

**OWSLEBURY PARISH COUNCIL  
DRAFT MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON  
19<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2007  
AT 7.45 PM IN OWSLEBURY PARISH HALL**

**PRESENT**

Chairman: Cllr Mr A Manship  
Councillors: Mrs J Chase, Mrs T Meads, Mr R Page, Mrs J Ruffell.

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Clerk: Mrs E Manship

**211/07 APOLOGIES**

County Councillor: Mr P Mason  
District Councillor: Mr R Humby, Mr L Ruffell  
PC Charlie Farley

**212/07 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS FOR AGENDA ITEMS**

None

**213/07 TRIBUTE TO COUNCILLOR JOHN SEABROOK**

The Chairman informed the meeting that Cllr Seabrook had passed away in the evening of Sunday 11<sup>th</sup> November at the age of 91. He had served as a Parish Councillor for Owslebury for nearly 20 years. The Chairman asked that silence be kept as a mark of respect.

**214/07 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

**a) Planning Application - Greenhill Farm**

The Chairman invited Public Questions:

Mrs Hancock stated that she would like to see the hedgerow along the boundary of Greenhill Farm reinstated. Mr & Mrs Muir confirmed they plan to remove the gates, trellis, fence and sleepers and reinstate the hedgerow. The property will not have gates, rather an open entrance with posts.

Mrs Hardman said her worry was that the stable block would be the start of a house, barn, arena etc. Mrs Powell who owns the adjacent field concurred. Mr Buchanan said that there was no hidden agenda. Mr & Mrs Muir were seeking to be open with their wishes and the plans illustrated their intent. However, if they wished for future buildings in the future these would require planning permission.

Mr Emmans asked whether the stable block could be housed the same side as the house. He mentioned that a similar sized block was refused a few years ago. Perhaps it could be reduced to 4 stables rather than 8.

Mr Buchanan (Agent) confirmed there was no intention to establish an equestrian centre. He said the two sides of the plot were designed to work as a whole. It was felt that the stables would devalue what they were trying to achieve with the parkland around the house. Also, WCC had previously granted a stable block and menage on the site and the fields on the east as horse paddocks so this was a logical approach.

Mr Emmans asked whether permission was given for 4 stables, not 8. Mr Buchanan said yes, but this application was a comparable size.

Mrs Hancock asked whether the application allowed for the retention of the wonderful view across the valley. Mr Muir confirmed the siting of the stable block was tucked into the corner, well back behind the belt of trees so it would not be seen unless you went right into the site. They particularly wished to preserve the view.

Mrs Harfield asked whether the certificate of lawful use would be removed. Mr Buchanan confirmed yes. Mr and Mrs Muir were conceding this as part of their application. They were seeking a change of use from Industrial use to a house in the countryside.

Mr Emmans said he could see that everyone was in favour. This was a one off opportunity to remove the site of its industrial use and he hoped it went through.

Mrs Sprot said the house was high and would be prominent over the village. Mr Buchanan said this was a key issue for which they had taken advice from a landscape consultant. Trees would be planted to landscape the plot, though on the south boundary a tree belt already existed. He also confirmed that the height was almost identical to the house currently on the site. Mrs Hancock stated this could only just be seen. Mr Muir said the landscaping was designed so that the house could only be seen through very small windows.

The Chairman invited Mr Mrs Muir / Mr Buchanan to talk through their application:

Mr Muir said they were committed to living on the site. They had the opportunity to make changes to their property without moving and invited people to consider how the site would be in 5 years time. They had tried to think through the application from others points of view and endeavoured to mitigate any concerns. They appreciated concerns regarding traffic in the lane and felt themselves that it was unsuitable for HGV's. No part of the site is for agricultural use at the moment. There is already a separate unit on the site for their current staff. The site has offices, storage, light industrial and workshops, all lawful and unrestricted for vehicular access. The planning authority had been unable to effect change. They had this opportunity, to demolish and replace with a new family dwelling with staff accommodation. Commercial use would cease, replaced with parkland. The current footprint was 49% of the site. The new footprint would be 10%, increasing the green open area by 15,000 sq. meters.

The Chairman invited Councillor Questions:

Q. How long will the project take?

A. Anticipated completion April 2009

Q. Have you purchased the site?

A. We have exchanged but not completed. Completion is expected in January 2008

Q. Stables for 8 horses. A large build. What acreage of land are these to support?

A. 19 Acres. Mrs Muir said that she could understand peoples concern regarding the stables, however, at the present time the land is used for a junkyard. In the same way that the carriages dumped on the site cannot be seen from the road, neither will the stables be visible. Mr Muir said that he felt the proportions were right considering the size of the house. Mr Buchanan said that they were within WCC Equestrian guidelines.

Q. What conditions were being put into place to minimalise the effect of the traffic during the building process.

A. Everything will be crushed on site and used as hardcore. Trucks will in the main be used for deliveries. Currently there are no restrictions regarding hours, however it is within the gift of WCC to ensure vehicles only access the site during sociable hours.

Q. This is a very large property. How eco-friendly will it be?

A. The aim is for the house to be eco-friendly. Heating installations etc. will be in line with best practice.

Q. The house seems very close to Greenhill House.

A. Yes, looking at an O.S. map the house will be close, but considering the topography of the landscape and trees etc. it will not appear to too close.

