MICHELMERSH & TIMSBURY PARISH COUNCIL

An ONLINE Planning Meeting of the Parish Council will be held on Monday 10th August 2020 at 7.30 p.m.

Members of the public and press are most welcome to attend.

AGENDA

Apologies

1. **Attendees**
2. **Declarations of any Interest.**
3. **Open Period**

4. **Planning Applications**

4.1 20/01778/FULLS
Single storey rear extension to provide family area
8 Tilebourne Close, Upper Timsbury, Romsey, Hampshire

4.2 PLAN/DS/TV066
Variation of condition 2, 9 and 10 of Appeal decision reference APP/Q1770/A/11/2161324 (Planning Application Reference: 10/02712/CMA) to reshape and improve the existing peripheral north eastern landscape bund to facilitate enhanced screening from wider views into the site and improve biodiversity on the site's periphery and to accommodate a temporary wash plant operation in the southern section of the site for a period of twelve months only at Salvidge Farm, Bunny Lane, Timsbury SO51 0PG

4.3 20/01683/FULLS
Erection of car ports and workshop with storage and first floor family/garden room with balcony, following demolition of existing garage/workshop
Casbrook House , Rudd Lane, Braishfield, SO51 0PU

4.4 TVBC - Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for consultation.

5. **Annual Play Inspection Report**

6. **Invoices for Payment**

7. **Dates of future meetings**

23rd September, 28th October, and 25th November

Katie Hardy, Parish Clerk Tel: 01794 367289
email: mtparishclerk@btinternet.com 4th August 2020

To join the meeting online, please copy the link below:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us04web.zoom.us/j/79725483940?pwd=bk5Nd0g5TUhKYTEyQTVQbHN1TlFqQT09

Meeting ID: 797 2548 3940
Passcode: 6Kx9zM
Please note that you don't need a zoom account to access the meeting.

MICHELMERSH & TIMSBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Council Meeting held ONLINE on Monday 10th August 2020 at 7.30 p.m.

Apologies: None received

1. Attendees: Parish Councillors Bob Davis, John Rhodes, Sharman Ferguson, Helen Palmer, Donald Cowling and Peter Clarke. Test Valley Borough Councillor, Nick Adams-King

2. Declarations of any Interest: Cllr Steve Langford declared an interest in planning application 20/01778/FULLS, as he is a near neighbour to the property.

3. Open Period: TVBC Cllr Nick Adams-King reported that the Borough Council is currently inviting comments regarding the temporary closure of The Hundred. There are mixed views as to whether the road should remain permanently closed to traffic. An online Facebook survey is hoping to identify local opinion on the subject.
Cllr Bob Davis asked Cllr Adams-King about the new planning zoning system proposals. Cllr. Adams-King stated that these proposals would have an impact on the new Local Plan and may result in the areas new housing requirement to rise form 500 per annum to 820 per annum.

4. Planning Applications
4.1 20/01778/FULLS
Single storey rear extension to provide family area
8 Tilebourne Close, Upper Timsbury, Romsey, Hampshire
Decision: No objection

4.2 PLAN/DS/TV066
Variation of condition 2, 9 and 10 of Appeal decision reference APP/Q1770/A/11/2161324 (Planning Application Reference: 10/02712/CMA) to reshape and improve the existing peripheral north eastern landscape bund to facilitate enhanced screening from wider views into the site and improve biodiversity on the site's periphery and to accommodate a temporary wash plant operation in the southern section of the site for a period of twelve months only at Salvidge Farm, Bunny Lane, Timsbury SO51 0PG
Decision: The Parish Council has specific concerns about the potential adverse effects of this development, but is unable to reach an informed view on this application. This is because in the Council's view the information provided by the applicant is inadequate in the respects set out below.

Visual and Landscape Impact

From the information provided, substantial parts of the proposed wash plant (which has an overall height of 9.2 m) would be visible above the perimeter bunds (which would be 4 m high) from viewpoints to the west and south. The proposed planting on the bunds would take time to mature and would provide little or no visual screening initially. A principle of the existing planning permission, as imposed by the Inspector, is that no plant should be higher than the perimeter bunds. This principle is incorporated in Condition 10, which (as proposed in the application) would need to be amended to permit the wash plant to be installed. Such a change would breach this fundamental principle and would set an undesirable precedent.

The plant has a very distinctive 'industrial' appearance and would present an alien feature in the local landscape, although it is difficult to judge whether that impact would be acceptable: the long sections through the bund illustrating the lines of sight from the west (Section A-A on Drawing 003, and Section B-B on Drawing 005) are not useful since these sections do not pass through the wash plant location and therefore do not show the plant. A long section through the highest point of the wash plant, and some photomontages illustrating the visibility of the plant from various viewpoints, would be more helpful.

