

ANDOVER TOWN COUNCIL



A

Minutes of Planning Committee

Time and date

6.00pm on Monday 18 January 2016

Place

Upper Guildhall, High Street, Andover

Details of Attendance:

Cllr A Cotter (Chairman) (P)

Cllr B Long (Vice-Chairman) (P)

Cllr C Bartholomew (A) Cllr B Carpenter (A) Cllr C Ecclestone (P) Cllr L Gregori (P)

Cllr D Marriner (A) Cllr J Msonthi (P) Cllr V Pond (P) Cllr R Rowles (P)

Officers Present: Town Clerk (Taking the Minutes)

Members of Public Present: 1

Borough Councillors Present: Cllr J Cockaday

PC196/15 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs C Bartholomew and B Carpenter.

PC197/15 Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

PC198/15 Minutes

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on Monday 21 December 2015 were deferred to the next full meeting of the Planning Committee.

PC199/15 Public Participation

Mr N Long – Andover Resident

Mr Long indicated to Members that the proposed site was a SHLAA as indicated in the Local Plan. However, the proposed development is more than doubling the number of buildings as originally estimated in the SHLAA.

The proposed development indicates that homes will be built right up to the edge of the A3400, which is a 50mph road. Would suggest that the speed limit be reduced. There are

no footpaths along the road. Something needs to be done about this as there have been three recent fatalities along the road.

There is a lack of water supply to the site. No more water can be taken from the Test Valley area.

The older fazes of the site are waiting for road surfaces to be installed and the installation of street lamps, the development has been there for four years.

There are Bronze and Iron age archaeological features on the site.

There is a serious lack of parking for visitors on the site.

The proposed development indicates the provision of allotments but there is a footpath going through the middle of the site.

PC200/15 Planning Applications

Members considered the following planning application and the following observations were made:

15/03041/FULLN	The erection of 582 homes (including 233 affordable homes), public open spaces (including play areas and an extension to the Harewood Common buffer zone), allotments and associated infrastructure. Access from Picket Twenty Way and from Phase 4 of the approved Picket Twenty Community.	Picket Twenty Extension Site, London Road, Andover
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object – to the location of the allotment site. It should not be placed in the buffer zone, once sheds and poly tunnels are added, allotment sites can appear built up and this would be detrimental to the appearance of the buffer zone. There has been no consultation with the Town Council with regard to the location of the Allotment Site, which was originally located next to the B3400. • Objection – object to hedges surrounding the allotment site. Would prefer deer proof fencing to provide security and low maintenance. Water must also be provided to the allotment site. • Objection – object to the footpath running through the Allotment Site, this is not practical and will not allow security for the allotment holders. There is insufficient parking space provided for allotment holders as there is potentially 24 plots on the site. • Objection – the new development will have a detrimental impact and a major visual impact on the B3400. The B3400 is mostly a rural vista, the sports ground area lends itself to increasing this vista and by putting houses immediately next to the B3400 will create an urban vista along this road, which will not be in keeping even with a 10 meter buffer of hedges, it will not hide the houses. • Objection – the B3400 has a 50mph speed limit currently with no footpaths, this would not be viable in conjunction with the proposed development, the Health and Safety risk would be too high. This is an undulating road, with blind spots. The proposed development will increase traffic along this road and we would request that the speed limit should be reduced down to a maximum of 40 mph. • Objection – the proposed extension will put further pressure on the existing infrastructure (of the built development) as the final surface to the SUDS roads cannot be laid until construction of the development has been completed otherwise the drainage holes will block. As the proposed development will take another 5 years to complete this will have a detrimental impact on the existing dwellings as it will cause 		

further flooding.

- Objection – the Draft Heads of Terms relating to the proposed Section 106 planning agreement cannot be met. The proposal is to extend the School to 3FE. The school site only has a capacity for 2FE and needs three classrooms to be built to accommodate 2FE.
- Objection – with reference to the visitors' parking spaces behind plots 150 and 151. The parking spaces are located too far away from the properties, potentially no lighting and no access to houses on the main route. This will not encourage visitors to park here.
- Andover Town Council welcomes the Buffer Zone and the extension to Harewood Common and recommends that it be protected for in perpetuity.
- Map D1 of the Revised Local Plan appears to show a larger area of land to be set aside for the extension to Harewood Common than in the proposed application for the Picket Twenty extension.
- Andover Town Council has serious concerns over the permanent serious negative impact on the flora and fauna in the area and that the mitigation for this detrimental impact will not become apparent for 15 years.
- Concerned that the figures provided for school places, by Hampshire County Council are incorrect. There are predicted to be a further 6000 houses to be built in the Northern Area of Test Valley over the next 10 years, this does not appear to be accounted for in the figures for school intake.
- Concerned over the Secondary School places. The current additional capacity of 26.7% as identified by HCC is not supported by the experience of local councillors and HCC is asked to check and explain their figures. There appears to be an overreliance on Andover College for over 16 provision while experience suggests that many Andover students have sought provision elsewhere.
- Part of the Draft Heads of Terms relating to a proposed Section 106 planning agreement mentions training for local people in the construction industry. What is the developers' contribution and how can they guarantee that the people of Andover will benefit? Is Andover College to provide the training?
- The Draft Heads of Terms relating to a proposed Section 106 planning agreement makes mention of a Community Development Worker. The current contract ends before 2018. Is there a need for a new Community Development Worker? If it is determined that one would be needed the Community Worker should be continuous from the current contract.
- As part of the Draft Heads of Terms relating to a proposed Section 106 planning agreement would like to see more dropped kerbs installed and better facilities for the mobility and sight impaired.
- Time must be provided for archaeological test pits to be dug to ascertain the location, value and importance of the archaeological features as described in Wessex Archology's report Project No. 69394.02. These features could be regionally important and must be carefully recorded.
- The results of the archaeological surveys and test pits must be publicly published prior to approval of the development.
- The Report Project No. 69394.02 suggests it was carried out before the current proposal was submitted, time must be given to ascertain whether the proposed development

will have a detrimental impact on the archaeological remains and where the remains lie within the context of the development.

- This proposed development submission makes assumptions that the GP's surgery will be provided, currently there is no funding and no provision. The expectation that the 5 GP surgeries will continue to provide additional capacity is flawed. Irrespective that there appears to be no additional funding, the main constraints are lack of GP's and the shortage of space to develop additional services within the current surgeries.
- This application is relying on facilities promised under previous applications, these facilities have not been provided and may never be provided. The trigger points for the initialisation of these facilities should be extended to allow as much opportunity as possible for them to be implemented.
- The shop and pub had not been advertised until this year and the cost of the land on the sites is prohibitive, there is concern that the sites will not be taken up.

- Having read the reports submitted in relation to the planning application, Andover Town Council supports the comments and concerns of Southern Water. Southern Water cannot provide additional water. The run-off from the site may cause additional flooding therefore SUDS roads must be used.
- Andover Town Council supports the objection of the Housing and Environmental Officers, the 2 bedroomed houses (4 people accommodation) proposed are too small. Suitable spaces standards are 79m2.

- If permission is minded to be given for this development, it is recommended that the existing Community Hall be substantially improved.
- The existing ancient hedgerows must be retained and protected.

PC201/15 Date of next meeting

Members noted the date and venue of the next meeting: Monday 25 January 2016 at 6.00pm at the Town Council Office.

The meeting closed at 8.10pm.

Chairman:

Date: