

THRUXTON PARISH COUNCIL
**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 5 JANUARY 2010 IN
RESPECT OF PLANNING APPLICATION FOR SHOWMANS QUARTERS**

Present:

Charles Milner Williams (Chairman) (CMW)

John Davis (JD)

Ray Bradbury (RB)

Debbie Foynes (DF)

Kate Phillipson (KP)

49 members of the public

Apologies

Heather Bourner (Clerk to the Council)

Ron Pennells

Ellie Charnley

Opening

402 CMW opened meeting at 7.30pm. No members of the press present. Meeting admin completed including explanation of process. Two principal speakers to be Mrs Connors (Applicant) (Mrs C) and Mr Leslie from Thruxton Down (Mr L).

Applicant comments

403 Mrs C - explained that the circumstances over the three applications has changed. This time looking for three sites to share the costs of meeting the planning requirements. She has lived all her life in the area, as have several generations of her family (non travelling Show people) and worked in Wallop and Andover. Knows that wherever travelling show people try to settle there is opposition. Is self funded. She said she remembered what she had said 2 years ago (when she was sole applicant for one pitch) but the circs had changed and the costs had escalated. Apologised for not attending last meeting.

Action group comments

404 Mr L – Govt has said that sites should not be in the open countryside unless on farmyard or edge of an industrial estate. Thruxton Down House does not meet these requirements. Traffic movements to 11 pm would lead to negative effect on horses. Negative impact on agriculture supported by NFU. Mr L (cont) – In respect of the planning application - no overriding need for development in the countryside; surrounding land exclusively for animal, agricultural or horse activity; of the 14 locations the applicant visits, 6 not in Hants and a further 3 not in Borough; no public transport and all facilities will require use of a car i.e. no local facility of govt policy; landscaping proposals not in keeping ; ref to s1 and 2 of the Borough Plan re need to meet need of community and to enhance quality of life of community; are suitable sites which TVBC should investigate; inconsistent to support if application for a single mobile home refused on basis of SET 03 and DES 06 and 07 (??)

Public Participation

405

1. The meeting was then opened to the general public. CMW stated that this is a new application. Previous objections not carried forward. PC must reiterate objections.
2. Janet Graham – Thruxton – asked why ref to Thruxton Down campsite. Not recorded as a campsite on any records. Confusing if not misleading.

3. Mrs C – Bought land with a view to it being used as a campsite and registered the address. Not used on application – TVBC have used it.
4. George Campbell-Johnston – Farmer to south of site – site is adj. To equestrian centre for the training of young horses. Vehicle maintenance and repair would not be compatible. Semi urban and use not suited to the countryside – would oppose application.
5. Lance Lindsley – Thruxton- asked if other families had a share in the site and if yes what would stop those other families subdividing their sites
6. Mrs C – answer – Will have to sell one plot to fund the work needed. Recognise concerns re spilling into the northern part of the site. Not intended to go into that area and had discussed applying for equestrian use for that part (later said TVBC said not necessary). TVBC would apply conditions re no. of caravans on each site/pitch. Didn't put details of times on application as she knows that TVBC will impose restrictions.
7. Brian Mellor – Thruxton- PC have a moral issue – unanimously rejected last time. Concerned re continual change of use in each application.
8. Elaine Brewer - Thruxton Q re accommodation of passing travelling showmen.
9. Mrs C No passing users will be allowed to use the site – would be one of the conditions made by TVBC. Equipment will be stored there. No maintenance will be done – will be done externally. Testing would be one day only. Vehicle maint. Has to go off site. One day annual testing – Health and Safety have to come in. Confirmed three families.
10. Gordon Brockman – Lambourne Way, Thruxton – Extended family will stay and won't be turned away. Have seen a showman's ground – is a 'pigsty' and an eyesore. Can't help but think it would happen at Thruxton Down.
11. Mrs C – agree some sites are eyesores and are overcrowded. Her family not Travelling Show People – married into the life. Confirmed would assist family. If site became overcrowded it would be reported to the council.
12. Mrs Lietchie – Thruxton Down – Questions – how many will eventually be there? Who will enforce restrictions on the site? Why that site?
13. Mrs C – The site came up for sale. It was a central location and she has close family locally.
14. Lance Lindsay – Thruxton – Impressed by the applicants character and felt that although a lot of positive aspects come from her there was no guarantee that Mrs C's good character would apply to others on the site or those that come after once Mrs C moves on. Risk that the standards promised by Mrs C may not be maintained.
15. Families chosen (to share the site) are similar (to Mrs Connors) in approach. TVBC can grant a licence for a number of years (usually 4) and if in breach of the terms of the licence they can be asked to leave
16. Joanna Ferguson Chairman Quarley Parish Council– object to a semi industrial site in open countryside. Feels the site is inappropriate. Understood that when the land was purchased the vendor thought that it was to be used for horses. Feels that there must be more appropriate places and TVBC should i/d a more suitable site.
17. Mr Atkinson Wills – landowner Laines Farm Quarley – asked whether an agent would be representing Mrs C at the TVBC meeting. Mrs C confirmed not.
18. Mike Windsor – Thruxton – concerned about creating a precedent including re an extension of the current site. TVBC would find it difficult to refuse any further application if they passed this one. Also asked what arrangements had been made in relation to water run off in order to protect the aquifer.

