

All minutes are draft until approved by the Council at the next meeting

**Marchwood Parish Council**

Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council in the Maple Room at Marchwood Village Hall on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2021 at 7.30pm.

Councillors: Cllr G Wright – in the Chair (P)

Cllr W Bucknell	(P)	Cllr J Case	(A)
Cllr M Havercroft	(P)	Cllr D Hindle	(P)
Cllr P Mballa	(A)	Cllr M Proctor	(P)
Cllr M Saxby	(P)	Cllr A Ushamba	(A)
Cllr R Young	(P)		

(P) Present

(A) Absent

In attendance: Mr B Gibbs (Clerk to the Council), Mrs C Cockeram (Deputy Clerk to the Council).

Mr Harry Hutchinson (Oceanic Estates Ltd), Mr Tony Boyle and Mr Andrew Hall (Boyle and Summers Ltd), Mr Phil Deacon (Deacon Design), District Cllrs Bennison and Hoare and 67 members of the public.

**Apologies for absence**

22/280 Cllrs Case, Mballa & Ushamba along with County Cllr Harrison sent their apologies.

**Declarations of Interest**

22/281 There were no declarations of interest made.

**Rules for debate**

22/282 The Clerk read the rules for debate applicable to the meeting.

**To receive a presentation from Oceanic Estates Ltd**

22/283 Mr Boyle, Mr Deacon and Mr Hall stood and spoke about the proposal listed on tonight's agenda. Between them they made the following comments.

- New drawings have been prepared and have been passed to the Parish Council to aid them with their discussion.
- The drawings show nothing more than an illustrative layout.
- No detailed permissions are being applied for that are based on these drawings.
- Permissions are being sought for access to the site and for the two proposed uses of the site namely residential and employment.
- The site is allocated within the New Forest District Development Plan that was adopted on the 6<sup>th</sup> July 2020.
- The site is in the ownership of Oceanic Galaxy Ltd.
- The site is designated as strategic site 3 (SS03) within the Local Plan as a site that could deliver up to 150 dwellings.
- The constraints on the site include the existing overhead power lines, the potential tidal flood risk, odours from the nearby waste water treatment works and the local highway network.
- The site is split into two parcels.

## All minutes are draft until approved by the Council at the next meeting

- One parcel is described as an allocation of residential dwellings with the other parcel (to the west of the site) being described as an employment opportunity.
- Public open spaces will also be provided.
- Much of the existing habitats will be protected as far as is possible.
- An allocation of land for allotments has recently been added to the scheme.
- Up to four surface water drainage solutions will be incorporated into the site to deal with surface run-off.
- The pathways and cycleways will provide the link to the rest of the community.
- There is still a lot of master planning objectives to be put in place.
- Consideration of the effects upon the existing conservation area will be made.

22/284 Mr Boyle spoke about the recent consultation exercise that had been held in Marchwood and made the following comments.

- Residential development will need to be placed at the eastern end of the site due to the constraints presented by the waste water treatment site and the waste transfer site.
- Site levels on the eastern edge of the site will be required to be raised as part of the flood mitigation.
- The site must be water neutral in that discharge into the water network must remain the same after the site is developed.
- The employment uses that are proposed go against the policies of the Local Plan with respect to strategic site 3 (SS03).
- Any proposed employment uses should not include container storage stacking.
- Landscape buffers will wrap around the employment development.

### **Public Participation**

22/285 Cllr Wright thanked Mr Boyle and his colleagues for the presentation.

22/286 Cllr Wright then summarised the representations made to NFDC regarding the application.

- There have been 81 representations made in total as of the 4th November 2021.
- 76 individuals have objected, with some making more than 1 submission.
- 59 mentioned that the current infrastructure cannot cope with the proposed development.
- 10 mentioned / questioned whether traffic surveys were carried out during lockdown.
- 2 mentioned they were carried out in June when people were still working from home
- 2 mentioned adding an additional junction to Normandy Way will exacerbate existing issues.
- 1 mentioned that the survey only covered entry and exit from Admiralty Way.
- 1 stated that modelling the traffic from the proposed employment development was impossible due to not knowing the types of business that would take residence.
- 9 mentioned that when an accident occurs on a local road, the whole village is brought to a standstill.
- 9 mentioned the poor state and maintenance of the local roads.
- 11 mentioned additional traffic is on top of that to be generated by the Solent Gateway plans.
- 23 mentioned existing issues with volumes of HGV traffic will increase.
- 1 mentioned that the development should not go ahead unless a service road serving Solent Gateway and Marchwood Industrial Estate to the A326 is constructed.
- 1 mentioned that the Trip Generation forecasts were underestimated.

## All minutes are draft until approved by the Council at the next meeting

- 35 mentioned that Marchwood does not need additional industrial units.
- 19 mentioned that Marchwood Industrial Park has unused capacity.
- 7 mentioned unused industrial capacity in neighbouring areas.
- 9 mentioned a growing imbalance between industry and residential developments in Marchwood.
- 8 mentioned Marchwood losing its village appeal.
- 3 mentioned that Cork Farm is detailed in the adopted local plan for housing only.
- 6 mentioned the proximity of industrial units to those living in Shorefield Road / Tides Way / The Gulls.
- 1 mentioned that B8 storage will open the possibility of container storage on site.
- 1 mentioned that the change towards home working reduces the need for more industrial units.
- 24 mentioned there will be additional noise pollution.
- 1 mentioned acoustic predictions in parts of Shorefield Road to be 'high risk'
- 6 mentioned additional light pollution.
- 21 mentioned there will be additional air pollution.
- 26 mentioned that the schools cannot cope with the additional demand.
- 20 mentioned that the Doctors Surgery cannot cope with the additional demand.
- 1 mentioned that nurseries and dentists cannot cope with the additional demand.
- 1 mentioned the bus service will not cope with additional demand.
- 23 mentioned the loss of green space.
- 4 mentioned that green spaces are good for well-being and mental health.
- 1 mentioned Boris Johnson recently spoke out against building homes on green field sites in the South East.
- 25 mentioned road safety concerns with additional traffic.
- 4 mentioned increased speeding around the village.
- 8 mentioned pedestrian access issues to the village centre from the new (and existing) developments.
- 7 mentioned that turning out of Admiralty Way is already difficult and will be made worse by the additional load.
- 1 mentioned having industrial entrance almost opposite Shorefield Road will be dangerous.
- 1 mentioned that Normandy Way has a 40mph limit with no road calming and insufficient crossing points.
- 2 mentioned that visibility on the proposed new Normandy Way junction is poor.
- 1 mentioned that the 1km walking distance in the 'Walking Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment' refers to the Junior School as a Primary School and makes no mention of the Infants School, which is 2km away.
- 26 mentioned flooding of the site and the risk to surrounding properties if the area is built upon.
- 1 mentioned that the effect of changing tides has not been accounted for.
- 1 mentioned the height of the water table during high tide.
- 2 mentioned that a lake forms on the site after heavy rain.
- 4 mentioned the creation of a raised 1.5m slab to build houses on will divert flooding to other properties as well as cause privacy issues.
- 3 mentioned that the stream in Magazine Lane is already susceptible to flooding, so diverting run off to this will exacerbate issues.
- 1 mentioned that the suggested drainage ponds are likely to overflow and create a bog in the communal areas.
- 22 mentioned the impact on wildlife.
- 2 mentioned the destruction of the old barn, which was home to bats.

## All minutes are draft until approved by the Council at the next meeting

- 1 mentioned that instead of an industrial area, a nature park with a lake should be created, to aid with flood mitigation and to create an area for exercise and relaxation.
- 3 mentioned that as the area floods it is frequented by egrets and other birds.
- 2 mentioned that improving existing green land as part of biodiversity assessment does not constitute improvement.
- 7 mentioned that the green space between existing housing and the proposed development is not wide enough.
- 4 mentioned a loss of daylight and privacy for existing homes.
- 6 mentioned a lack of communication regarding the plans.
- 2 mentioned that the plans were submitted during lockdown.
- 7 mentioned the proximity to the Waste Water Treatment works.
- 2 mentioned that the play park will be adjacent to this.
- 1 mentioned that the sewage works cannot cope with additional demand.
- 1 mentioned the proximity of the quay for sewerage disposal by barge.
- 1 mentioned that the facility is well known for failing to meet environmental clean air quality standards.
- 1 mentioned that amenity areas in general are sited in areas unsuitable for development, which makes them undesirable for amenity.
- 1 mentioned that if the area closest to the Waste Water Treatment works is not suitable for housing due to odour, it should not be suitable for workers.
- 4 mentioned overcrowding.
- 4 mentioned parking concerns of vehicles parking on the existing highways.
- 2 mentioned that the wording of the plans suggested an opportunity for allotments, but does not actually commit to providing them.
- 2 mentioned that the new properties will have the view of the green space that current residents and the community benefit from.
- 2 questioned whether the green space in the plans was reserved for a future planning application.
- 2 mentioned the hazards of the power lines and gas supply line.
- 4 mentioned the health concern of living close to power lines.
- 2 mentioned an increase in litter.
- 2 mentioned that the development does not respect the design protocols of the existing Admiralty development as claimed, as it creates back-to-back situations to maximise economic return.
- 2 mentioned that the site is adjacent to container berth SCT 4 which is licenced to handle class one explosives.
- 2 mentioned de-valuing of neighbouring properties.
- 1 mentioned that the density of proposed housing cannot constitute high quality.
- 1 mentioned that the pylons would need to be removed and cables buried underground.
- 1 mentioned an increase in crime.
- 1 mentioned that the development as proposed is not sustainable.
- 1 mentioned that the layout of roadway and parking will increase likelihood of criminal and antisocial behaviours and does not conform to the current guidance in designing out crime.
- 1 mentioned that a smaller development to the southern part of the sight may present an opportunity for a more sustainable development.
- 2 mentioned detrimental effect to neighbouring conservation area.
- 1 mentioned that the site is adjacent to a tank cleaning facility which creates fumes.
- 1 mentioned that the proposed cycle route is only partial and will not keep cyclists safe.

## All minutes are draft until approved by the Council at the next meeting

- 10 identified a need for more housing.
- 3 identified that additional housing need could be catered for by the Fawley Waterside development or other areas.

22/287 Members of the public spoke about the application and made the following comments:

- If employment is permitted with no current container storage uses what obstacles are there to stop another application in the future from changing the use classes of the site.
- Who will own the proposed employment site?
- How high will these developments be if they are to sit on raised levels.
- The flood plain risks have been inadequately considered.
- The present drainage system will be unable to cope once the development is complete.
- Water will back up into other areas of the village during periods of heavy rain.
- The development will almost certainly flood during spring tides.

22/288 **21/11293 Corks Farm, Normandy Way, Marchwood, Southampton.**

Hybrid application seeking; Outline permission (Access only) for residential development up to 150 dwellings, together with associated Public Open Space, ANRG and infrastructure, and Employment land (Use Classes E(g) (i) (ii) (iii) and B8); Full consent for reprofiling of land for employment development, enclosure and site infrastructure.

22/289 **RESOLVED:** To submit the following comments and recommendations.

Marchwood Parish Council would like to raise a **strong objection** to this application listing the following material planning considerations.

We have used the New Forest District Local Plan 2016-2036 Part One (The Local Plan) as our main source document.

### 1. Strategic Site 3.

SS03 (Land at Cork's Farm) is shown on the policies map of the Local Plan as being allocated for the residential development of at least 150 dwellings and public open space.

This application seeks to reprofile part of the site for employment development.

The Local Plan Section 7 (Business and the economy) and Policy STR6 (Sustainable economic growth) both provide clear guidance as to what should be considered as acceptable economic development within the New Forest District. Both said that the use and reuse of existing employment sites, in combination with additional employment land provision within Strategic Site Allocations was deemed sufficient to meet the identified employment needs over the Local Plan period 2020-2036 at the time of its adoption.

Paragraph 7.28 also says "Both the Marchwood Port site and ABP land holdings at Dibden Bay include significant land areas respectively of about 90 and 400 hectares that could accommodate a wide range of supporting uses and infrastructure (subject to obtaining the necessary consents). ABP also own large parts of the Marchwood Industrial Estate to the north of Marchwood Port. At this early stage there is no clearly identifiable need to make further land allocations for supporting development, infrastructure or consequential economic or other growth?."

The Parish Council is clear that there can be no justification for releasing a further parcel of land for employment needs so early in the life of the Local Plan. It therefore asks the Local Planning

## All minutes are draft until approved by the Council at the next meeting

Authority to tells the developer that no employment allocation at this site will be acceptable to the Parish Council and the community it represents.

This hybrid application as submitted would not provide a well-designed development at the site and as a result would not respond positively to the waterside location. The design and layout as described in design document CFM\_1501 fails to provide protection from future sea level rise.

The scale, form and siting of the development would also fail to conserve or enhance the heritage and setting of the Royal Naval Armaments Depot Conservation Area including its listed buildings and walls as required by the planning strategy of the Local Plan for this site.

Due to the positioning of the proposed employment area the proposal fails to provide a strong settlement edge with a clear distinction between formally designed streets, courtyards and spaces and natural recreational greenspace.

