

**Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting of  
Braishfield Parish Council Planning Committee held on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2019**  
at 7:00pm to 8:00pm, in Braishfield Village Hall

Present:

Members of Braishfield Parish Council:  
Cllr Richard Brazier, Chairman of the Committee  
Cllr Jane Bennett, Chairman of the Parish Council  
& Vice Chairman of the Committee  
Vice Chairman of the Parish Council, Cllr Ian Knights  
Cllr Carole Renvoize  
Cllr Mark Swinstead

Others:  
Clerk, Kate Orange  
Members of the public – 17

Apologies

73. Apologies were received from Cllrs Sally Yalden and Cllr Peter White, who were each unable to attend due to prior commitments.

Declarations of personal and pecuniary interests by Members

74. No Member declared any personal or pecuniary interest in any business on the agenda for the Meeting.

Accuracy of Minutes

The Committee agreed the accuracy of the Minutes of the Meeting of 5/2/2019 and a copy was signed by the Chairman.

Comments on planning applications

Planning application 19/01622/FULLS

75. *For planning application "Change of use of part of the internal space of an existing agricultural barn for use as a plant room to serve the adjacent farm and farm buildings Paynes Hay Farm Paynes Hay Road, Braishfield, SO51 0PS, Ref. No: 19/01622/FULLS" it was proposed to comment as follows:*

*"No objection"*

RESOLVED

Planning application 19/01620/FULLS

76. Comments from the members of the public (as "public participation") were noted as follows:
- The site is outside the settlement boundary; the proposal leads to over development of the plot, the houses are too close together; looking from the front, all that can be seen is the garages – the houses cannot be seen; it is backland development in the terms of the Village Design Statement
  - The developer tried to remove mature trees, which have subsequently been protected. More of the trees in that area need to be protected; there are no TPOs on her own trees (she lives on Crookhill). More trees on that site are under threat. If this proposal is given permission it is the thin end of the wedge – looking on the map there are many spaces to be filled in this area, and this will join Braishfield to Romsey
  - These houses are crammed in on the site, and very small even though they are 4-bed houses. The garage is next to the neighbour's bedroom. This is an ill-thought out proposal. If this plot is to be developed, the bungalow would ideally be demolished so that a better layout of the site could be achieved

- A member of the public, who farms within Braishfield and travels through Crookhill daily, noted that he has many protected trees on his land. On his daily commute to his farm, he enjoys the drive once he gets to Crookhill from Romsey – it is the trees that are so special in this area. A neighbour has placed a pole in the ground to show the height of the proposed buildings and it shows they will be seen as you go into the village – unlike existing houses. This type of tandem development with shared drives and houses at the rear does not exist in Braishfield. People he knows who live on Crookhill say they have near misses in their cars, as the traffic goes fast. The existing bungalow has settlement cracks and will surely eventually be knocked down and developed into a larger home. With a larger site, there will be more traffic and if there is a shunt on that hill, it may include pedestrians on the new footpath. This is a lovely aspect of the village and it will be spoilt. He noted that he has received an offer from a developer to sell part of Lower Crookhill Farm
- There may be 3-4 cars per house; there are concerns that the large garages will be converted into accommodation – there could be 10 cars on the site, which are too many for the access point onto Braishfield Road
- There is inaccuracy on the application. To the question “is there any broadleaf woodland within 100m of the site?”, the applicant answered “no”, but there is one within 70m; they say there is no pond near the site, yet there is one on the site; they have said there are no mature shrubs on the boundaries – yet the hedge is mature. The plans appear to be inaccurate – there are no dimensions shown on the plans – no heights, no datum: what planners may think they may have agreed to, may not be constructed in the place or to the size that they expect. The surface of the drive has not been stipulated – if gravel it will be noisy for the neighbours. The driveway from the road to the houses is a single lane, which will cause problems with vehicle movements on the site
- On the plans the neighbour's shed with a shared roof is not shown on the plans and this is in the place where the drive is proposed to be placed
- An adjoining neighbour's house has its daytime living accommodation at the rear. This development will take away their privacy. The visual impact of this will be huge
- An adjoining neighbour cannot see down the hill from their driveway, so this is a safety concern. But the main concern is about privacy. Other buildings in the area are lower – bungalows or chalet bungalows. The proposed buildings will look directly into a bedroom, dining room, patios, swimming pool – all of their personal privacy will be removed. The driveway is right next to two bedrooms, so noise will be an issue. The neighbour's outbuilding which has a shared roof with the site, is not shown on the plans
- The driveway passes directly past the front door of Little Beeches, which will be dangerous
- These seem to be high quality expensive houses, which few could afford to buy; but the houses could have been for disabled accommodation. They are too tall and too densely packed. The site would be better with one house
- Backland development here may remove the defence against it elsewhere in the parish
- The height is described as akin to nearby houses. All the houses nearby were built as bungalows – they are dormer bungalows, not full 2 storey houses as the proposed ones are: the proposed houses will be taller
- Drainage proposals are not shown in the application. What effect will the increased load have on the existing shared drains? Little Beeches is not on mains drains – it has a septic tank, which may be affected by the position of the proposed houses. If they are connecting into existing drains, this will disrupt the neighbours

