

Minutes

Meeting of Ampfield Parish Council Planning Committee

Monday 15 August 2022, held in Ampfield Village Hall, 7:00pm to 8:38pm

Present:

Members of Ampfield Parish Council

Chairman Bryan Nanson

Vice Chairman Graham Roads

Cllr Martin Hatley (not a member of the Planning Committee: present in his capacity as a Member of Test Valley Borough Council)

Cllr Julian Jones

Cllr Chris Ling

Cllr Julie Trotter

Others:

Members of public: 9 people

Ellen Pearce (Planner, Inspired Villages)

Kate Orange, Clerk to the Council

Apologies

160. Apologies were received from Cllr Kate McCallum and Cllr David Stevens. Hampshire County Councillor Alan Dowden had also wished to attend but sent apologies.

Previous Minutes

161. The Minutes of the Meeting Thursday 20 June 2022 were agreed and a copy was signed by the Chairman.

Interests

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

Application 21/02697/RESS

163. The Meeting was adjourned at 7:05pm for public participation on 21/02697/RESS.
- a. Ellen Pearce addressed the Meeting on behalf of Inspired Villages.
 - i. The proposal had been amended in the light of feedback from the public.
 - ii. The proposed retaining wall and land height adjacent to Flexford Close had been reduced by approximately 0.5m and would be approximately 5m further back from the brook.
 - iii. One unit had been removed from the proposal and the total floor areas were reduced.
 - iv. The advice of the tree officer had been taken to remove some unsafe or unhealthy trees and to encourage enhanced biodiversity.
 - v. Some parking had been moved to the gaps between buildings.
 - vi. The site was challenging in terms of topography and contamination.
 - b. A resident of Flexford Close presented his comments together with those of his wife and a neighbour:
 - i. They did not object to the development as a whole. The detailed proposal seemed satisfactory, but for the increase in land height of 1.5m to 1.7m (approximately) along Monks Brook compared with the agreed Phase 1 proposal.

- ii. It was the responsibility of Test Valley Borough Council to ensure that development protected and enhanced the environment: developers' profits should not be a significant consideration. If the levels could not be reduced, then could the buildings adjacent to the brook be reduced to a single storey to reduce the impact on Flexford Close?
 - iii. They were also not happy with the design of the planting along Monks Brook.
- c. A resident of Flexford close. He had been involved in planning consultations early on.
- i. He noted that these increased site levels had not been discussed in the consultations. It had been known from the start that the site was contaminated, but the original plan had been to remove the contaminated soil.
 - ii. During construction work, the contaminated soil had been disturbed and left uncovered. He wondered how much pollution had escaped as a result. It was known that there was asbestos on the site.
 - iii. Dust arising from construction work was not being suppressed.
 - iv. Saturday working had not been mentioned in the consultations, but work had taken place on at least three Saturdays most recently starting at 7:15am.
 - v. These new buildings will be in direct view from his house and much of the vegetation which screened the site had now been removed.
 - vi. The 0.5m reduction in the height of the land shown on the latest revised plans was insufficient as the plans were still nothing like the original proposal in the vicinity of Monks Brook.
- d. A resident of Flexford Close noted the following:
- i. He was in favour of the development in principle but had objections to the detailed plans.
 - ii. He was aware that the reason given for the increased height of the land on the site was for level access; but longer paths would also achieve this.
 - iii. The Local Plan required development to "respect and enhance" the local area. He did not consider that this proposal respected or enhanced Flexford Close.
 - iv. 25m from his home there was proposed to be an 11m high wall. This would be overbearing.
 - v. Existing trees along Monks Brook were a problem and needed to be managed. Eight conifers had fallen on or near to his property over the last couple of years. The remaining conifers block light from his property and the large quantity of needles fill the gutters. The alders were infested with alder beetles. Other species of native tree such as the naturalised holm oak would be preferable to alders, in his opinion.
 - vi. There was an error in the tree report within the application: a tree recorded as a lime was actually an alder.
- e. A resident of Flexford Close estimated that the ridge-height of the buildings along Monks Brook, at the highest point would be approximately 14.5 to 15.5m above the brook. Better privacy may be achieved in 15 years' time when the new trees had grown sufficiently; but presently, with scaffolding in place and without planting, residents who backed on to Monks Brook had no privacy. The proposed buildings would look across and overlook the gardens. From his bedroom window, he would be looking at the top of the retaining wall, and the new dwellings themselves would be on top of that.