### 2. Access to the site.

The developer had commissioned a transport assessment that was undertaken on its behalf by Paul Basham Associates. The scope of the published report includes site accessibility, access arrangements, parking provision and the impact that the proposal will have on the local road network.

Item 4.6 of the transport assessment states "Hampshire County Council (HCC) requested that the agreed eastbound approach stopping sight distance at the proposed access on Normandy Way is to be checked over a distance of 1.5 times the agreed stopping sight distance". Using the sight stopping distance tools on the hants.gov.uk website and the 85th percentile speed from the transport assessment, a sight stopping distance of 74 metres can be determined. One and

a half times this distance equates to 111 metres whereas the visibility splay assessment submitted as part of this application indicates a distance of 94 metres at this junction. The Parish Council therefore takes the view that this assessment does not meet the threshold of the safety standards as outlined in the pre-application briefing received from Hampshire County Council and that no safe access to the site can be gained from Normandy Way as outlined in the planning application.

### 3. Traffic Level Surveys.

a. Section 6.4 of the Transport Assessment states that HCC highlighted: "due to the location, modelling should include the impact of the proposed development and the committed development of the Strategic Site 2 (SS02 Land South of Bury Road) and the developments of the Solent Gateway site (planning app 21/11156) and the McMullen Barracks (planning app 20/11456) in the assessment".

Section 6.5 of the Transport Assessment details how a review of planning application 20/11456 was undertaken as part of the modelling. However, there is no mention of planning application 21/11156 in the report. The Parish Council asserts that the consequence of these applications 20/11456 and 21/11156 (if approved) will have a large impact on traffic levels.

Whilst it is accepted that application 21/11156 has yet to be determined by the local planning authority it should also be noted that Solent Gateway are already permitted to approximately double the volume of their operations at their site with consents already received. This fact is detailed in a number of their supporting documentation. This cumulative impact of the permissions should be considered when determining this application as being the minimum increase in traffic levels.

## All minutes are draft until approved by the Council at the next meeting

b. The surveys completed on 30th June 2021 were undertaken towards the end of a Covid 19 lockdown period where people were advised to work from home. We simply say that these surveys are clearly not representative of 'normal' conditions.

The conclusion reached by the Parish Council therefore is to state that traffic surveys highlighted in the report are an inadequate assessment of the current position. In addition, the report fails to take into account the full impact of other developments nearby and should be disregarded as incomplete.

### 4. Flood Risk.

The HCC Flood Authority Report questions the methodology of using surface drainage and is critical of the timing of the infiltration tests that were carried out. HCC said "Although some infiltration testing and groundwater monitoring has been undertaken, the dates appear to be in late June which is outside the winter testing period recommended".

The Parish Council says that the analysis provided as part of this application is totally inadequate to determine if the flood risk to new and existing properties can be successfully managed via the proposed method.

The planning strategy document for SS03 says that "wherever possible, development should be directed to Flood Zone 1 and will only be considered within Flood Zones 2 or 3 where it is possible to mitigate flood risk. Preparation of a detailed site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required to demonstrate how the proposed development will be made safe over its lifetime?".

The Parish Council is therefore of the opinion that insufficient work has been done here to assess the risks of developing within Flood Zone 2 & 3. The Parish Council is also keen to find out if the Environment Agency has been consulted on this application.

### 5. Odour.

The proposed development is located east of Slowhill Copse waste water treatment works (WwTW), which is operated by Southern Water (SW), and a household waste recycling centre (HWRC) and waste transfer station operated by Veolia. The developer had commissioned an odour assessment that was undertaken on its behalf by Phlorum Ltd. The scope of the published report seeks to understand whether odorous emissions from these facilities (principally the WwTW) could significantly impact the amenity of future users of the proposed development.

There are several statements within the Phlorum report that call into question the validity of the odour analysis. The report states "No agreement over the scope of assessment could be reached, with Southern Water suggesting the scope placed too much weight on the outputs of a dispersion model and the assumption that samples collected at the WwTW on a given day would be representative of an annual period".

When looking at the results of the Sniff Tests, these were carried out over just three days, with the summary stating "the odour exposure at every sampling location within the application site was judged to be negligible, which is not significant, with reference to the Institute of Air Quality management (IAQM) guidance". As pointed out by SW in the report, sampling over 3 days is not representative of an annual period.

If the delegated planning officer is minded to permit this application then the Parish Council would ask that this proposal is dealt with by the planning committee of New Forest District Council.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.18pm