

FORDINGBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 12th May 2021 at 7.30pm in the Town Hall (Minutes subject to approval at the next meeting of the Council)

Present: Cllr Paton - Chairman
Cllrs Adams, Anstey, Earth, Hale, Goldsmith, Jackson, Lewendon, Mouland,
White and Wilson

In attendance: Paul Goddard, Town Clerk
Rachel Edwards, Asst Town Clerk
Reporter from the Salisbury Journal
The applicant for planning application 21/10286
6 neighbours of planning application 21/10286
2 Members of the Public

1. To elect a chair

Cllr Wilson proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Adams and therefore **RESOLVED**: that Cllr Paton be elected as chair of the Planning Committee. All in favour.

2. To elect a vice chair

Cllr Paton proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Hale and therefore **RESOLVED**: that Cllr Lewendon be elected as vice chair of the Planning Committee. All in favour.

3. To receive any apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Perkins and Cllr Bellows (NFDC).

4. To receive any Declarations of Interest

Cllr Adams declared an interest in applications 21/10524 and 21/10286 as the applicants are trade customers. Cllr Adams said he would remain in the room while these applications were being discussed but not speak or vote.

Cllr Jackson declared an interest in applications 21/10286 as he is a friend of the applicant. Cllr Jackson said he would remain in the room while these applications were being discussed but not speak or vote.

5. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 14th April 2021 and report any matters arising

Cllr Hale proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Mouland and therefore **RESOLVED**: that the minutes of the meeting held on the 14th April 2021 be signed as a true record. All in favour.

Matters arising

Agenda item 13 – Penny Farthing homes advised that residents' consultation letters were sent to 102 properties, regarding the proposed Tinkers Cross development, planning application 20/11469. Cllr Lewendon found this improbable and asked the Clerk to find out to which addresses these letters were sent.

Action: Clerk to ask developers for addresses

6. To receive any matters raised by Members of the Public

No matters raised.

7. To report any Results on Planning Applications, Appeals, Tree Works Applications & Tree Preservation Orders made

Application 21/10460

SITE: BICKTON ASH, BICKTON LANE, BICKTON, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 2HA
DESCRIPTION: Electric car charging point (Lawful Development Certificate that permission is not required for proposal)
DECISION: Was Lawful

Application 19/10881

SITE: LAND AT ST JOHNS FARM, STUCKTON ROAD, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1AR
DESCRIPTION: 20 no. retirement homes; 78no. dwellings; village hall; playground; new access arrangements and associated development (All matters reserved except Access)
DECISION: Refused

Application 20/11439

SITE: 47-49 HIGH STREET, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1AS
DESCRIPTION: Extension and alterations to an existing shop and 5 bedroom flat to form a shop at ground floor level and 4x flats (1x 1-bed, 2x 2-bed, 1x 3-bed), with associated external alterations.
DECISION: Refused

Application 20/11440

SITE: 47-49 HIGH STREET, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1AS
DESCRIPTION: Extension and alterations to an existing shop and 5 bedroom flat to form a shop at ground floor level and 4x flats (1x 1-bed, 2x 2-bed, 1x 3-bed), with associated external alterations (Application for Listed Building Consent)
DECISION: Refused

Application 20/11281

SITE: 5 SYCAMORE COURT, HIGH STREET, FORDINGBRIDGE P6 1RQ
DESCRIPTION: Rebuild the roof turret with weatherproof material due to it causing issues
DECISION: Granted Subject to Conditions

Application 21/10391

SITE: FORDINGBRIDGE FARM SHOP, ARCH FARM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, WHITSBURY ROAD, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1NQ
DESCRIPTION: External alterations to existing outbuilding (Retrospective)
DECISION: Granted Subject to Conditions

Appeal Decisions

No appeal decisions.

Tree Work Decisions

No tree work decisions.

