

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE **2320**
14 SEPTEMBER 2016, 7.30 PM BIANCHI ROOM, OTTERBOURNE VILLAGE HALL

Present: Cllrs Jones (C); Acton; Barton-Briddon; Stansbury; Romero; Rodford; Moody

In attendance: District Cllrs Jan Warwick; Eleanor Bell; Brian Laming; 75 Parishioners; Clerk

1. Apologies for Absence: Cllr Stirrup
2. Declaration of Interest: None received.
3. Planning Application Case No. 16/02115/OUT
Site address: Land East of Main Road, Otterbourne
Outline planning permission by Gladman Developments for up to 90 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access point from Main Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.

The Chairman opened the meeting and Cllr Acton gave a summary of the planning process to-date. WCC had completed Local Plan Part 1 and Part 2. LPP 1 had been adopted and LPP2 was in the final stage awaiting the Independent Examiner's report. At both Independent Hearings a number of developers had made challenges. At LPP1 there had been attempt to re-designate the MTRA3 status of Otterbourne which required no target for housing developments to be set and only for development with community support to be considered outside of the settlement boundary. Further challenge had then been made to the settlement boundary and green gaps. WCC had supported Otterbourne's existing position as submitted at LPP1 and the Independent Examiner had agreed. At LPP2, developers had challenged the adequacy of the housing land supply set aside by WCC to meet local need with presumption that if found insufficient the National Planning Policy Framework would be used for applications outside of the settlement boundary. The Independent Examiner's report was awaited, but a preliminary letter had been received advising the Examiner felt the land supply was adequate and there was no need to find more.

To support its position at the LPP1 stage, the Parish Council had undertaken a Village Survey from which feedback had been received in support of some small scale development of 10-25 houses and some affordable housing for purchase. This had been met with the community's support at the Bourne Close development and was currently under consideration for the Coles Mede proposal.

The Gladman Developments website was important for residents to view. Planning Applications on behalf of developers were frequently taken to Appeal and to the High Court. The Gladman consultation which had been sent out to all households had received 11 responses: 1 from Otterbourne Parish Council advising the land was outside of the settlement boundary and the proposed development had not been identified by the community; 1 letter in support and 9 letters from residents who were not supportive of the development.

The Parish Council had called the Planning Committee meeting in order to gain feedback from residents before formulating its response to WCC.

4. Open Session for Parishioners

The following matters were raised:

Otterbourne School was at full capacity and was unable to take all children from the village this year. Further housing development would mean additional year on year capacity could not be met for the number of extra children. Gladman had said schoolchildren were attending from outside of the village, but this was because the school was of high standard and it attracted children from outside of the catchment area. It was currently oversubscribed by those who lived within catchment. It was in a constricted site.

The Coles Mede junction was already very congested and Main Road was very busy. The Cranbourne Drive junction was also very congested and difficult to exit. Main Road acted as the alternative route when the M3 was closed or was congested. Additional development of 90 dwellings could bring 180 extra vehicles and increase traffic problems with concern for emergency vehicles being unable to gain access.

It had been advised that the land was unused, but that this was only in recent years and due to the scale of rent increase for the land. The question was raised as to whether the recent application for a stable block had been genuine.

The proposed development land was owned by the Lovegrove family and their land extended some miles beyond. The concern was raised that if this application should succeed it would bring further applications for development into the countryside around the village.

There would be loss of the countryside footpath which was well used by villagers and had been in existence for centuries. Although this was shown on the development plans, it would be significantly changed in nature and no longer a countryside walk, but one through a housing estate bounded by housing and fencing on both sides.

The whole of the land between the village and the Itchen was floodplain and the proposed land formed a vital part of the village's flood defences. The waterways through the land should not be compromised. The field was important for water retention and development would increase run-off and flooding in the village.

The loss of habitat for wildlife such as newts and bats was raised.

It was not sustainable development as the infrastructure to support it could not be met. Children from Otterbourne were currently unable to attend the local school and were being taxied to Colden Common School. The Doctor's Surgery at Twyford was already at full capacity.

The development was not in accordance with the Local Plan and if the settlement boundary was breached there would be a lot more development in the future.

The land to the east of Main Road was in Percolation Zone 1 and contained many aquifers and boreholes. The Bourne Stream was a tributary of the Itchen which should not be compromised.

Increased traffic along Main Road was raised with the emphasis on pedestrian safety. The pavements were very narrow in places and it was difficult to cross the road safely. There was considerable use by large vehicles from Veolia, Clancy Docwra and Four Dell Farm. The death of two children had already occurred on Main Road.

The amount of new development already granted for the village included a 62 bed care home at the top of Otterbourne Hill and a 64 room care home on the old Captain Barnard site. The infrastructure of the foul sewer system was under strain resulting in overspill of sewage into some dwellings.

Engineering solutions to infrastructure such as soakaways were never sufficient to offset the volume of rainwater run-off unable to percolate through lost fields.

It was contrary to the Village Design Statement and the settlement boundary and the loss of open space and increase in number of dwellings would be detrimental to the character of the village.

Concern was raised that preventing development at Four Dell Farm had not been successful despite the best efforts of the Parish Council.

Concern was raised that the success of the application would rest on a challenge to the Local Plan.

A resident informed the village that a Gladman proposal at Kings Somborne had been unsuccessful.

Cllr Acton advised that if WCC rejected the application it would probably go to Appeal. WCC had made a very good defence of their position at the Inspector's Hearings. Cllr Bell advised that the Local Plan had been examined in public and Part 1 had been found sound and Part 2 which involved the land allocation and included maps on the local gaps and settlement boundaries had been found sound. The indication from the Examiner's Memorandum was that the Local Plan was sound. Cllr Warwick advised that the LPP1 had already been challenged in the High Court in relation to a Denmead case and it had been found sound. Cllr Laming stressed the importance of residents expressing their views individually online by 5 October. Cllr Bell advised that it was important to have as many comments as possible submitted at this stage and that all comments would be forwarded to the Inspector if the application went to Appeal.

There being no further questions, the Chairman asked for a vote of hands. The vote was unanimous for Otterbourne Parish Council to submit an objection to the application.

| | | |
|--|----------------|-------|
| To draft objection and submit to WCC by 5 October 2016 | Chairman/Clerk | 5 Oct |
|--|----------------|-------|

The Meeting was closed 9 pm.