

Headbourne Worthy Parish Council

Minutes of extraordinary meeting 4th October 2011

7.45 Church Rooms, St Mary's Church, London Road, Kings Worthy

Present

Councillor David Pearcey, Chairman

Councillor Jane Rutter

Councillor Lisa Wright

Clerk Hilary Graham

Public

Mr Rob Williams, Williams Ewan Ltd

Mr Mike Brownlow, Studio Four Architects Ltd

Mr Nick Brewster, National Westminster Bank

Mr Roy Williams, of 145 Springvale Road

Mr Martin Ingram, resident of Bentley Close

Mrs Kirsten Ingram, resident of Bentley Close

1. Councillor Pearcey made the introductions and explained that the meeting had been called to discuss the development proposed by Williams Ewan Ltd at 143 and 145 Springvale Road.
2. He gave a history of the application and the Parish Council's position to date.
3. Springvale Road was the subject of a Local Area Design Statement (LADS) in 2007. This came about because of residents' concerns regarding piecemeal development and was paid for by Winchester City Council (WCC). The statement was adopted by Winchester City Council as a "Supplementary Planning Document" and something which would be a "material consideration" in a planning application.
4. Planning application 09/02020/FUL 147 Springvale Road. This had been developed by Williams Ewan Limited. Four properties had been built where one stood previously. The Parish Council strongly objected, mainly on the grounds that it was contrary to LADS. The plans were altered and eventually Winchester City Council gave planning permission. Whilst acknowledging that the decision was WCC's to make Headbourne Worthy Parish Council (HWPC) felt sufficiently strongly that it sought clarification from Mr Simon Finch, head of planning for WCC. He stated that he was of the opinion that it was appropriate for the permission to be granted and Councillor Pearcey quoted part of his reply: "the document culminates in a series of development guidelines ...I am satisfied that the permitted scheme

generally respects them..... It seems to me that this development is a bespoke design in response to the constraints and opportunities of this site and its setting." HWPC reluctantly accepted this explanation.

5. Planning application 10/03279/FUL 145 Springvale Road. This was the first application for the current plot. HWPC, despite the outcome of the adjacent site, objected on the grounds that this was contrary to LADS. Following that Mr Williams of Williams Ewan Ltd attended the HWPC meeting on the 9th May 2011 and acquainted the meeting with the plans. As WCC were likely to require new plans the Parish Council's decision stood pending their receipt.
6. As a separate matter members of HWPC had attended a meeting with the Winchester City Planning department to discuss the practical application of LADS and were satisfied that the broad principles had been applied in the case of 147.
7. Planning application 11/01436/FUL 145 Springvale Road. This was the second application. This was discussed at the HWPC meeting on the 11th July, which Mr Williams attended. There was not a Council quorum at that meeting and the two Councillors present were pleased with the amendments, particularly the interlinking with the site next door. The Clerk undertook to canvass the other Councillors and call an extraordinary meeting if there was an overall objection. The deadline for the submission of an objection passed and none was submitted. Subsequently Andrea Swain of WCC Planning Department contacted the clerk to say that she was considering refusing the plans on the grounds of overdevelopment and insufficient landscaping, and would appreciate a written opinion from HWPC. As the Parish Council's meeting of the 12th September was imminent the matter was discussed there. Mr Williams was not present as he was not aware of the issues. A quorum decided to object on the grounds of overdevelopment, insufficient landscaping and exits from several properties onto Springvale Road close to other exits.
8. Mr Williams then contacted the Clerk to ask for an extraordinary meeting so that he could present his views and WCC agreed to give a two week deferral so that arrangements could be made.

Mr Rob Williams

9. He said that local input was important and that he had brought a new drawing for the meeting to consider as new plans were being prepared. The reference of this amendment was: Drawing 02, Job no 30051, Revision K. WCC was going to refuse permission for the current application and a revised application would be submitted. He had a meeting with WCC on the 7th October.
10. This plan reduced the number of properties to 3 and increased the landscaping.
11. Mr and Mrs Ingram were concerned about traffic. Mrs Ingram asked for consideration to be given to gaps in the fencing for hedgehogs and toads. This was being done. The reduction in the number of properties would go some way in addressing the traffic issues. They also said that they had received no letters from the developers before commencement of the scheme. Mr Williams could not understand this as they had written to all the neighbouring properties.
12. After some discussion HWPC agreed to stand by the objection to the current plans (11/01436/FUL), and support the new scheme.
13. The meeting finished at 8.48