



# Itchen Valley Parish Council

## Planning Committee Minutes

Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2017

**Present:** - Cllr Langford (chair), Andrews, Appleby, Riley.

**In Attendance** – A Weaver Clerk. N.Mackintosh, S.Mackintosh, R.Bernays, J.Bouldin, P.Marter, D.Petrie, J.Petrie, G.Petrie, H.Petrie, T.Wickham, N.Moss, M.Nevers, A.Grant, P.Grant, E.Hindley, K.Adams, K.Sloan, A.McDowell, C.Bechis, P.McManns, D.Humphreys, S.Humphreys.

**1. Apologies** - Cllr Denniss.

**2. Approval of the Minutes and Matters Arising from the Meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> October 2017.**

Minute Approval – Mr D.Petrie stated that he refused to approve the minutes. The Clerk, Mr Weaver pointed out that Mr Petrie had not been present at the previous meeting. Cllr Riley pointed out that minutes of the meeting could only be approved by Itchen Valley councillors.

Mr Petrie challenged the content of the minutes, particularly the absence of detail about the discussions that had taken place. Clerk Mr Weaver stated that the minutes contained summary headings of the matters discussed and a detailed record of actions, decisions, and responses taken in respect of each agenda item. This was the routine format that council minutes followed which could be readily seen by examining the minutes from previous meetings.

The minutes were agreed as a correct record. The Chairman signed the minutes.

**3. Public Participation and Declarations of Interest.**

There were no declarations of interest. Twenty three local residents were present.

### Paddock Development

Mr P.Marter introduced himself and highlighted that he was present to speak about access and safety within the Paddock Development. He was particularly concerned about vehicular traffic in the area and wanted proposals to improve safety.

Chairman Cllr Langford highlighted the problems of parking and expressed the Parish Council's desire to improve facilities. The Parish Council continued to encourage Hampshire County Council to review traffic safety in that area.

### SDNP W1063 and 1064 Allocation Policies Itchen Abbas

Mr Petrie and other residents present made several queries and representations concerning the responses made by Itchen Valley Parish Council to SDNP Draft Plan Consultation. The principal focus of concern was that the Parish Council had suggested housing allocation should be in Itchen Abbas, specifically at SHLAA sites W1063 and W1064.

Cllr Langford gave a background summary that had brought the authority to its present position.

### South Downs National Park Draft Local Plan

South Downs National Park (SDNP) Authority have produced their first draft plan which they have invited the Parish Council to comment upon. The Plan covers the period up to 2033. It is not intended to be a housing development plan. Like other national parks (Exmoor, Lake District) is principally about the landscape, although there is recognition that there cannot be NO housing.

SDNP have examined housing figures and know that 265 housing units have been built each year within the SDNP area for the last ten years. There is a housing need for 447 housing units for which

two-thirds need to be affordable. They have settled upon 250 housing units per year to fit with requirements and aspirations.

In preparing their plan, SDNP invited landowners to put forward sites for development (SHLAA). Three were received from Itchen Abbas: W1035, W1063 and W1064. Draft Plan looked at where houses should go and came up with eight for Itchen Abbas within W1035.

#### Itchen Valley Parish Council View

Parish Council have considered the draft plan. In context, the Parish Council is aware that Itchen Valley has built three houses per year for last 25 years – 80 houses.

SDNP allows Itchen Abbas to build one half house per annum for 20-year period through to 2033, but the Parish Council know that the owners of the site do not want to see it developed, but also do not want to see it taken out of the plan. In practice, NO houses are to be built.

The Parish Council feel that NO houses will stagnate the village for the following reasons:

- No affordable housing to be built – there are 17 units of verified demand on the waiting list that fulfil the criteria for affordable housing. These may have to move away from the parish.
- Local facilities need support – the school has 94 pupils of which half come from outside the community. A lack of local demand may jeopardise the future of the school – provision may be bolted onto a larger school elsewhere. Also, bus services, village hall, local pub, and other services all need local usage to be sustainable.
- Without any development there will be no funding for infrastructure – eg. George V1 playing fields need development money for improvement.

The Parish Council feels that the village needs growth, needs new housing to prosper and be vibrant, but the only prospect to support this view offered by landowners is W1063 and W1064. No other landowner has come forward.

The Parish Council could go another route which is to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan. This is a professionally produced village plan, which must show the “development” that the parish wants, goes in front of an inspector after a referendum who judges its soundness including whether it fits with policy. It would cost about £30K of council tax money over two years. The Parish Council knows that “development” does not accord with the policy of the SDNP draft so we would have to change this policy – too big a hill to attempt and a waste of £30K.

Insofar as the two landowners of W1063 and W1064 are concerned their sites have been discounted on the grounds of landscape – the first line of the plan. They will have to overcome this subjective comment and then they will have to change the draft plan policy on housing numbers to get their land included, we have only supported their submissions for the reasons given, we do not propose them.

Lastly, the Parish Council’s opinion has a weight of one, just the same as any individual.

The Parish Council is only here to give a view on policy. To have no development for the next 17 years is a principle the Parish Council is not happy with.

#### Additional Comments and discussion

Councillor Riley added that the reason why the focus was on Itchen Abbas and not the 4 villages was because Itchen Abbas was the only village with a village boundary.

Councillor Appleby pointed out that Itchen Valley Parish Council had sought to publicise these issues and communicate with residents about them on many occasions, through the Itchen Valley News, through other publicity and at regular Parish Council meetings, etc.

Councillor Langford pointed out that Itchen Abbas Parish Plan developed to reflect local views several years ago had identified the need for small developments.

There were questions, answers and discussion about a range of issues covering: village boundary changes, infilling in various villages – Easton, Martyr Worthy, Rural Exception Sites, consultation with, influence on and relationship with SDNP, accountability to local members and communities, mixed developments and affordable housing, smaller and larger properties, authenticity and credibility of local housing waiting list.

#### Summary and Conclusion

Cllr Langford stated that IVPC had focussed on the strategic housing issues in their SDNP Plan response but acknowledged that, on reflection, they had failed to communicate properly about the specific local site issues.

#### Boomtown Licensing

Cllr Appleby publicised the public drop in meeting and the ongoing consultation about the Boomtown licensing application which included provisions for increasing numbers of attendees, staff, and overall noise levels, including low frequency noise. He stated that the Parish Council would make a submission on this but reiterated the need for as many people as possible to submit their views. Objections could only be made in respect of the following matters:

- Prevention of crime and disorder;
- Public safety;
- Prevention of public nuisance;
- Protection of children.

All members of public left the meeting (8.15 pm).

#### **4. Planning Applications**

##### (i) [Application for a detached garage with home office space above.](#)

Wangfield House Main Road Itchen Abbas Winchester Hampshire SO21 1AT  
SDNP/17/06134/HOUS Consultation Deadline – 29<sup>th</sup> December 2017

Cllr Appleby indicated that he had visited the neighbours. Members discussed the application and confirmed that IVPC had no objections in principle but there were problems with the planning submission documents, drawings do not match design and access statements.

**Action:** Chair Cllr Langford to consider the matter and progress further.

**5. Other Items for Consideration**

Nil

**Date of next meeting**

Tuesday January 16<sup>th</sup> at 7.00 pm at Itchen Abbas & Avington Village Hall.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.