- f. A resident of Flexford Close noted the following:
- i. Some matters were unclear on the tree drawing: some trees would be felled and some would remain, but specific details were not given; and there was no elevational drawing of the view from Flexford Close to show what the development may look like from the existing houses. Without an elevation from Flexford Close, we could only guess what improvement would be made to privacy through the planting of saplings.
 - ii. The earlier plans had shown a gap between units B6 and B7: now a cottage was planned. It was facing numbers 1, 3, & 5 Flexford Close, rather than being side-on.
 - iii. The height of the buildings adjacent to Monks Brook should be reduced.
 - iv. He was disappointed that the matter was being considered by Ampfield Parish Council in meeting of its planning committee along with other applications. However it was noted that the meeting of Ampfield Parish Council had been convened in order to meet the deadlines of Test Valley Borough Council, on this and other planning applications.

g. The Meeting was reconvened at 7:23pm.

164. The Planning Committee discussed the application 21/02697/RESS in detail:

- a. On other local developments, Test Valley Borough Council had suggested to developers that some more established trees be planted early in the construction phase to provide screening for neighbouring properties.
- b. The proposal for buildings adjacent to Flexford Close (along Monks Brook) as shown in the outline application (which had received consent), and the in the current application, were compared. In the latest proposal the buildings were proposed to be approximately 1 storey higher than was proposed at the outline stage, and the land level had also increased. The massing (volume) of the proposed buildings, particularly when viewed from Flexford Close, had increased considerably in comparison with the outline proposal. They were also facing the Close, whereas in the outline proposal they were facing away. These three factors resulted in a loss of privacy for the residents of Flexford Close; and detracted from the appearance of the street-scene in Flexford Close. It was felt that the development would dominate Flexford Close to the extent that it would be all that could be seen from the Close.
- c. The slight reduction in height made since this application was first submitted was insufficient.
- d. The Ampfield Village Design Statement stipulated that heights should fit in with the local street scene. This derived from the Local Plan.
- e. The handling of contamination (retaining on site rather than removal) was a concern, although it was noted that this appeared to have been agreed already.
- f. The Council supported the application at outline stage and continued to support the principle of the project.

165. For planning application **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, Baddeley Road, Flexford, North Baddesley, it was proposed to submit to Test Valley Borough Council the following comment:

“Objection”, for the following reasons: the height of the proposed buildings on the banks of the Monks Brook being overbearing in relation to the existing dwellings on Flexford Close, which would be overlooked; the great variance of that aspect of the application compared with the proposal which had received outline consent; and to note that the planting along Monks Brook could include some more mature trees, and a balance of evergreen and deciduous, in order to provide earlier screening. Also, to note that the parish council supported the principle of the development.

RESOLVED

Application 22/01976/FULLS

166. The Meeting was adjourned at 7:34pm for public participation on application 22/01976/FULLS.
- a. A resident of a nearby property raised concerns about the proposal and the work underway, on behalf himself and his neighbour:
 - i. The history of the property was that Sunnyside house was a modest 3 bed roomed home on an average sized plot. It had been extended to provide a further bedroom in 1992. The whole plot was surrounded by high trees and large shrubs, which provided screening for the properties on the north and west. The application in 2021, for extensions, annexe and roof extension, had been objected to by Ampfield Parish Council and neighbours, on the grounds of loss of privacy for the neighbours, the scale and overdevelopment of the site; and the application had been withdrawn. The annex, which was currently under construction, had received permission in late 2021. There had been many objections to this, although not from Ampfield Parish Council.
 - ii. The current proposal, taken along with the new annexe, to which it will be connected, is for a very large house. The application needs to be considered as part of the whole scheme.
 - iii. The trees and planting shown in the application no longer exist, having been levelled in order for the annexe to be built, along with the hard-landscaping including a large patio, wall and swimming pool. Where the neighbours used to see a hedge, there is now an open site, with a large amount of hard-landscaping. The plans do not show the reality of the changes that have been made to the setting. The vegetation has gone and there is nowhere left free of concrete for new plants on the boundaries.
 - iv. Work, ongoing to the annexe, had been extremely disruptive to the neighbours: noise, diggers and heavy machinery were working from dawn until dusk, every day. Neighbours had asked the owner to reduce the hours and noise, but nothing had improved.
 - v. The scale of the proposal was difficult to appreciate. It seems larger than the original proposal, and comments made by neighbours and the parish council had not been taken into account. The proposal for the rear elevation included more windows than before. The grassed area could only be approximately 2m deep, whereas an expansive lawn was shown on the perspective drawing, which also showed Sunnyside as smaller than 1 The Stables, which was incorrect.