8. To consider new Planning Applications

21/10524	61 CHURCH STREET, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1BB	Mr Shering - Crownshade Ltd
Raising of the parapet wall & chimney stack (Application for Listed Building Consent)		
<p>Cllr Anstey reported that the proposal seeks to raise the central chimney stack shared by No.59 and 61 Church Street, Fordingbridge, and raise the gable parapet wall to the end of No.61. The need to raise both elements has come about as the roof thatch has been built up over the decades, progressively increasing the thickness of the roof covering, thus causing the thatch to over sail the height of the parapet wall in places. Consequently, the abutment between the wall and the thatch is unable to provide an adequate weather tight junction. Furthermore, the Chimney Stack has been shortened in height through the increase in thatch layers, and as such the safe permitted height required by Building Regulations from the top of the chimney pot to the thatch line has been breached. The shared chimney is to be carefully taken down to bottom of corbel detail, and then rebuilt 5 brick course high to restore the height relationship between the thatch and the top of chimney.</p> <p>The Conservation Officer had no objection, stating in her report that there would be no impact upon the significance of the listed building and the proposal would be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and local planning policies.</p> <p>Cllr Anstey proposed and it was seconded by Cllr White and therefore RESOLVED to recommend PERMISSION under PAR3, as there is no detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the building and the proposal allows for a weather tight junction. All in favour.</p>		

21/10286	16 SALISBURY STREET, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1AF	Mr Cheal
Use of the outside area from residential garden to cafe seating area and children's play area; 2no. single-storey outbuildings; demolition of existing; decking and fencing; Alteration to route of existing pedestrian right of way from No.12 across site to Salisbury Street		
<p>Cllr Paton presented this application to change the use of the rear garden behind 'Bubbles' at 16 Salisbury Street as outlined in the description. Cllr Paton reported that this application has attracted many comments from members of the public, both for and against the proposal. There is no flood risk and no adverse impact on the biodiversity of the site. Following a desk-based assessment, the planning officer recommended considering the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning history of the site; - Impact on residential amenity of adjacent neighbouring properties, in respect of light, visual intrusion and privacy; - Creating healthy and safe communities through good design; - Impact on the character and appearance of the area, including Fordingbridge Conservation Area; - Impact on vitality and viability of town centre; - Impact on the local delivery of services, including local shops and pubs; <p>A neighbour of this planning application gave the following speech:</p> <p>"I strongly object to the development that has already been constructed at 16 Salisbury Street due to its intrusive nature on existing neighbours and this negative impact must be taken into consideration.</p> <p>"The development of new houses that I live in was granted planning permission and constructed, legally, well before this development began. I alerted the planning department to the breach in planning permission, in January 2019, but it has taken over two year since then for the applicant to apply for permission. This new development has direct lines of sight into my property and garden, as well as the garden shared by the other residents at 18-20 Salisbury</p>		

Street. Not only is this overlooking and a visual intrusion but also a complete loss of privacy. This is clearly unacceptable from any development.

"I am aware that the applicant will state that noise is a factor when purchasing a property in a town centre but I would disagree. Yes, Fordingbridge is a town centre that has many shops but all of them are on the high street, not behind it where all of the land use is for residential properties. In fact, the applicant has previously constructed residential properties in this area and the planning committee have approved other residential developments behind Salisbury Street.

"The area of land behind Salisbury Street is currently an area of tranquillity, which is unique to a town centre, and should be celebrated, not destroyed. Many people have moved here because of this and the Town Council must take into consideration its residents and not vote in favour purely because this is a business.

"The proposed walkway for the development is directly behind many houses and a constant footfall up and down it will cause huge noise disturbance. The noise levels that would be created from an area for young children must also be taken into consideration. Having experienced the noise created by a group of around 40 people visiting the site in the last month, I can tell you that it would force me to keep my windows and doors closed during the peak of summer which is my only source of natural ventilation. I have seen that the working hours have been described as non-impactful by the applicant. However, these do not take into account the fact that a vast majority of neighbours are retirees or employees who now work from home and will do so for the foreseeable. The modern world does not work 9-5. Therefore, these working hours, producing huge amounts of noise, will have a negative impact on the residents of the surrounding properties. The amount of seating that has been created has also been neglected. The development has seating for over 100 people, which would have a huge increase on the current noise levels of the area.

"The planning that has been submitted is incorrect. We can assume that, as this is a retrospective application, the applicant has supplied false information in an attempt to purposefully mislead yourselves. Firstly, there was no existing decking or air conditioning unit at the site as stated in the application. Also, the largest outbuilding is not a storage shed – it is in fact a fully fitted kitchen with foul sewerage, which I am sure you have seen from the images submitted. The impact of this development having a functioning kitchen outside only leads to further noise disturbance, from cooking and serving food and drink, and problems with odour that have not been addressed. I would also be concerned about litter ending up in the River Avon, a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Surely you cannot make a decision in favour of an application that is known to be false.