The Chairman invited questions that had been sent to the Clerk:

Q. Concern had been submitted regarding the style of the property, not being what one would expect in consideration of other neighbouring properties.

A. The house is in the vernacular style, a country house in a rural location, comparable to others in the area. Ancillary buildings were more contemporary to give the impression of modernisation over the years.

Q. Would it be felt in time that a separate accommodation block was required as security for the horses?

A. The stable block was being built within site and sound of the staff accommodation. It was envisaged that this build would be sufficient for both purposes.

The Chairman confirmed the plans had been sent to "Planning Aid". He invited the Clerk to read through their thoughts and suggestions:

In favour:

- a) The change of use to residential with stables gets rid of the sites industrial use.

Against:

- a) the new dwelling maximises views for the occupier, making it in a prominent location on the site  
 b) the new house is bigger than the current property  
 c) precedent might be set for other brownfield sites to do the same  
 d) loss of employment land

Suggested Conditions:

- a) I would suggest that you ask for a condition that restricts future development on the site – and removes permitted development rights for future extensions – reason – this development is larger than the existing residential development.  
 b) I would ask that a condition be put on about providing details for screening – you should ask the LPA to consult you before they agree any scheme proposed by the developer.

Martha James  
 Planning Aid South Caseworker.

## 215/07 PLANNING

### a) To discuss planning applications

<b>07/02532/FUL:</b>	<b>Greenhill Farm, Baybridge Lane, Owslebury. SO21 1JN</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Demolition of existing dwelling, residential annex and commercial buildings and removal of all hardstanding, outbuildings and access roads, erection of 2no dwellings and ancillary outbuildings, associated works to include landscape, woodland, parkland, pond and repositioning of vehicular access
<b>Closing Date:</b>	<b>Friday 9<sup>th</sup> November 2007</b> (extension agreed)
<b>07/02533/FUL:</b>	<b>Greenhill Farm, Baybridge Lane, Owslebury. SO21 1JN</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of Stable Block
<b>Closing Date</b>	<b>Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2007</b> (extension agreed)

The Chairman invited comments regarding the House:

- Cllr Meads stated she was particularly pleased to see the visual impact assessment. Her own view was that the property looked stunning and would be an asset.
- Cllr Page said that he was not sure that it was not too prominent and would not be seen.
- Cllr Chase said that there was a lot of work involved in clearing up the current site but that the gain outweighed the pain and felt the site could stand it.
- Cllr Ruffell felt that the location on the site was far better than the current house.
- Cllr Manship felt that exterior lighting should be kept to a minimum, as on the top of the hill it could shine like a Christmas Tree.

The Cllrs voted to approve the application with the 2 conditions advised by Planning Aid and an additional condition regarding exterior lighting.

The Chairman invited comments regarding the Stables:

- Cllr Page said he felt it was rather large in comparison to the other buildings
- Cllr Meads said she felt that screening was the most important factor
- Cllr Page said he would be happier with a smaller block and on the same side as the house

- Cllr Chase said she agreed with both of these comments
- Cllr Ruffell said that she agreed about the screening and was concerned regarding over-development of the site.

The Cllrs voted to object to this application on the basis of its size and location.

<b>07/02701/FUL:</b>	<b>Marwell Zoo, Thompsons Lane, Owslebury. SO21 1JH</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Temporary change of use of land to ice rink with boot changing facilities, refreshment marque, ticket booth, and associated plant equipment.
<b>Closing Date</b>	<b>Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> December</b>

Comment Only: That restrictions be placed on the application to ensure the volume of music is kept to a reasonably low level and floodlighting is discreet. That consideration be given to the safety of traffic entering and leaving at the junction of Portsmouth Road and Thompsons Lane – no street lighting and a known black spot.

**216/07 LOCAL BUS REVIEW, TRANSPORT MEETING AND PARISH COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE**

- It was generally felt that the morning and evening bus were well used but the lunchtime bus less so.
- It was questioned whether a double-decker is required. Perhaps a mini-bus could be used.
- It was questioned whether if the price of the bus pass was reduced and the timings changed to fit in with Peter Symonds hours, whether the bus would be used more. The current price is £440 per year so many parents were choosing to drive their children in. Peter Symonds finishes at 4.35pm. The young people just miss the 4pm bus and have to wait to 6pm.
- It was noted that the bus used often did not have a lower deck to enable easy access for pushchairs, wheelchairs and the elderly.
- Cllr Chase was asked to act as Transport Representative for the Parish Council

**Action: Clerk to notify WCC and also circulate information for parishioners to respond to individually**

**217/07 IN MEMORY OF COUNCILLOR JOHN SEABROOK**

The Chairman confirmed he would be attending the funeral on behalf of the Council  
 The Council agreed to send a wreath and a £50 donation to a charity important to Cllr Seabrook.

**Action: The Clerk to action.**

**210/07 DATE OF THE NEXT PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**

The next Parish Council meeting will be held on **Monday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2007 at 7.45pm**

The meeting closed at 9.30pm

Chairman..... Date.....