amendments to application 23/02385/FULLS. The revised application was now running concurrently with a Planning Appeal for the original scheme. This amended scheme was the developer's preferred option: if it received planning consent, the Appeal would be withdrawn. The developer had amended the proposal to reflect the concerns of residents. Blocks near to the boundary with Flexford Close had been altered and re-positioned in order to improve the outlook from Flexford Close.
  - b. A resident of Flexford Close represented a further 18 residents not present at the meeting. Two more residents also spoke. The objections are summarised as follows:
    - i. The revision of the application, to try to address residents' concerns, was appreciated.
    - ii. The adjustments did not fully address the key objection, namely the height of the blocks on built-up land along the banks of Monks Brook. Single storey buildings would have reduced the impact.
    - iii. Test Valley Borough Council's Southern Area Planning Committee had focussed on the impact arising from just three of the proposed blocks. Neither the committee or developer had considered the affect of the other blocks on the boundary with Flexford Close.
    - iv. The problem of the building up of the ground along Monks Brook, which increased the impact of the height and scale of blocks built on it, was not addressed.

264. The meeting was reconvened at 7:10pm for Council discussion on the revised application 23/02385/FULLS. The revision had not resolved concerns arising from the raised ground level, and height/massing of the blocks along Monks Brook. It was understood that the treatment of trees on bank of Monks Brook, of concern to some residents, had been under direction of Test Valley Borough Council.
265. The meeting was adjourned at 7:20pm for public participation on application 24/00262/FULLS.
- a. The owner of Kingfisher House explained the background to the application. They had taken pre-application advice five times from Test Valley Borough Council Planning department, had the support of three neighbours, and the Conservation Officer was favourably disposed to the proposal. The garden of Kingfisher House, within the settlement boundary, was large enough to accommodate another dwelling. They planned to live in the new dwelling themselves.
  - b. A neighbour raised concerns that the proposal may open up the ground to further development, perhaps including the demolition of Kingfisher House. There followed discussion on this, and it was noted that Kingfisher House is protected by being listed.
  - c. There was general discussion about other instances of back-land development on Knapp Lane.
266. The meeting was reconvened at 7:25pm for Council discussion on application 24/00262/FULLS. It was in accord with the Village Design Statement; some residents had raised concerns about traffic and disturbance during construction; the application had the support of three neighbours.

### Comment on Planning Applications

267. Current planning applications were considered and the comments for Test Valley Borough Council were agreed.
- a. *Amendment to 23/00964/OUTS; Outline - Residential development of up to 309 dwellings, delivered across 3 severable residential parcels and 1 access parcel with associated infrastructure and works; all matters reserved other than access; Kings Chase South, Land South Of Ganger Farm Ganger Farm Lane Romsey. **Comment: 'Objection'**, for reasons of the raised ground levels and the height/massing of buildings adjacent to Flexford Close.*
  - b. *24/00262/FULLS; Erection of dwelling; Kingfisher House, Knapp Lane, Ampfield, Romsey. **Comment: 'No objection'**, with note on protection of neighbours from traffic during construction.*
  - c. *24/00378/FULLS; Erection of two storey rear extension; 20 Straight Mile Ampfield Romsey Hampshire SO51 9BB. **Comment: "No Objection"***
  - d. *24/00422/FULLS; Erection of tractor shed/implement store and formation of farm access track with associated landscaping using the existing field access from Green Lane, Ampfield; Land Adjacent Ashwood Cottages, Green Lane, Ampfield, Romsey. **Comment: "No Objection"***
  - e. *24/00447/FULLS; Erection of rear lobby and extension to boot room, alterations to and lowering of existing rear extension floor, extending the mezzanine in the extension to provide bedroom above, formation of passage at the rear and installation of 4 rooflights; Monks Barn Knapp Lane Ampfield SO51 9BT. **Comment: "No Objection"**, noting also, we trusted that issued raised in the pre-application had been addressed and that protection would be afforded to the neighbours during the construction phase, in particular to The Cottage.*
  - f. *24/00448/LBWS; Erection of rear lobby and extension to boot room, alterations to and lowering of existing rear extension floor, extending the mezzanine in the extension to provide bedroom above, formation of passage at the rear and installation of 4 rooflights; Monks Barn Knapp Lane Ampfield SO51 9BT. **Comment: "No Objection"**, noting also, we trusted that the concerns raised in the pre-application advice had been addressed and that the Conservation Officer approved of the proposal.*

RESOLVED

---

Chairman .....

Date .....