

**BRAISHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL**  
Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting of Braishfield Parish Council  
held at Braishfield Village Hall  
on 19 November 2018 (7:05pm to 9:05pm)

Present

Members of Braishfield Parish Council

Chairman Jane Bennett  
Vice Chairman Mike Edwards  
Cllr Ian Knight  
Cllr Mark Swinstead  
Cllr Peter White

Others

Clerk / RFO to Braishfield Parish Council, Kate  
Orange  
Test Valley Borough Councillor Martin Hatley  
25 members of the public (after 8:50pm, 5  
remained)

Apologies

1448. Parish Councillors Carole Renvoize and Richard Brazier sent their apologies as they could not attend due to family commitments.
1449. County Councillor Alan Dowden sent his apologies as he would have liked to attend the Meeting but had a prior appointment.

Declaration of personal or financial interests in respect of the business on the agenda

1450. No Member of the Parish Council declared any personal or financial interest in respect of the business of the agenda for the Meeting.

Accuracy of the Minutes of the previous Meeting

1451. The accuracy of the Minutes of the Meeting of 06/11/2018 was agreed and the Chairman signed a copy.

Public Participation in respect of the business on the agenda

1452. A member of the public enquired why the landowner had made an application to divert footpath 4. Cllr White responded that although the reason has not been stated, it would seem to be connected to the alterations proposed at Paynes Hay Farmhouse.
1453. In connection with planning application 18/02713/FULLS, members of the public made the comments, summarised here:
- Hill View Road is extremely narrow. There are already problems with a high level of on-street parking on Hill View Road, making passing down the road difficult (sometimes impossible) particularly for larger vehicles; and causing difficulties with parking for those residents who do not have their own drive or who need access due to mobility problems.
  - The surface of the road is not in good condition and it needs re-surfacing.

- The proposed use of the hammer-head as a parking space is unacceptable as it is needed for turning, and apparently not owned by the applicant. The other parking space, in front of no. 12, has a telegraph pole in it.
- If the hammer-head is used for parking, the residents of no. 13 will not be able to get a vehicle to the house.
- There is a perception that the use may not continue to be supported living: the applicant built 12a and 12b for his sons who never lived there. How likely is this building to remain in use as supported living, or will it become a conventional dwelling? (Cllr Hatley confirmed that if, at a later date, the owner wanted to change the use class from C2 to C3, they would need to prove the business case, and apply for planning consent, otherwise residential use would be unlawful. )
- The site is not the right place for commercial development.
- A resident who lives at the back of no. 12 will have their views spoilt. Those at 11, 12, 12a, 12b will be overlooked.
- When 12a and 12b were planned, it was said that they would be overlooking a long garden to the rear: this garden is now the site of this proposal.
- On the planning consent for 12a and 12b, there is a restriction that the residents, if not the sons of the owner, should only be persons on the TVBC housing list. (Cllr Hatley will look into this assertion. )
- Why can the owner not use 12a and 12b for the proposed supported living purpose.
- During 2017, mature trees and hedgerow on the boundary of 12b and the adjacent field were cut down in preparation for this application to be made; at a time when they had nesting birds in them. These were on the boundary with the Conservation Area.
- A presentation was made to the public prior to this application being lodged and the negative comments that were made by the public at that presentation have not been reported in the application.
- Have Test Valley Borough Council visited the site? (Cllr Hatley confirmed that the case officers always visit site).
- A resident reported having been denied consent to have a disabled parking bay on the road, because the road was too narrow.
- Temporary access for construction will be through the adjacent field in the Conservation Area, via the hammerhead at the end of the road. There are concerns that this access track may become permanent. It may also increase the likelihood of more houses being constructed on the adjacent land.
- There are concerns that it may not be feasible to construct the building as the site is sand.
- The hedgerow on the hammer-head will be lost to provide access for the construction, and it is within the Conservation Area. Do Aster housing association own the hedge? (Cllr Hatley feels that is possible, if Test Valley Borough Council

formerly owned the road. Cllr White considers that, if the proposal for a car-parking space at the hammer-head is to succeed, the applicant will probably have to apply to Aster to acquire ownership of the land, and to Hampshire County Council to extinguish the highways rights).

- The newly constructed retaining wall to the side of 12b appears to be built on the neighbouring land.
- How will the emergency services (fire appliances and ambulances) access the house, along a footpath with no vehicular access?
- Why is the design 2-storeys? For supported living, a single storey would be more appropriate.
- Supported living will entail visits from carers and friends/relations. Does the applicant own the land at the hammer-head, on which they intend to put a parking space?
- Is the parish council under pressure to supply this need? (Vice Chairman Mike Edwards confirmed that this is not a parish council matter; and Cllr Hatley confirmed that the provision of supported housing is a County Council level issue. )
- Can we be assured that this will be determined by the planning committee of Test Valley Borough Council? (Cllr Hatley will request this should the need arise i.e. if the case officer is minded to recommend that permission is granted, Cllr Hatley has opportunity to require it to be determined by the committee. Those who submit comments on the planning application will be notified of the details of the planning committee. Cllr Hatley will not form his own view until the final vote.)

