



14 November 2022 – New Forest District Council Offices

22/10813 | Demolition of the existing buildings; erection of 25 dwellings with associated access, landscaping and parking | ORCHARD GATE, NOADS WAY, DIBDEN PURLIEU, HYTHE SO45 4PD

Attendees

James Gilfillan, Senior Development Management Officer, NFDC

Clare Spiller, Planning Consultants, Chapman Lily

Paul Harrington, Architect, Morgan Carey

David Cracklen, Director, AJC

Simon McFarlane, Planning Director, AJC

Meeting Notes

1. Housing land supply update – Presumption in favour

JG - confirmed that the LPA currently only have a 3+ years supply of housing land and that the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies.

SM – Noted that this would be a key consideration in AJC making any significant amendments to the proposed development, which was considered to be a defensible scheme which delivers significant benefits that are likely in his opinion to outweigh any perceived harms, particularly in the context of the lack of a designated character area, the 'general' accordance with housing mix requirements and the minimum density guidelines in the Housing Design & Character SPD (2006) (30dph) and the NFDC housing supply situation/tilted balance.

2. Housing Mix (NFDC strategic housing comments)

JG – Didn't feel that it was strictly necessary to accord slavishly to the housing mix requirements set out in the consultee comments, particularly for a relatively small development. The current proposed housing mix of 2/3/4 bedroom dwellings was more closely aligned to the Neighbourhood Plan requirements to provide more 2&3 bedroom dwellings (Aim 2) and the specific characteristic on the

site and the area. i.e. that a flatted block(s) with smaller 1 bedroom units would be out of character with the area.

3. Design/layout

JG – Felt that the ‘interior’ of the site was acceptable in respect of a higher density and layout in context of the tiled balance. Some concerns were raised about the frontage area closer to Noads Way and a range of ideas were discussed about how to potentially address these. This included physically separating the frontage property 01 and introducing some additional landscaping in between units 02/03. Changes to block 04-07 were discussed to address the road differently, introduce a corner element with a more subservient wing which might screen more of the rear of the building. However, when the CGI was presented it appeared that addressing the green as proposed may be more appealing and the simplicity of the block which mirrors the units 22-25 is also considered to be a good design response in relation to ‘the green’.

AJC/PH – Agreed to explore making some further changes to the frontage area and including a physical separation and increased boundary landscaping between units 02/03.

4. Transport (HCC comments)

a. Road adoption/internal visibility splays

AJC – The road will be built to adoptable standards but not offered for adoption. Internal visibility splays around a bend where vehicles are likely to be travelling slowly were not considered to a critical item to address. JG – Agreed.

b. Road safety audit (RSA)

c. Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and review (WCHAR)

AJC – Both of these requests were considered to be unnecessary given the location and size of the proposed development.

JG – would liaise with HCC and confirm whether they were actually necessary.

5. Drainage/overwinter monitoring (HCC comments)

AJC – confirmed that overwinter monitoring is going to be undertaken to address the HCC comments. The current drainage layout had been designed to accommodate a high-water table in any event. It was requested that drainage could be dealt with by way of condition or specific committee resolution

in order to avoid a lengthy delay in the determination of the application, especially in the event of the need for appeal.

6. Nitrate neutrality

7. Biodiversity net gain

AJC – Both the requisite nitrates (40.34kg) and Biodiversity Net Gain (0.25ha) of land at Roke Manor, Test Valley would be secured by legal agreement. Grampian conditions would be attached to the planning permission.

8. Affordable housing viability/Bruton Knowles response

a. Areas of agreement/disagreement

AJC – set out that the key difference in the Sturt Viability Appraisals and the Bruton Knowles assessment was the GDV and sales values per sqft. A rebuttal note would be submitted to address the differences with sales price comparisons. It is possible that a compromise position could be reached to provide some affordable units on site, which would further add to the suite of social benefits.

b. AJC future intention

Irrespective of the viability appraisal the intention is to deliver this site in partnership with a Housing Association and deliver 100% affordable dwellings.

9. Committee/timeframes

JG – Would consider the drainage condition issue, the necessity of the RSA and WCHAR and confirm whether (subject to all other matters) the application could be taken to committee sooner rather than later with 14 Dec/11 Jan the targets.

10.AOB

None.