19. Mrs C – Has been told she would have to install a sewage treatment plan.
20. Mr Pakenham – Thrupton/Kimpton – Cholderton Water Company not consulted at all and believed to be in his catchment area.
21. DF – Saw Photos of the Shadfield site – dreadful – have not put screening up.
22. Mrs C – Agree.
23. DF. Not evident what the maximum number of vehicles is. No prosecutions known in respect of a failure to comply with conditions/restrictions.
24. Heidi Lietchi- Downlands House Thrupton Down – questioned whether only lighting would be solar powered lights referred to in application.
25. Mrs C – confirmed that there would be solar low level lighting. Electricity will be provided to the site. Significant generator use not an issue.
26. RB – asked some Qs – Mrs C responded that no fuel would be stored on the site. If the sitn changed an interceptor tank would be required. The only fuel is in the tanks of vehicles and they are refuelled off site. Owns 5 acres. Site is 2 acres. Aware of the concerns re the northerly part of the land. TVBC have said no need to make an application for equestrian use etc.
27. CMW confirmed that impact of the development on property values could not be taken into consideration.
28. KP – asked Qs re maintenance. Explained that Guidance 04/2007 refers to the requirement that Travelling Show People can live, maintain and store vehicles on same site. Showman’s Guild Docs also refer to need to maintain on site. Also asked about testing.
29. Mrs C said that H and S legislation has changed. No maintenance can be dealt with on site. Have to have the correct paperwork. All rides for each family would take place on same day i.e. 3 days per year.
30. JD – Discussed planning application at Picket Piece – Mrs C says not aware. JD also concerned re access and egress. Mrs C says no problems with ability to tow up the hill.
31. Mrs C happy to work with PC and residents (a small watch/liaison group) if application passed.
32. Mr Pakenham – TVBC have failed to take action against an illegally parked caravan over 11 years.
33. David Scott – Thrupton Down - reinforcing the point made by JD re road. 60mph limit on road. Often exceeded especially when circuit active. V. diff to pull out and/or manoeuvre. Can be very dangerous. Mrs C – gates will be well in from the road. Will not be any reversing etc onto road.
34. CMW drew that part of the meeting to a conclusion. Thanks Mrs C for coming and answering questions.

405 Meeting of Thrupton PC commenced.

No declarations of interest

1. RB – As a PC we opposed it before and I oppose it now. No change other than worse b/c now 3 users on the same site and not all close relatives.
2. Proposal is basically for an industrial site with light, power, water and sewage. Not appropriate to use rural farmland for this purpose. Other sites are available in Andover with facilities in place. There have been changes in the application for the site over the last couple of years and the policing and enforcement of any breaches of restrictions would be very difficult.

3. DF – Voted for the Application the first time b/c of family. Nature of Application changed last time and more again this time. Wrong site for a business of this nature. The plot is already being subdivided and there is no control over what would happen in the future.
4. KP. Concur with what already said. Primary concerns are control in the future (b/c of subdivision etc); precedent set and the TVBC difficulty in preventing further development if this granted; concerns about enforcement; wrong site for commercial activity; landscaping proposals out of place in chalk land setting; still v. concerned about issue of maintenance etc - understand what she says but whole thrust of the guidance and Showman's guild rules is that it is a lifestyle requirement of TSP to live, maintain and store vehicle on same site - she says will not do so but that is the whole reason for having special rules for this group of people – it is these requirements that take it outside the normal planning process [if there is no requirement to meet these requirements then should we be looking at it as a TSP application at all????]; Does not meet the requirements set out in 04/2007.
5. JD – as others plus effect on Racedown House; landscaping inappropriate on chalk downland; lack of local services (one of the 04/2007 criteria)
6. CMW – some sympathy with application; Mrs C came across very well; Would support on a more suitable site....right application in the wrong place. Concerns focus around disruption to the local community, noise, effect on agricultural land, lack of facilities. CMW made the point that the last planning application for Thruxton Down was for a small market garden.
7. The Chairman called for a show of hands on the proposal before the Thruxton Parish Council Votes cast.
 In support of the Application – 0
 Against the Application – 5.

406 Resolved

That Thruxton Parish Council formally write to TVBC to object to planning application 09/02391/FULLN. In view of the need to lodge the formal objection by 8 Jan 10 it was agreed that the precise wording would be left to the Chairman and Cllr Davis.

407 Date next meeting

Next ordinary meeting of the Parish Council would be at 7.30PM on Wednesday 3 February 2010.