To agree a comment for Test Valley Borough Council on the draft “Landscape Character Assessment”

1454. *In response to the draft Landscape Character Assessment by Test Valley Borough Council, it was proposed to comment that the Parish Council welcomes the protection of farmland and countryside between Romsey and Braishfield.*

RESOLVED

To agree a comment on the diversion Order for part of Footpath 4

1455. *For the diversion Order for part of Footpath 4, it was proposed to comment that we are concerned about potential safety hazards in respect of the derelict barn at the Paynes Hay Road end of the proposed route.*

RESOLVED

Comment on planning application 18/02713/FULLS

1456. Several Members of the Parish Council visited the site of planning application 18/02713/FULLS in order to understand the application in context. The Council considered the application and the comments made by members of public at the Meeting, and the following points were raised.

Vice Chairman Mike Edwards voiced concerns about backland development; over-development of the site; poor access; lack of parking; traffic considerations; the

impact on the Conservation Area; the impact on views; proximity to boundaries; split height roofs; overly compressed roof (shallow pitch). He read out a detailed précis of these concerns and passed a copy to the Clerk.

Cllr White read out a question which the Clerk had put to a planning officer - “The proposed dwelling does not have vehicular access - which affects ambulances, fire service, and construction traffic. The road is very narrow and has a high density of road-side parking. Are these issues relevant in planning terms?” - and the answer, “This may not be a material planning consideration, however due to the description given of high density on street parking, this may provide the evidence of why ensuring the minimum parking standard to adhered to.”

Backland development: this proposal is a test of the policy set out in the Village Design Statement (VDS). A strong argument against backland development is loss of privacy for the dwellings which are overlooked.

There are concerns about the pedestrian-only access, especially as there is likely to be increased need for vehicles, including emergency vehicles, at this property.

Single-storey may have been a better design, in terms of the impact on neighbours, and the accommodation for wheelchair users.

Loss of trees and hedges are a concern.

The cases cited in the application as examples of backland development, are not necessarily so, and are not relevant because the same issues of privacy do not apply.

Councillors were told that there will be three occupants, but there are only two bedrooms, so the “study” is to be a bedroom.

The business use (of supported living) will not in itself be reason for this application to be refused consent.

It is not clear whether s106 or CIL money is payable for this

Cllr Hatley observed that members of the public who wish to make comments, should do so directly to Test Valley Borough Council - in simple terms of why they do or do not like the proposal. Planning law does not protect a view but privacy is taken into account.

Cllr Hatley noted that there is no shortage of supply of land for housing in the Borough: there is a 7 year land-supply in the Borough as a whole; and Braishfield is in Northern Test Valley, which has a greater supply.

The privacy of no’s 11, 12, 12a and 12b as well as Southview will be affected. Loss of light for neighbours will not be a factor in this proposal.

1457. *For planning application 18/02713/FULLS, Proposed residential dwelling for supported living, 12 Hill View Road Braishfield Romsey Hampshire SO51 0PP, it was proposed to comment as follows:*

*Objection, with the following reasons (to be fully drafted and submitted by the Clerk):*  
*backland development; over-development of the site; poor access; lack of parking;*  
*traffic considerations; the impact on the Conservation Area; the impact on views;*

*proximity to boundaries; split height roofs; overly compressed roof; (in accordance with detail passed to the Clerk and read out by Vice Chairman Mike Edwards during the Meeting); and, concerns about construction traffic on the narrow and congested road; privacy concerns for 11, 12, 12a, 12b and Southview, which will all be overlooked on their private living and recreation areas; the cases cited as backland development are not relevant to this proposal because they don't present the same issues of privacy and access.*

RESOLVED

Comment on planning application 18/02820/FULLS

1458. Members of the Parish Council had visited Paynes Hay Farm recently in connection with an associated application. The Council considered the issues surrounding the application 18/02820/FULLS. There were some concerns voiced about the gothic design of the openings in the wall, in the context of the design of the farmhouse.
1459. *For planning application 18/02820/FULLS, Erection of below ground partially enclosed swimming pool and pool house, Paynes Hay Farm Paynes Hay Road Braishfield SO51 0PS, it was proposed to comment that the gothic arches on the north elevation are not in keeping and are unsympathetic with the setting of the Grade II listed Queen Anne building. Otherwise, the Council has no objection to the development in principle.*

RESOLVED

Next Meeting

1460. The next Meeting will be held on 8 January 2019.