

# MICHELMERSH & TIMSBURY PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of an Extra-Ordinary Parish Council Meeting held on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2006 at 7.30 p.m. in the Jubilee Hall, Timsbury.

**Present:** Parish Councillors, Mr. P. Pritchett-Brown (Chairman) Mr. R. Vie, Mr. N. Cooper, Mr. D. Cowling, Mrs. C. Evans, Dr. J. Glasspool, Dr. M. Subramanyam, TVBC Councillors, Mr. D. Bidwell and Mr. M. Hatley, Miss K. Fitzherbert-Green (TVBC Planning Services) Parish Clerk, Mr. P. Buist and about 30 members of the public.

### Action

#### Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that it was not a public meeting, but a meeting of the Parish Council. During the open period, anyone present could speak, but the meeting would then be closed for the Council to consider the matters on the agenda. He also made the point that planning authority had no obligation to act in accordance with the Parish Council's wishes, but the Council would aim to reflect the views of the parishioners.

#### 1. Apologies

None.

#### 2. Open Period

*Dr. Subramanyam arrived at this point.*

All speakers referred to the two planning applications relating to the Old Redland Tile Works. The following is a summary of the points made:

- Hampshire CC had no concerns over additional traffic, could we ask for the information on which this decision was based?
- The main concern was addition traffic in Rudd Lane, there was now an opportunity to review this now that the outline permission was time expired.
- The existing landfill site had not been consulted and the site would need to be cleaned up prior to any development. Concern over escaping methane gas was expressed.
- The width of the access road was insufficient and not in line with guidelines.
- The development only covered part of the site. What would happen to the rest?
- Was there a need for homes in this area?
- Could conditions be requested such as number of houses limited to 30?
- There should be no street lighting on the development.
- Smaller low cost homes and bungalows should be provided.
- Could emergency vehicles access and exit the site?
- Quoting Mottisfont VDS was not appropriate or relevant.
- Visitor parking was insufficient.

The Chairman explained that traffic was not within the remit at this time. Houses were planned for this site because of Rudd Lane residents concerns about commercial traffic access to the site. He suggested that the Parish Council could arrange a meeting with Hampshire CC to talk about the traffic concerns.

PPB

#### 3. Declarations of Interest

Dr. Subramanyam declared an interest in items 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5.

#### 4. Planning Applications

*Dr. Subramanyam left the room and took no part in items 4.1 and 4.2.*

##### **4.1 Variation on Condition 2 on Outline Permission, Old Redland Tile Works (This application is for an extension of time).**

The application was considered. The Chairman **proposed** that as the Parish Council had objected to the original proposal and to remain consistent, it should object to the extension of time on the same grounds as the opposition to the original. This was **agreed unanimously**.

PBu

#### **4.2 Details of erection of new housing, garages, car barns, access road and associated amenity space, Old Redland Tile Works.**

The application was considered and it was **noted** that the Council should only comment on the reserved matters. The Chairman proposed and the Parish Council accepted unanimously that there would be no objection but the Council would comment that there should be no street lighting; consideration should be given to low cost housing; the development should adhere to M&T VDS; visitor parking should be reviewed and access road widths should be re-considered.

PBu

*Dr. Subramanyam returned to the room.*

#### **4.3 Erection of detached dwelling, plot adjoining 4 Waterworks Cottages, New Road.**

It was **noted** that approval for a new house attached to 4 Waterworks Cottages had been approved. This was a new scheme. The Chairman **proposed** and Donald Cowling seconded that there should be no objection. The proposal was **carried** on a vote of 4 for and 3 against.

PBu

#### **4.4 Erection of 2-storey and single storey rear extension, 4 Waterworks Cottages, New Road.**

It was **noted** that the extension would have no impact on the scene from the street. Dr. Subramanyam **proposed** and Donald Cowling seconded that there should be no objection. This was **carried unanimously**.

PBu

*Dr. Subramanyam left the room and took no part in item 4.5.*

#### **4.5 The development of land without complying with condition 1 and variation of that condition to extend time and to remove reference to Bunny Lane access track, Hunts Farm Quarry, Rudd Lane.**

The application was considered. It was **proposed** by the Chairman and **accepted unanimously** that there should be no objection to the proposal.

PBu

*Dr Subramanyam returned to the room.*

### **5. Invoices for Payment.**

The following invoices were approved for payment:

Southern Water (water charges for the pavilion)	£35.22
The Studio (printing the newsletter)	£127.10
P. Buist (Nov & Dec salary, allowance & expns)	£665.95

### **6. Update on Sports Facilities Licence and Consideration of any Urgent or Immediate Action Required.**

The Chairman **noted** that the deed of variation on the Jubilee Hall lease had been signed by all parties.

It was also **noted** that a letter had been sent today by the Council's solicitor to the Sports Club in clarification of the points raised by the club. A letter in the Romsey Advertiser suggested that the delay was due to the Council and that the club had "unconditionally" accepted the licence offered. This was not accepted by the Council's solicitor who had pointed out in a letter referred to and quoted from by the Chairman that the club's response had been "subject to contract without prejudice" and that the club's responses had generated a lot of work.

The matter of payment for services had been made clear and that the club would be required to pay running costs relating to its use of the pavilion.

### **7. Chairman's Mandate.**

The Chairman was mandated to speak on behalf of the Parish Council on the items contained in these minutes.

**8. Any Other Urgent Business.**

There was none.

**9. Dates of future meetings.**

The next meeting would be held on 25 January 2006.

The meeting closed at 8.45 p.m.

Peter Buist  
Parish Clerk  
24 January 2006.