



MINUTES OF ADDITIONAL ORDINARY MEETING

**Monday 1st February 2021 at 7:30pm
via Zoom**

Councillors Present

Cllr Geoff Chapman (GC) – Chairman (Chair), Cllr David James (DJ), Cllr Bill Preston (BP)
Cllr Gary Whiteside (GW) and Sharon Shea (Clerk)

**207/FC/
10/20-21** **Apologies for absence** Cllr Judith McGinley (JMG)
Did not attend Cllr Peter Waggett (PW)

**208/FC/
10/20-21** **Declarations of Interest**
None

**209/FC/
10/20-21** **Meeting open to the Public**
At least twelve members of the public attended via eight Zoom sessions (not all sessions used the video function so the exact number is unknown)

**210/FC/
10/20-21** **Planning Applications**
The Parish Council considered the following planning applications:

- (a) **20/03544/FUL Land south of St Michael's Close, North Waltham**
Full planning application for the erection of two dwellings with access, garaging, parking and landscaping and associated works.

No representation from the applicant.

Discussion: The Chair pointed out that this was the fourth application in relation to this site following the PIP (approved) and two technical details applications (both refused, one under appeal). The date for the PIP has expired and now the applicant has submitted a full application. The main issues relating to the technical details applications, namely nitrates offset and surface water runoff, remain to be addressed.

Although approval of the PIP suggests that the proposals for land usage are acceptable, it does not follow that the proposed development is acceptable. The PIP remained valid for one year only and is likely to have been approved at all only because the local authority could not demonstrate a 5-year land supply. As a result considerably less weight was given to the Local Plan, many requirements of which have been set aside for this development.

Concerns were expressed over the demarcation lines marked on the plan as it remains very unclear who would be responsible for what, particularly shared areas such as driveways, the space between properties and land at the southern boundary. There was no indication of how land deemed as 'protected' in relation to nitrates offset (e.g. shown in the plan as meadow or wooded areas) would continue to be protected, nor who would bear any responsibility for it and be accountable for its use in the future.

Many concerns were raised over surface water runoff as development at the site to date has seen an increase in flooding in St Michael's Close; additional development can only make this worse. The proposals for use of permeable surfaces at the site are not deemed practical as the soil below the surface is clay. Also, once the properties are purchased, the new owners

might well replace permeable surfaces with hard paving thereby removing even the possibility of surface water being adequately managed. It remains unclear how such changes could be controlled and how the proposed responsibilities of householders regarding drainage measures at the site could be enforced. The current soakaway system in St Michael's Close does not work properly now; although cleared regularly the pipes to the chambers become blocked and dirty water can be seen coming up from the drains. The risk of residents' homes and gardens becoming flooded has increased and is a growing concern.

Recent experiences have reinforced concerns about issues with the sewerage system, which is already inadequate and prone to frequent blockages. The system has been overloaded since St Michael's Close was completed decades ago and that issue has never been addressed. For the system to work adequately just for the current residents the existing 6" pipes would need to be replaced with 12" pipes – an enormous and expensive undertaking. The water company appears unaware of the scale or frequency of incidents as the local operative is familiar with the system, knows the issues and deals with problems on a regular basis. Additional loading could well result in the infrastructure deteriorating beyond the point of repair.

Significant concerns were raised over the lack of clarity regarding ongoing responsibility and accountability for various aspects of managing the site, particularly as these aspects centre on problems that are deemed not to have been adequately addressed such as the nitrates offset and the surface water runoff proposals. The latter is of particular concern as the negative effects of the development that has taken place at the site to date are all too apparent further down St Michael's Close.

Parish Council response: Objection – see full response at Appendix A.

(b) 20/03458/ROC Former Wheatsheaf Garage, North Waltham

Variation of condition nos. 1 and 3 of planning consent 20/00540/ROC for amendment to the landscaping on the site frontage.

No representation from the applicant.

Discussion: The PC accepted as valid the reasons for replacing a hedge with a small retaining wall.

Parish Council response: No objection.

