

Kings Worthy Parish Council

Minutes of the Planning & Highways committee meeting

held on Tuesday, 09 November 2021 at 19:30

in the Main Hall at Kings Worthy Primary School, Church Lane, Kings Worthy

Attendees

Councillors Ian Gordon (Chair of the meeting), Signe Biddle, Colin Cossburn, Mandy Hallisey and Les Haswell

Clerk(s)

Christopher Read & Louise Daniel

Apologies

None.

Members of the public

23 (including Cllr Steve Cramoysan [WCC])

P/21/093 – Public question time

Cllr Gordon stated to the meeting that due to the number of objections already received by Winchester City Council (WCC) this application would almost certainly be going before the WCC planning committee. Members of the public attending the WCC planning committee meeting will only get 3 minutes to talk collectively. Thus, he recommended that local residents that wish to object should appoint a representative to speak on their behalf.

Three members of the public wished to speak about the application being discussed.

A resident of a property neighbouring the application site thanked the Parish Council for organising the meeting. They noted their objections which included but were not limited to:

- The need for housing given that the 250 dwelling Local Plan Part 2 target had been reached.
- The high density of housing proposed on the site.
- The bio-diversity impact of the proposal.
- Issues with vehicles using the site including the available space for heavy goods and delivery vehicles.
- Issues of sustainability and traffic impact with the demolition of a 4-year old house to construct a new site entrance.

The local resident also noted that there is limit of 5000-words given to members of the public replying, whilst the developers have submitted a 17-page document. The local resident had

issues with this document including the reference to the 250 dwelling target which does not take into account other local developments such as Barton Farm.

Another resident that also lives adjacent to the application site noted their objections which included but were not limited to:

- The potential water and drainage issues which would result from the proposal, particularly on Springvale Road.
- The large price offered for the dwelling that is to be demolished for the new entrance way (£750,000).
- The developer is not looking to keep the current trees and some clearance has already taken place.
- They had bought a property that is open to the rear and their house would be exposed to the dwellings on the proposed site.

A local resident who lives in Springvale Road stated their objections to the application which included but were not limited to:

- It was agreed by WCC that the Top Field development would be within the fenced area. This proposed development may result in a road being put through the reptile mitigation area, which is to the rear of the application site, and potential further development on Top Field.
- Issues with the number of available school places at the local primary school.
- Funding for the Tesco layby has been available, then not, then available again.

P/21/094 – To Consider the following planning application:

21/02410/OUT

132A Springvale Road And 2 - 5 Tudor Way Kings Worthy Hampshire

Proposal: Redevelopment of the site to provide 26 dwellings.

Discussion –

Cllr Biddle has concerns with the impact on the local resources such as doctors' surgeries.

Cllr Haswell stated that he was informed by an estate agent that the village is growing more dense, not expanding.

Cllr Cossburn stated that having lived in the village for 40 years he has seen it fill in. Foxwood Close and Boxall Gardens are both examples of developments in back gardens. He noted that the application site is a brownfield site.

However, there is a big issue with the density (34 dwellings per hectare [DPH]), with the Local Plan density being 30 DPH. The application documentation also refers to materials that match the surrounding area but refers to reconstituted stone which is not in-keeping.

Cllr Cossburn's view was unless the trees have Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), they do not need permission to fell them. There are approximately 35-45 trees coming down but only approximately 24 replacing them. Some form of development on the site is very likely. Hampshire County Council (HCC) highways have not commented as there is a lack of sufficient information available for them to do so.

Cllr Cossburn felt that the Parish Council should object to the application on the grounds of:

- The high density of the proposal.
- The effect on the street scene particularly from the other side of the valley.
- The proximity of the additional new entrance to the existing which could be dangerous.
- The impact of the traffic (over 100 movement per day) particularly on 130 & 132B Springvale Road.
- Impact on the environment
- School places – These houses will get school places over existing properties that are further from the school.
- The lack of adequate parking particularly given the 30mph speed limit as people can park on the Springvale Road.

Cllr Haswell noted that that the target of 250 dwellings for the parish had not been reached.

He also stated that there are no footpaths proposed and thus HCC are unlikely to adopt the road or provide streetlights.

Replying to a comment, Cllr Gordon stated that the wooded land adjacent to the application site has been sold to another developer.

Cllr Gordon stated that the agreement made when WCC built on Top Field means they own it. They have no intentions of selling it or allowing it to be further developed.

The Tesco layby is going ahead but the plan for it to come from CIL was not put in writing. There are issues with services in the grass verge being too close to the surface.

Cllr Steve Cramoysan [WCC] noted the procedures for WCC planning committee meeting to members of the public including that as a WCC Councillor he gets 5 minutes to speak.

Cllr Cossburn stated that local residents should appoint a representative to speak on their behalf and asked if they can make themselves known to the Clerk so that Cllr Cramoysan, the Parish Council and the appointed representative can ensure speakers do not repeat themselves.

It was noted that the TPO for the willow tree at the entrance to Tudor Way has been removed. A member of the public had been informed, as had Cllr Steve Cramoysan (WCC), that this was due to the tree being diseased.

A vote was held on the application with 0 in favour, 5 against and 0 abstaining.

It was therefore unanimously agreed to object to the application with the formal response to be drafted by Cllr Cossburn and agreed at the next committee meeting.

P/21/095 – Clerk’s Notices

None.

P/21/096 – Chairman’s Notices

None.

P/21/097 – Items for discussion at the next meeting on the 23 November 2021

None.

Meeting Closed at 20:49.

Signed:

Date: