

MICHELMERSH & TIMSBURY PARISH COUNCIL

**A Planning Meeting of the Parish Council will be held in on
Monday 16th August 2021
at 7.30 p.m. at the Jubilee Hall, Timsbury**

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

4.1 21/01505/FULLS – amended application

Construction of 3 dwellings
Smallberry Hill, Haccups Lane, Michelmersh, Romsey

4.2 HCC/2021/0442 - TV236

The erection of an inert waste and trommel fines wash plant facility
Ace Liftaway, Yokesford Hill Estate, Yokesford Hill, Romsey SO51 0PF

5. Chairman's Mandate

6. Agenda items to be included in next month's Parish Council Meeting

7. Dates of future meetings - Parish Council Meeting 22nd September 2021

Katie Hardy, Parish Clerk
Tel: 01794 367289 email: mtparishclerk@btinternet.com 10th August 2021

MICHELMERSH & TIMSBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Parish Council Meeting held on Monday 16th August at 7.30 p.m.

Apologies: Cllr Peter Clarke, Cllr Donald Cowling, Cllr Sharman Ferguson, Cllr Steve Langford

1. Attendees: Cllr Bob Davis (Chairman), Cllr John Rhodes, Cllr Helen Palmer, Cllr. Nick Adams-King, Parish Clerk, Katie Hardy. Three members of the public.

2. Declarations of any Interests
None

3 Open Period

21/01505/FULLS – amended application

Two residents spoke to explain their objections to the amended application, raising the following points:

Although the site had been included in the settlement boundary, TVBC were still required to take into account all material considerations in determining the application. These included the Conservation Area Policy, which should in any case have been taken into account when the settlement boundary was redrawn.

The revised landscaping, with gabion retaining walls, on the amended application would be out-of-character with the surrounding area and the resulting terracing would present an overbearing feature in parts of the site.

The position of Plot 1, close to Haccups Lane, was not in the character of the area where houses were generally set back from the road. The proposed northern access to Plots 2 and 3 would be a new access, contrary to the statement by the applicant that this was an existing access to Smallberry Hill whereas it had never served this purpose. This access would also require the removal of ancient hedgerow identified in the Conservation Area Policy

Cllr Nick Adams-King joined the meeting

4 Planning

4.1 21/01505/FULLS – amended application

Construction of 3 dwellings

Smallberry Hill, Haccups Lane, Michelmersh, Romsey

Cllr. Bob Davis informed the meeting that a local resident has raised questions with TVBC about the process by which it was decided to include this site in the settlement boundary. The decision would have breached the Conservation Area Policy which identified the site (which adjoins the Conservation Area) as presenting 'important open views' and also stated that, 'it was improbable that this site would be built on'. Some of the correspondence had been circulated to councillors. TVBC had not yet provided the requested information.

Cllr Nick Adams-King advised that it is very rare for an area within the settlement boundary to be removed. Cllr Nick Adams-King said that it would be reasonable for the Parish Council to raise the issue with TVBC regarding the lack of consultation about the site being added within the settlement boundary, especially due to the fact that the Parish Council had previously asked for the site not to be included. However, the issue of whether it was lawful to have added this site to the settlement boundary could only be determined by judicial review. It was concluded that there was little or no prospect of the decision being reversed, certainly at this stage, and therefore this matter was not likely to influence the outcome of this application.

Decision: Following discussion, the Parish Council agreed that the proposed changes in the house elevations and the site layout were minimal and did not address the Council's previous grounds for objection. Additionally, the proposed retaining walls and terracing would present an artificial and unnatural appearance, totally out-of-keeping with the surrounding area, such that the amended scheme was even less acceptable than the previous scheme.

Councillors also expressed concern about the use of the southern part of the site, which is not within the settlement boundary, now designated as 'orchard' plots attached to two of the dwellings. The Council would wish to ensure that, if planning permission were granted, development rights were removed from this part of the site to prevent the erection without planning permission of buildings (sheds, summerhouses etc). Also, the southern access road would run through this land: this would be 'development in the countryside' and would not be necessary to allow the site to be developed since a second access was proposed. It was agreed to include these points in the consultation response.

It was also agreed that the Parish Council should restate in its response its concern about the way in which the site was included within the settlement boundary: that decision appeared not to have taken account of the Village Design Statement and the Conservation Area Policy, or the Parish Council's previous request that the site should be designated an 'open area' and not included in the settlement boundary.

4.2 HCC/2021/0442 - TV236

The erection of an inert waste and trommel fines wash plant facility Ace Liftaway, Yokesford Hill Estate, Yokesford Hill, Romsey SO51 0PF

Councillors were concerned about the potential adverse impact of a Wash Plant in this location, which is just outside the parish boundary, especially following the complaints about the Plant recently installed at the Waltet site on Bunny Lane. The main concern was noise: the site is on rising ground and noise could affect areas in Timsbury lower down in the valley, as well as houses (outside the parish) on Yokesford Hill. The applicant had provided a noise assessment report: the Chairman had reviewed this and considered that it did not provide adequate evidence that noise levels at neighbouring houses would be acceptable.

Decision: It was agreed that the company provided a useful and necessary service. However, the Council was concerned about any further development that could result in increases in dust or noise emissions or traffic movements, or adverse visual or landscape impacts. In this case the Council did not consider that the noise assessment report was adequate to demonstrate that noise issues would not arise, and would request clarification.

5. Chairman's Mandate

6. Agenda items to be included in next month's Parish Council Meeting

7. Dates of future meetings - Parish Council Meeting 22nd September 2021

Meeting closed 9pm