- A member of the public who is a developer by profession, noted the following:  
Key objections to this proposal are the design of the buildings, the loss of privacy for the neighbours and the visual impact from the road. Although it is in the settlement boundary, it is not a sustainable location: it is between Abbotswood and Braishfield. The agricultural tie on Little Beeches, if it exists, is unlikely to affect this proposal. He was surprised to see the bedrooms at the front of the houses, i.e. facing the neighbour's living accommodation and overlooking them. The house looks like an urban design. It is overbearing and the design does not suit the location. TVBC may not pick up the discrepancies in the application such as the fact that there is a pond which has not been mentioned in the application. Great Crested Newts are in Braishfield
- The existing house has a leaning chimney, which may be a risk to the resident, when construction plant is on site
- The archaeological importance of nearby Fairbourne Farm was noted and artefacts were found when the garden centre on Sandy Lane was extended: given that the garden will not have been disturbed below ground, should an archaeological survey have been done?
- Little Beeches may have an agricultural tie on it as it was originally built for agricultural workers
- The oak that was felled had a bat box on it. What else has been missed out from the application?
- One resident thinks that the site is not in a settlement boundary. Another disagrees
- The Chairman noted that members of the public are able to submit their comments directly to Test Valley Borough Council via their website, if they wish them to be taken into account. The Chairman clarified that backland development is contrary to the Braishfield Village Design Statement

For planning application "Erection of two detached dwellings with detached garages, Little Beeches, Braishfield Road, Crookhill, SO51 0QB, Ref. No: 19/01620 FULLS" it was proposed to comment as follows:

"Objection", for the following reasons:

1. The proposed dwellings will overlook the rear of the neighbouring houses on each side and also Little Beeches. This will result in a loss of privacy in the private living and recreation areas of the affected houses. This is compounded by the height of the proposed houses, which are full two-storey houses whereas others in the vicinity are single storey, with or without loft conversions. The position of the driveway, very near to neighbouring bedrooms, will be noisy for the neighbours and for occupants of Little Beeches; and it is not clear what the surface will be, as gravel will be even more problematic. Loss of privacy and the effect on neighbours is why this type of backland development is to be avoided, as required by the Braishfield Village Design Statement.
2. The height of the proposed houses will make them very prominent, visible above the surroundings on the approach from the south. It takes effort to ascertain this from the information given in the application, because a street-scene drawing has not been provided.
3. The site will be over-developed if the proposal goes ahead, because the proposed houses are closely spaced to each other and to Little Beeches. Key dimensions are absent from the plans, so it is difficult to be certain exactly of the size and position of the proposed buildings.

4. The access is narrow and goes directly past the front door of Little Beeches, which is potentially hazardous for the occupants of Little Beeches. With two 4-bedroom houses on the site, plus Little Beeches, the access will be used by a large number of cars, but the drive is so narrow that there are not places for cars to pass each other on the site – this poses a risk on the highway (where cars may be waiting to enter the property).
5. The design is out of place in Braishfield: it is urban in style and has nothing in common with local designs. Few materials are listed on the application, so it is not entirely clear what is proposed. The VDS requires the use of local materials and features.
6. We are aware of inaccuracies in the application: there is a pond on the site, which has not been stated on the application; there is a mature hedge and trees on the site, not stated on the application; there is a broadleaf wood within 100 metres of the site. There was a bat box on a tree which has already been felled by the developer and there are Great Crested Newts in Braishfield: it is not clear that the information on wildlife is detailed enough, given the presence of bat boxes and a pond on the site. We are aware that important archaeological artefacts have been found at the nearby garden centre on Sandy Lane and at Fairbournes Farm and it seems that an archaeological survey may be necessary.
7. In support of the foregoing, the proposal is contrary to the following points stipulated in the Braishfield Village Design Statement:
  - a) The village structure – a collection of hamlets – should be preserved.
  - b) To protect the open-space nature of the village, building behind houses should be strictly controlled.
  - c) Buildings should not overshadow their surroundings. The building should respect the scale of the area. Important spaces and through views should be respected.
  - d) Development should respect the rural nature of the area.
  - e) The settlement should be sympathetic to the existing street scene
  - f) Incorporate local feature and typical local materials
  - g) Innovative design should be encouraged provided they are in keeping with the area.

RESOLVED

77. Councillors noted the following:

- Cllr Jane Bennett referred to the Village Design Statement (VDS). The proposal appears to be contrary to the following requirements of the VDS:
  - The village structure – a collection of hamlets – should be preserved
  - To protect the open space nature of the village, buildings behind houses should be strictly controlled
  - Buildings should not overshadow their surroundings. The building should respect the scale of the area. Important spaces and through-views should be respected
  - Development should respect the rural nature of the area
  - The settlement should be sympathetic to the existing street scene
  - Incorporate local feature and typical local materials
  - Innovative design should be encouraged provided they are in keeping with the area

This proposal urbanises a small site. It is not clear what the proposed materials are. Heights, style, levels etc. as would be clear on a street-scene drawing are not clear: The Councillors needed a site visit and the neighbour has erected poles to show the proposed heights. It is not clear what materials are proposed. She wishes to object.

- Cllr Carole Renvoize is opposed to the proposal, for all reasons stated elsewhere this evening. The height in particular is very surprising and a street scene drawing would have been revelatory

- Cllr Mark Swinstead agrees with Cllr Renvoize and is particularly concerned about loss of through views
- Cllr Ian Knights feels that the proposal would result in over-development of the site: that the proposed buildings would overlook neighbours and the access are the main problem
- Chairman Richard Brazier noted that material planning reasons are what the planners will take into account. He would like to see this application go to planning committee (if the planning officer is minded to support the application): the expression of objections from the public would seem to warrant this. At a committee, the parish council would have 3 minutes to speak and the public would have a total of 3 minutes – so if members of the public wish to speak, they are advised to group together. Key issues are the settlement boundary, visual impact, overlooking of neighbours; access and protected trees; inaccuracies on the application form; and lack of key dimensions

78. Next Meeting

Next Meeting depends on whether there are any planning matters to be considered.