

All minutes are draft until ratified by the Committee at the next meeting

Marchwood Parish Council

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Marchwood Village Hall on Monday 13 January 2025 at 7.30pm.

Present: Councillors: J Case, K Petty, and M Saxby (Chairman).

In attendance: T Dudley, Parish Clerk, Angela Woodward, Deputy Clerk, RFO.

Apologies

PC/25/039 – Apologies for absence were received from Councillors N Buckett (Health), D Hindle (annual leave) J Leath (Health) and L Shelley (Previous Commitment).

Resolved – to accept apologies for absence from Councillors Buckett, Hindle, Leath and Shelley.

Declaration of Interest

PC/25/040 – There were no declarations of pecuniary interest for this meeting.

Public Participation

PC/25/041 – No members of the public attended this meeting.

Minutes

PC/25/042 - RESOLVED - the minutes of the meeting 2 September 2024 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

Planning Applications

PC/25/043- RESOLVED: To submit the following comments and recommendations.

App No	24/11043
Address	Slowhill Copse, Bury Road, Marchwood SO40 4UD
Proposed	Construction of battery storage scheme with associated acoustic fence, grid connection and landscaping, access retained as existing and provision of substation including switchgears and transformers.
Comment	No objection PAR 1
App No	24/11065
Address	7 Contest Way, Marchwood SO40 4TW
Proposed	Front and rear dormers; fenestration alterations.
Comment	No objection PAR 1

App No	23/11219
Address	2-38 Ordnance Way, Marchwood SO40 4AR
Proposed	Replacement of all windows on even numbered houses 2-38 with double glazed UPVC.
Comment	No objection PAR 1
App No	24/10992
Address	SS3 Land at Corks Farm, Normandy Way, Marchwood
Proposed	Reserved matters application for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (pursuant to outline permission 22/10449) for the development of 150 residential dwellings.
Comment	Objection PAR 4 1) Highway Issues a) Road Safety Audit (RSA) No RSA has been submitted. Wider road safety is a concern as the development is in an area where we have previously commented on our concerns about road safety along Normandy Way. We must insist that an RSA is undertaken at the earliest opportunity. b) Adoption There is no evidence that the local authority will adopt the site, so there is a worry that the minimum acceptable standards may not be adhered to for all the internal roads and footpaths and/or the Developer has considered Hampshire County Council's (HCC) best practice. c) Layout The layout of the development underpins road safety, and I cannot see sufficient information to address junction layouts in terms of visibility. Shared spaces should be contained to dead ends and turning places rather than on road edges and lanes. Furthermore, the main north-south straight road is too straight and doesn't do enough to reduce excessive vehicular speed. I am also concerned there is no mention of priority at road junctions, which may contribute to an unacceptable road safety risk level. d) Refuse Vehicles & Fire Tenders It was noted that HCC stated that this proposal does not comply with HCC TG2 guidance regarding vehicle size and speed. Furthermore, there are concerns that the overhang of these

	vehicles might overhang pedestrian areas, driveways, and parking bays and should be avoided. e) Parking (including Disability Parking) The Developer has allocated 85 spaces, and 9 visitor spaces, 199 unallocated– as we have seen elsewhere in Marchwood, this has led to poor parking by residents and overspilled parking onto the highway. Also, this will impact the Refuse and emergency service vehicle's access and exit from the development. Furthermore, the parking layout at several dwellings seems odd and can lead to additional unexpected parking outside homes. 2) Lockerley/Marchwood natural gas pipeline Members agreed that the Marchwood Parish Council supports the HSE recommendation that the local authority and/or Developer consult with the gas pipeline operator as they may have a legal interest (easement, wayleave, etc.) in the vicinity of the pipeline. 3) Prevention of crime and disorder, including anti-social behaviour (ASB) a) Terrace Housing Studies have shown up to 85% of unlawful entries occurred at the back of the house with open rear entry footpaths. Therefore, I urge consideration to support Hampshire & IOW Constabulary's recommendation that if the footpaths are necessary to give access to the rear of the property, they should be gated to reduce crime and ASB. The gates should be 1.8m high (to match the fence boundary) and fitted with a lock that is operated with a key on both sides. b) The Three Blocks of Flats i. We support Hampshire & IOW Constabulary in stating that the apartment blocks must sit within an area of semi-private space enclosed with a robust boundary at least 1.2m high. ii. Ground-floor apartments with doors that can be accessed from the surrounding semi-private space must be protected by a private garden, which is the sole preserve of the resident of the apartment with doors that can be accessed from this space. The private garden must be at least 1.5m wide and
--	--