Noise

The applicants' Planning Statement briefly refers to noise at 5.2 and concludes that *'Any loss of tranquillity associated with the variations proposed at the site would be experienced within the context of the ongoing activity and unnoticeable*' and that '*no significant adverse noise impacts will occur'.* These assertions are unsupported by any evidence. The wash plant would incorporate motorised conveyors, vibrating screens and pumps and is handling hard materials. Whilst the statement may be correct, we would expect it to be supported by a formal noise assessment based on measured and predicted noise levels. The upper parts of the wash plant will not benefit from the noise reduction afforded by the perimeter bund. Noise from this site is a particular concern and although the site is subject to noise limits (Conditions 7 and 8) we believe that HCC should require some technical evidence that any new operations on the site are not likely to breach these limits. Noise from the recycling sites on Bunny Lane is often clearly audible, because ot its level and character, in residential areas, particularly at the Casbrook Fields development to the NE. Any increase in noise emission would be unacceptable.

Water Treatment

No detailed information is provided about the treatment of water from the washing process. The installation appears, from the brief description and layout drawing, to incorporate some water treatment facilities that presumably allow some of the process water to be recycled. The Council raises the following questions:

- Would any water be discharged outside the defined site and if so how would this discharge be regulated?
- How would the 'fines' material in the process water be separated and how is the resulting sludge dealt with?

Dust

The issue of dust emission is not addressed. Dry, dusty materials will be loaded into the wash plant and moved by conveyor prior to washing. Any discharge of dust, particularly from the higher levels of the plant, is likely to be carried beyond the site: the prevailing winds would most often carry dust from the site towards the residential areas to the NE. The appearance of a dust cloud above the wash plant (if it occurred) would add to the visual and landscape impact of the installation. Local properties already experience dust fallout, believed to originate mainly from the recycling sites on Bunny Lane, including Waltet. The Parish Council would wish to be assured that any new operation would not increase dust emissions.

Mitigation Measures

The Council finds the information on Drawing 002 '*Revised Landscape Mitigation Scheme and Site Layout – July 2020'* to be confusing. Some of the additional proposed works indicated on this drawing (such as higher bunds and the footpath re-routing) appear to be already required under the terms of the 2012 planning permission (10/02712/CMAS). We therefore ask HCC, when reviewing the application, to determine whether the works now proposed, and claimed to be 'improvements' and 'enhancements' have been, or should have been, already carried out.

Duration of planning permission

The application seeks planning permission for the wash plant for a trial period, 'no longer than a year'. The installation and associated works appear to be very extensive, complex and (presumably) costly and the Council finds it difficult to believe that this is intended to be temporary. The Parish Council considers that the environmental impacts of the proposals should be assessed on the basis that this will be a permanent installation.

Overall Comments

The Parish Council recognises the contribution made by this site to the local economy, in recycling materials and providing local employment. However, the site is located in a rural and conspicuous location in the Test Valley relatively close to dwellings, and the Parish Council is concerned that any additional operations on the site do not further affect amenity because of visual/landscape impacts, increases in noise levels or dust emissions, or other environmental effects.

The Parish Council is not satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient and clear information to allow the impact of this development to be properly assessed and therefore asks that the County Council takes the Parish Council's concerns into account and, where necessary, requests the applicant to provide further information. On the basis of the information provided with the application, the Parish Council objects to this application.

4.3 20/01683/FULLS
Erection of car ports and workshop with storage and first floor family/garden room with balcony, following demolition of existing garage/workshop
Casbrook House Rudd Lane, Braishfield, SO51 0PU
Decision: No objection

4.4 TVBC - Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for consultation.
Cllr Bob Davis asked Cllr. Adams-King what response the Parish Council could make on such a consultation. Cllr. Adams-King stated that this consultation was predominantly responded to by agency-based organisations such as the Environment agency.

4.4 Parish Profile & Local Plan
Cllr. Bob Davis confirmed that he would submit the comments received from Councillors to Test Valley Borough Council, regarding Michelmersh & Timsbury's Parish Profile and the Local Plan.

5. Annual Play Inspection Report
The ROSPA Inspection report has been circulated to Parish Councillors.

6. Invoices for Payment
£1137.59 TVBC – Playground inspections and repairs
£720.00 TVBC – Dog bin emptying
£326.48 Hampshire County Council – installation of speed sign poles
£121.38 NW Adams – ROSPA Play Inspection Report
The Council agreed the above invoices for payment

7. Dates of future meetings
23rd September, 28th October, and 25th November