(c) T/00659/20/TCA North Waltham Primary School, Church Road, North Waltham

Application for works to trees growing in a conservation area.

PROPOSAL: We would like to selectively thin an area out by a third to allow natural light into classrooms and to stop the deterioration of the large wood frames of the building.

No representation from the applicant.

Discussion: No comment.

Parish Council response: No objection.

(d) T/00013/21/TCA 17 St Michael’s Close, North Waltham
 Application for works to trees growing in a conservation area.
 PROPOSAL:
 Tree 1 Whitebeam: fell.
 Tree 2 Beech: crown reduce 3/4m all round leaving a finished height of 10m and radius of 3/4m. Crown lift to 4m.

No representation from the applicant.

Discussion: No comment.

Parish Council response: No objection.

(e) T/00671/20/TPO 2 St Michael’s Close, North Waltham
 Application for works to trees growing in a conservation area.
 PROPOSAL: Ash:-fell. [This tree has significant decay at the base.]

No representation from the applicant.

Discussion: No comment.

Parish Council response: No objection.

(f) T/00047/21/TCA 9 St Michael’s Close, North Waltham
 Application for works to trees – conservation area
 T1 Willow: pollard to 3m
 T2 Cypress: fell.

No representation from the applicant.

Discussion: No comment.

Parish Council response: No objection.

ACTION:
 Complete online consultation forms to BDBC.

Clerk

211/FC/10/20-21 **Date of Next Meeting** – As and when required

Signed Date

APPENDIX 1

RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION 20/03544/FUL**Land south of St Michael's Close, North Waltham, Hampshire****Full planning application for the erection of two dwellings with access, garaging, parking and landscaping and associated works****Parish Council's response to consultation:**

Objection, reflecting the views of local residents, with the following comments:

1. Nitrates offset

The PC notes that concerns relating to nitrates offset have still not been satisfactorily addressed. As the application does not make clear who is responsible for various areas of the site, it is unclear how land currently deemed to be 'protected' as part of the nitrates offset plan will continue to be protected – i.e. there is no covenant in place. Should that land be developed in future then the nitrates offset will be nullified. It is unclear how the land will be protected for the future and how its protection will be monitored and enforced.

2. Run-off drainage

The PC notes that significant concerns regarding run-off drainage have not been satisfactorily addressed. There is evidence that development to date at the site has increased flooding problems in St Michael's Close. Although cleared on a regular basis, the existing soakaways are frequently overloaded as pipes leading to the chambers become blocked leaving dirty water circulating back up to the surface. Further development can only exacerbate the problem and increase the risk of flooding residents' homes and gardens.

The proposal describes the use of permeable surfaces to manage surface water drainage. It is unclear how this provision (which in itself is likely to be inadequate as any porous surface will still be laid onto clay, which is impermeable) will be managed in future should a householder decide to cover the area with block paving for example.

As with the nitrate offset proposed by the developer it is unclear who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance required to maintain any of the proposed drainage solutions, whether effective or not, and how this will be monitored and enforced. Again, there is no covenant in place to restrict what a property owner can do in future which could affect run-off drainage.

3. Sewerage

It is well known to the residents that the current sewerage system in St Michael's Close is inadequate and has been since it was first installed around 40 years ago with 6" pipes. Were it to be installed today, it would be with 12" pipes. The system regularly fills with sludge and needs unblocking, and this is very unpleasant and worrying for residents. The company responsible appears unaware of the scale of the problem although it is their local operative who deals with incidents on a regular basis. Any increase in the loading of the system with more properties risks more frequent and more damaging episodes that could result in the whole requiring replacement.

4. Location

The proposed development does not:

- relate well to the existing settlement;
- respect the qualities of the local landscape and neither is it sympathetic to its character and visual quality, especially the historical view from the churchyard;
- respect and relate to the character, form and appearance of surrounding development;
- respect the amenities of the residents of neighbouring properties.

In addition, it would be an extra burden on an ageing infrastructure, the impact of which has already been felt with the current development of two dwellings.