"I can see that the applicant managed to get many comments supporting the proposal but, as I am sure you have already noted, the majority of these come from people who live outside of Fordingbridge and therefore the development has no impact on them. They also have not mentioned the material consideration listed. If I had posted the link to the planning portal on Facebook, as was done by one of the applicant's contacts, then I could have had a huge number of comments to object but they would also be irrelevant.

"I have also seen that retrospective planning permission has been submitted for another development by the applicant showing that the applicant has no regard for how the planning process works. As an experienced developer, I find this shocking.

"I urge you to refuse this development and I ask for you to reverse the changes made, not only because the application is incorrect but because of the impact on the privacy and disturbance that it would cause neighbours. If this application is permitted then I feel that we have strong grounds for appeal and legal representation will be sought on the basis of statutory nuisance

among other things. We are not advocating the closing of a business but are objecting to its expansion into a residential area.”

The applicant responded that the gardens to the rear of 16 Salisbury Street had full view of the residences next door before the neighbours purchased their properties. He has since put up screening to mitigate the impact on the neighbours. He said that the flood defence wall determined the height of the decking in the application and that this is higher than the neighbouring garden which forms part of the flood plain. The applicant said that an Environmental Health survey had been carried out on the air conditioning unit on the outbuilding and this was found to be at the ultra low noise level. He also reported that heavy timber seating had been chosen to avoid excess sound made by people moving chairs. He asserted that the reasons given in the objections were incorrect.

A second neighbour reported that the applicant was incorrect in saying that residents had chosen to buy properties overlooked by the public. He said that no one had chosen to live next door to a busy café with a viewing platform into their garden or into the rear windows of their homes. He said that the loss of privacy was a serious concern and the neighbours will be greatly affected by this application.

Cllr Wilson asked the applicant how high the decking is. A neighbour reported that it is 1m 07cm above their garden and the decking is used by members of the public.

Cllr Anstey reported that the number of issues raised cannot be addressed at this meeting and needs to be put to NFDC. Cllr Earth agreed.

A third neighbour said that while the application is for a lovely development, 100 people sitting immediately adjacent to a private garden, with a trellis that can be seen straight through, is inappropriate. The applicant reported that the screening could be changed for something thicker but that this would cast a shadow over the adjacent garden. The second neighbour responded that there is nothing more that the applicant could do to minimise the impact of the proposal and that’s exactly why the application should be refused. The applicant reported that the (retrospective) pre-app had been approved.

Cllr Wilson said that the application is complicated with different elements of decking, seating and outbuildings covered in just one application. She thought more information was needed regarding the specific height of the decking and fencing. Cllr Hale was concerned that the application doesn’t match up with the reality of what’s been installed, especially with regards to the kitchen. Also, that the decking should have had its own separate application.

Two proposals were made:

1. Cllr Anstey proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Wilson to recommend REFUSAL under PAR4. This motion was not voted on.
2. Cllr Lewendon proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Hale and therefore **RESOLVED** to ask for further information from NFDC. 8 in favour, 1 against

Action: Clerk to arrange a site visit for Councillors to view the proposals

20/10952	86 Whitsbury Road, Fordingbridge SP6 1LA	Mrs Hughes
Demolish existing garage and erect new detached garage with associated home office space over		
Cllr Jackson reported on this re-consultation. He said that the original application had a proposal for external stairs and Fordingbridge Town Council recommended refusal under PAR4 because the external stairs would overlook the neighbouring gardens. The plans have now been changed to incorporate the staircase within the building and the neighbour has withdrawn their objection.		
Cllr Jackson proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Goldsmith and therefore RESOLVED to recommend PERMISSION under PAR3, as the staircase would now be internal to the building and the neighbour has withdrawn their objection. All in favour,		

[All members of public left the meeting.]

9. To consider new Tree Works Applications

Members noted the following tree works applications.

