

## **Minutes**

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

**Thursday 07 October 2021, held in Ampfield Village Hall, 7:00pm to 7:50pm**

#### **Present:**

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

Chairman Bryan Nanson

Cllr Chris Ling

Cllr Kate McCallum

Vice Chairman Graham Roads

Cllr David Stevens

Cllr Julie Trotter

#### **Others:**

Kate Orange, Clerk to the Council

11 members of public

#### **Apologies**

102. Apologies were received from Cllr Julian Jones and Cllr Mujeeb Rahman.

#### **Previous Minutes**

103. The Minutes of the Meeting Monday 06 September 2021 were agreed and a copy was signed by the Chairman.

#### **Interests**

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

#### **Public Participation**

105. At 7:05pm Standing Orders were suspended for public participation.
106. Several members of the public made representations on application 21/02697/RESS.
- a. A spokesman represented more than 35 residents of Flexford Close. The residents were concerned about proposed site levels. Site work had already commenced, raising the ground level adjacent to Flexford Close so that it was now approximately at eaves level of the existing houses. Second-storey windows of proposed buildings would be at roof level of houses on Flexford Close, depriving residents of privacy, and dominating and overshadowing the Close. Normal practise would suggest that the roof levels of new buildings should be similar to those on existing nearby buildings. Plans submitted at outline planning stage did not indicate the ground levels now proposed; also they showed bungalows adjacent to Flexford Close, rather than the two-storey buildings now proposed. Bathrooms, rather than living space, adjacent to Flexford Close, and also planting of trees (which some, but not all, residents supported) would mitigate some of the problems. The proposed retaining gabions were unattractive and inappropriate for a residential setting. The residents asked that Ampfield Parish Council oppose the application.
  - b. Representatives of Inspired Homes, Ellen Pierce and James Parkhurst, responded. They had met with some residents prior to submitting the application, mainly focusing on the landscaping; and they intend to continue working with neighbouring residents. Proposed heights were in accordance with outline planning permission, albeit ground levels had not been established at that stage. The ground level needed to be elevated to improve wheelchair accessibility and to contain ground contamination. Mitigating measures such as early tree-planting were proposed. Ground levels at the date of the Meeting were temporary, earth having been moved for the construction of Phase 1.
  - c. A resident of Flexford Close noted that the height of proposed adjacent buildings means that they will overlook residents of Flexford Close, removing light and privacy. Bungalows

would be preferable. It seems that contaminated land was being covered with membrane with additional soil on top. They queried what was to prevent water run-off from higher land running under the membrane and washing contamination into the Monks Brook (a chalk stream, and an SSSI). Tanks were now proposed, instead of the balancing ponds of the original proposal. A large majority of Flexford Close residents had supported the application at outline planning stage: it was the issue of the increased ground levels which has raised opposition. Residents were also upset about the current levels of vibration and noise. Vibration, which seemed to be caused by a digger, could be felt inside houses on Flexford Close.

- d. A resident of Flexford Close noted that their patio and bedroom would lose privacy due to the proposed building heights. They were also concerned about artificial lighting from the site and proposed buildings, which would affect them in the evening and night.
- e. A resident expressed a wish to work with the developers. The proposed elevations facing Flexford Close were very imposing. They requested that the developers reconsider the appearance of the development as viewed from Flexford Close. The proposed gabion wall was unattractive.
- f. Chairman Bryan Nanson confirmed that Councillors had visited the site, and some had visited Flexford Close on the day of the Meeting.

107. The Meeting was reconvened at 7:20pm.

### Planning Applications

108. *Current planning applications were considered and the comments for Test Valley Borough Council were agreed.*

- a. **21/02697/RESS**; Approval of details for appearance, landscaping, and layout of a care village pursuant to outline planning permission 17/01615/OUTS; Former North Hill Sawmill Yard Baddesley Road Flexford North Baddesley Southampton Hampshire SO52 9BH. **Comment: "Objection", with the following reasons: this proposal differs from the outline permission in terms of ground level and height of the buildings in relation to Flexford Close; specific concerns are lack of privacy, overbearing nature of the proposed buildings, landscaping, heights not in line with outline permission, and contamination worries (albeit not a planning matter).**
- b. **21/02683/FULLS**; Single storey rear extension with balcony above; Tudor Wood Lower Farm Lane Ampfield SO51 9BP. **Comment: "No objection"**
- c. **21/02914/TPOS**; T1 - Pine (5ft Stump) - Fell, T2 - Yew - Fell, 28 Beechwood Crescent Chandlers Ford Eastleigh Hampshire SO53 5PA. **Comment: "We are content to rely on the opinion of the tree officer"**

RESOLVED

### Next Meeting

109. The next Meeting would be at 7pm on Monday 25 October 2021, in Ampfield Village Hall.

---

Chairman .....

Date .....