



MINUTES OF ADDITIONAL ORDINARY MEETING

**Wednesday 10th June 2020 at 7:30pm
via Zoom**

Councillors Present

Cllr Geoff Chapman (GC) – Chairman, Cllr Judith McGinley (JM) (Chair), Cllr David James (DJ), Cllr Bill Preston (BP), Cllr Peter Waggett (PW), Cllr Gary Whiteside (GW), Cllr Jan Woodfin (JW) and Rosemary Coulter (Clerk)

**016/FC/
03/20-21** **Apologies for absence**
None

**017/FC/
03/20-21** **Declarations of Interest**
PW and GW declared an interest as residents of St Michael's Close

**018/FC/
03/20-21** **Meeting open to the Public**
Six members of the public attended the meeting

**019/FC/
03/20-21** **Planning Applications**
The Parish Council considered the following planning application:

20/01255/TDC

Land at OS grid ref 455998 146067, St Michael's Close, North Waltham

Technical Details Consent (TDC) for the erection of 2 no. dwellings with associated access, garaging, parking and landscaping, pursuant to Permission in Principle (PIP) approval reference 19/01954/PIP for up to 4 no. dwellings

A written representation had been received from the applicant prior to the meeting, which was referred to during the meeting.

Issues raised:

- The Parish Council (PC) responded to the PIP application with a number of concerns and, although it was not a desirable application, there was no mechanism to object.
- The location of the proposed development is in conflict with policy SS6 New Development in the Countryside. However, this policy is not current due to the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's (BDBC) lack of a 5-year land supply. In BDBC's approval of the PIP, they stated that this consent would not normally be given with the caveat that the standard 3-year time period to submit the TDC was reduced to 1 year.
- Approval of the PIP does mean that the owners now have a fundamental right to build at this location.
- The technical documents submitted with the application are lengthy in volume but lacking in technical detail. The details of what will actually be built is scant and poor and does not consider how this will relate to the topography of the site. It was felt that further technical information about the proposal is required.
- Concern was expressed about the lack of topographical information about the site. For example, the new pond is at the highest point of the site and, therefore, cannot be used to enable water 'run off' from the two new properties. As water comes off the site, it will initially go into existing gardens at the top of St Michael's Close and in turn exacerbate the existing flooding issue at the bottom of the road. Flooding has already increased with the building of two existing bungalows on the site, causing additional costs for the Borough

Council in clearing the issues. It was felt that a clear, detailed technical document was required to demonstrate how drainage and flooding issues will be managed.

- Sewage drainage has failed a number of times in St Michael's Close due to overloading. An opportunity to review this situation and update an aging infrastructure has been missed.
- Water pressure in houses at the bottom of the hill needs to remain high so that water can be pumped to the top, causing problems for houses at bottom.
- Concern was expressed that changes may be made to this application as it goes forward. The building of the existing bungalows on the site has not been completed and changes have been made to the original specifications.
- Concern was expressed about the lack of information as to how open spaces will be managed. The proposal that the site will be managed by the developers may work in the short – medium term but there was concern as to how this will work in future years. Concern was expressed that there was a possibility that this responsibility and cost would be passed to the PC in years to come.
- Concern was expressed about the incremental increase of traffic through the village. Although this proposal may predict an increase of 2 cars/household, the incremental increase, taken alongside the existing new bungalows and developments at the Wheatsheaf garage and house in Popham Lane, will be far greater. There are also a number of other small developments planned in North Waltham awaiting decision which, if approved, will have a significant impact on traffic. Hampshire County Council (HCC), as the Highways Authority, consider each planning application individually and assess each application on its own merits but do not take the cumulative effect of additional ongoing developments into their assessment. The Parish Council have already approached HCC regarding this issue and are awaiting a response.
- A heritage report has been compiled by residents, which has been submitted to BDBC today with legal representation. This had only come to the PC today and several Councillors had not had the opportunity to read yet. The heritage report addresses the impact on Boundary House and North Waltham village as a whole and draws different conclusions to the report submitted by the applicant. The proposed development is adjacent to the North Waltham Conservation area and its impact needs to be considered.
- This proposed development is outside of the settlement policy boundary and creates an incongruous settlement pattern. It is adjacent to the conservation boundary and due to being at a higher elevation will lead to harm to the sight lines called up by the conservation area plan.
- Residents expressed concerns about the lack of privacy. Both bungalows would face into their existing back gardens.
- It was questioned whether another TDC could be submitted for two more dwellings in the near future. The PIP approved the building of 4 dwellings and there is further land available at the site. Any further development, after the PIP expires, will need a full application to be submitted.
- Concern was expressed about BDBC's continuing lack of a 5-year land supply and that there was great concern about speculative developments across the Borough. However, BDBC have announced a date to consider the Manydown development and, if approved, this situation may change.
- Local residents are not in favour of this development and asked how they can involve further support. It was suggested that the PC engage the support of Borough Councillors, who have more influence and could request that this is taken to Development Committee on the weight of public opinion or at the request of a Borough Councillor. Concern was expressed about the deadline for comments on the consultation and the PC clarified that the Planning Authority are obliged to take into account any comments made up to the point of decision. The Clerk confirmed that she had already agreed an extension to the consultation deadline.
- A resident asked if there is any power to ensure the development remain single storey. The PC advised that the Planning Authority could make this a condition of approval.
- Concern was expressed that the developer was claiming exemption from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the development was 'self-build'. However, it was questioned as to how the developer could occupy both bungalows. The PC explained that CIL is split between the PC and BDBC to help improve local facilities, e.g. parks, leisure facilities, and would not be used by utility companies.