	enclosed within a robust boundary at least 12m high. Windows on the ground floor must be defended by planting. iii. The communal entrance doors for each block of flats should be tested and certified to LPS1175 Issue 8 Security Rating or PAS 24: 2022. The doors should have access control and visitor door entry systems. Tradesperson buttons should not be recommended as they can cause ASB. Lighting in the communal areas should be 24-hour. These measures will assist in reducing ASB. iv. The communal cycle store and bin store should have a doors certified to LPS 1175 Issue 8 Security Rating A1 as recommended by Hampshire & IOW Constabulary. I urge MPC to support the Police's other recommendations regarding the cycle store and bin store as outlined in their letter to NFDC dated 7 January 2025. 4) Environmental Concerns a) Noise We should welcome and support NFDC's noise monitoring conditions but question if there has been sufficient modelling to mitigate the 24/7 noise from the nearby container dock and adjacent land. b) Flooding Flooding is an increasing occurrence, so we urge that NFDC/Developer to review their estimate of risk factors. The site holds a large body of water, Members raised safety concerns. c) Landscaping, Biodiversity & Trees i. Block of flats We encourage NFDC to review the architectural design of the proposed flats. In the opinion of MPC, they are dark, dismal and out of keeping with the typical street scene and of the rest of Marchwood. Alternative building materials should be considered to improve the street scene. ii. Playground area
--	---

	It is unclear from the plans what age groups are considered the target for providing a playground. Our experience would suggest that ASB can be reduced if play areas encompass all age groups and do not focus primarily on younger children. iii. Biodiversity The Cork Farm area has a rich diversity of flora and fauna, and MPC cannot determine if there has been sufficient investigation on the impact of the landscape, particularly the resident bats, barn owls and other native flora and fauna. We would welcome a condition that protects our wildlife, which parishioners have worked tirelessly to achieve. iv. Tress We wish to serve notice that we expect the planning authority to insist on specific trees and shrubs native to the area that are easy to preserve, conducive to good land management, landscaping objectives, and sustainable given current and future costs, and to uphold health and safety concerns. The committee noted the future high cost of maintenance for the site and that was considered not achievable by the Parish. v. Community Infrastructure This item may be outside the remit of the consultation. Still, given that Marchwood may lose its Doctor's Surgery, it was believed it might be prudent to repeat that the proposed development should reflect on the access to local amenities such as shops and medical facilities, given the Developer states Marchwood is an attractive place to live and raise a family. The Committee stated that the developer did not understand the local environment. The proposed plans were out of keeping with the rest of Marchwood, the proposed dwellings were cramped on to a small part of the site believed to be because of the pipeline and also because of the flooding issues that was considered to be dangerous for a family environment.
--	---

All minutes are draft until ratified by the Committee at the next meeting

Planning decisions

PC/25/044 - The planning decisions were noted.

Tree Applications

PC/25/045 –

TPO/24/0599 – No objection subject to the approval of the Arboriculturist.

TPO/24/0002 – No objection subject to the approval of the Arboriculturist.

PC/25/046 - Tree decisions – The tree decisions were noted.

PC/25/047 - The date of next meeting 17 February 2025. The meeting closed at 20.35pm.