Case Ref: CONS/21/0189
Site Address: 2 Cottage Mews, Fordingbridge, SP6 1RJ
Proposed Works: Ash x 1 Reduce
Reason: To reduce excessive shading of garden

Case Ref: CONS/21/0223
Proposed Works: Golden Cypress x 1 Fell
Site Address: 15 Bartons Road, Fordingbridge, SP6 1JD
Reason: Because of proximity to thatched dwelling, excessive shading, low amenity value, previously reduced by approx 50% and subsequent re-growth is poorly formed. Multiple stems are rubbing both 11kv overhead cable and BT line. Client believes the predominant lean has increased in the last 2 years.

Case Ref: TPO/21/0221
Proposed Works: Sycamore x 1 Reduce
Site Address: 81 Allenwater Drive, Fordingbridge, SP6 1RE
Reason: Sycamore - Crown raise by removing the lowest 3 limbs this is because they are over extended and the aim is to get the canopy more upright, Reduce the remaining crown by 2-3 metres to remove sail affect as the tree has recently shed a few limbs.

Cllr Wilson queried whether the tree (application TPO/21/0221) was sited in the garden of 81 Allenwater Drive or on adjacent land belonging to the Town Council.

Action: Clerk to confirm location of tree

[The Salisbury Journal reporter returned to the meeting.]

10. To consider any Licensing Act 2003 applications

No Licensing Act 2003 applications.

11. To receive an update on the NFDC planning document

The Clerk sent a summary in advance of the meeting, detailing which Councillors had expressed an interest in particular elements of the NFDC plan. These were as follows:

Community Facilities: Cllrs Hale and Paton
Play areas: Cllr Paton
Communication Strategy: Cllr White
Public Realm: Cllr Wilson
Street Furniture: Cllr Wilson
Signage: Cllr Wilson
Walking & Cycling routes: Cllr Moulard
Bus shelters: Cllr Lewendon
Car Parking: Cllr Goldsmith

Cllr Wilson was concerned about the communication between HCC, NFDC and FTC. She also emphasised that there are tight timescales to meet. Cllr Paton said that everyone with an area of responsibility needs to go away and work on it and report back.

Cllr Jackson asked about the role of the Neighbourhood Plan steering group and advised that if the group is to be disbanded then this needs to be a formal Council decision. Cllr Lewendon reported that if the Neighbourhood Plan is not completed then FTC would not be entitled to an extra portion of CIL funding.

Action: Clerk to add Neighbourhood Plan to General Council agenda

12. To note any items of correspondence

An update on the Augustus Park development has been received – see Appendix.

13. To receive a report from the Clerk or any other relevant planning business

Nothing to report.

14. To note the date of the next meeting as Wednesday 16th June 2021

The meeting closed at 8.37pm.

Strategic Sites Update (May 2021)

FORD 1 – Augustus Park, (Land East of Whitsbury Road), Fordingbridge SP6 1NQ
Planning Permission Ref: 17/10150 – 145 dwellings

The bio-retention pond has not yet been remediated. I spoke to the Site Manager and he stated that he thought a contractor has now been found and that the remediation work would be carried out in the short term.

The swale headwalls are required to be faced off with brick. The Site Manager stated that he would get them completed by the end of next week.

The cracked section of pathway adjoining Whitsbury Road has not been remediated. The Site Manager is going to chase this with Hampshire County Council.

The Landscape company are returning to site in the short term to complete the gravel pathway in the Eastern SANG, including linking the path from the development to the pathway already in situ. They will also have another look at the planting in the internal courtyard adjoining Plots 71-76 to make sure that all required planting has gone in. (It looked a bit bare in places.)

The Western entrance to the Eastern SANG is now open.

We are liaising with the Developer to ensure a suitable maintenance access to the Western SANG for the maintenance mower etc. is constructed.

Plots 122-130 have not yet commenced construction. Plots 119-121 are at ground floor level. Plots 133-137 are at roofline. Plots 131 and 132 are having windows and doors fitted. Plots 144, 145 are at the external and internal stages. Plots 100-111 are completed, as are all remaining houses in the development.

In Phase 1 two houses are being used by the Sales Team and are not for sale at present. All the remaining houses are occupied.

In Phase 2 all houses are occupied.

In Phase 3 four houses have been reserved and three have exchanged. The rest are occupied.

In Phase 4 seven houses are for sale. All the rest have been reserved. These are all pending construction.

Regular monitoring of this site by the Site Monitoring Officer will continue in the short, medium and long term.