- vi. The extension would overlook the private living and recreation space of the neighbours, due to its size, height and the loss of planting.
 - b. A resident showed photographs of Sunnyside, from the time before the work had started on site, showing the established garden with shrubs and trees on the boundaries. This had now gone.
 - c. The Meeting was reconvened at 7:50pm.
167. The Planning Committee discussed application 22/01976/FULLS in detail.
- a. It was noted that parking at Sunnyside was already a problem with the residents using the whole of the grass verge to park on, say that it was impossible for pedestrians to walk past on that side of the road. On-site parking had not been improved by this proposal.
 - b. In the previous application the parish council had queried whether SSE had been notified, as they have a substation adjacent.
 - c. The proposal was very similar to the application that the Parish Council objected to in November 2021. The same points still stood. Additionally the impact as all development on the site, proposed and underway, needed to be taken as one.
 - d. Bearing in mind the proximity to the conservation area and listed buildings, and the impact on adjacent neighbours, the proposal constituted overdevelopment of the site.
 - e. it was noted that the square dormer windows had the effect of increasing the bulk of the building and did not respect the character of the area.
 - f. Whilst keeping an open mind, Cllr Hatley noted that, due to the comments that members of the public had made, should the planning officer be minded to give permission he would request that the decision goes to TVBC's planning committee.

168. *For planning application **22/01976/FULLS**; Erection of two story rear extension, single story side extension, reconfiguration of roof space to create one bedroom; Sunnyside House Ampfield Hill Ampfield Romsey Hampshire SO51 9BD, it was proposed to comment as follows:*

***“Objection”**, for the following reasons: over-development of the site because of the cumulative effect of previous development taken with the current proposal and the bulk of the buildings; changes in character to the area, not compatible with the local plan; the detrimental effect on the neighbours; point A made in the objection to the previous withdrawn proposal; the history of ongoing parking problems and noise nuisance during the current development; the inconsistency in the application, whereby vegetation cover is shown at boundaries but was impossible now to achieve on site; and to note that some drawings were misleading as they showed planting, and the perspective chosen distorted the scale relative to neighbouring buildings.*

RESOLVED

Comments on other Planning Applications

169. *Current planning applications were considered and the comments for Test Valley Borough Council were agreed.*
- a. **22/01860/TPOS**; Oak - Dead wood, clear overhead services, head back from property to give 2 metre clearance, remove epicormic growth, Sweet Chestnut - Reduce branches overhanging property to previous pruning points; 20 Beechwood Close Chandlers Ford Eastleigh Hampshire SO53 5PB. **Comment: “We are content to rely on the opinion of the tree officer.”**

- b. **22/01850/TPOS**; Cedar T1 - Fell; 9 Hocombe Wood Road Chandlers Ford Hampshire SO53 5PN. **Comment: “We are content to rely on the opinion of the tree officer.”**
- c. **22/02036/TREES** | Works to trees as per schedule received | Ampfield Primary School Knapp Lane Ampfield Hampshire SO51 9BT. **Comment: “We are content to rely on the opinion of the tree officer.”**
- d. **22/01894/FULLS**, Porch extension to front and conversion of conservatory to habitable, fully insulated space, 24 Flexford Close. **Comment: “No Objection”**

RESOLVED

Chairman

Date

DRAFT