

Minutes of the meeting of Barton Stacey Planning Committee held at 19.30 pm on Monday 29th March 2021 as a virtual zoom meeting.

Meeting opened at 19.30pm. **Present:** Cllr B Jayes, Cllr A Bettle-Shaffer, Cllr C Sherwood
Also present: The Clerk – Mrs Jo Gadney, **Members of Public** – 2

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION For ten minutes residents are invited to address the Parish Council, make comment on items on the agenda or raise matters for consideration at a future meeting.

A resident would like to object to planning application 21/00784/FULLN which he believes goes against numerous policies of the Test Valley BC Revised Local Plan (Com 2, Com 11, E1, LHW4 and E9). He has logged his objection with TVBC. He has issues with the build mass, materials, amenity, privacy/overlooked. The proposal is on top of an already extended property. The massing extends the existing dwelling and is not in keeping. The render proposed is not in keeping nor is the grp flat roof finish and doesn't integrate character of dwelling or Conservation area. The roof lights are in clear line of sight and will impact privacy in both the property and garden.

1. Election of Chair – Cllr Bettle-Shaffer, proposed and resolved

2. Apologies - None

3. Declarations of Interest – None

4. Minutes of previous meeting – To approve the minutes of the planning committee meeting held on Tuesday 2nd March, 2021. Proposed and resolved that the minutes should be approved. The minutes will be signed after the meeting.

5. Planning applications

21/00784/FULLN – Ground floor rear extension and associated works – 2 Longmead, Cocum Road, Barton Stacey, SO21 3RN – Previous planning application shows property in the Conservation area however this application says the property isn't within the Conservation Area. It also states that it isn't near a watercourse. Aware that the applicant hasn't discussed the plans this with the adjoining neighbour, however this isn't a legal obligation. The extension does seem very long (overdevelopment?) and windows very high up. Clearly a loss of privacy for neighbours and light pollution. Render not in keeping. Roof lights should provide enough light to not need these 2 over-looking windows. Plans not well thought out. Gutters – not included on plan, need to ensure these don't overhang the property. Original roof of conservatory was tiled, but then redone in grp. Grp is renewable and durable/heavy duty. The PC understand the neighbours concerns. Proposed and resolved to object to the application with comments re render, Conservation area/water course close by, sky lights provide enough light and thus side windows wouldn't be necessary. In summary the plans need to be re-thought. 2 queries – confirm guttering (and ensure not overhanging property) and build mass %.

21/00788/TREEN – T1 unknown, fell – 1 Longmead, Cocum Road, Barton Stacey.
Not a TPO tree. Is as tall as the house and within 2 metres from property. Both roots and

branches could affect property. Would like to see a replacement tree planted in a more suitable location. Could be a Goat Willow which is a self-seeded tree which in old age gets brittle branches. Proposed and resolved for a neutral decision but with the recommendation of planting a replacement tree in a more suitable location.

21/00812/CMAN – Ancillary storage area – The A303 Recycling Facility, Drayton Road, Barton Stacey, SO21 3QS – a large amount of grassland will be removed along with many trees. Huge capital investment required and therefore unlikely to be only used for a year. All applications from this site are retrospective which means really that consultees have no say over it. What is acceptable re noise/sound levels? The noise survey took place in 2017 when the site was smaller and quieter. A few new trees won't hide this huge area. Water table here is high (despite being high up) and a borehole will be built. Traffic to the site will increase – slip roads are too small/short to cope with large vehicles. Interesting to see that HCC say that it isn't relevant for an EIA – how can this be correct? Propose and resolve to strongly object to the application. It is a Greenfield site, increase in traffic, site size increasing again and mission creep. Noise survey existing levels taken 4 years ago. Reducing rural identity. Retrospective application. Could HCC accept this IBA to reduce IBA mound levels?

6. Date of next meeting - TBC

Meeting ended at 20.15