



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Meeting of Dogmersfield Parish Council with Vortal Properties Ltd Tuesday 18th February 2014

In attendance:

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cllr Geoff Beaven (GB) | Dogmersfield Parish Council |
| Cllr Alastair Clark (AC) | Dogmersfield Parish Council |
| Cllr Graham Leach (GL) | Dogmersfield Parish Council |
| Mr David Heron (DH) | Vortal Properties Limited |
| Mrs Claire Inglis (CI) | Dogmersfield Parish Council |

GB opened the meeting at 7.30pm by commenting that a number of events had taken place since the last meeting with Vortal Properties in December 2013. These have included discussions amongst members of Dogmersfield Parish Council (DPC), a meeting with Hart District Council (HDC) Corporate Director, Leader of the council and the Chairman of HDC; and a development briefing to residents of Dogmersfield not only about development of the Fisk Field but development in general.

The result of all of this was the response to Vortal from DPC that covered the key issues from the December meeting.

DH of Vortal declined the opportunity to respond and react to this response.

DH presented outline schematics for Chatter Alley and Church Lane. He stressed that some of the schematics were for illustrative purposes and had not been discussed with all of the owners of the land involved. GB asked DH to confirm his understanding of landowners associated with the pockets of land in question. This was confirmed by DH.

DH confirmed that the schematic for Church Lane was indicative at the moment from discussions held with the landowners. DH has also spoken with HDC planning department who highlighted that for land parcels >0.2 hectares with the capacity for 5 houses there would be a requirement for affordable housing to be built as part of any development. On the other hand the nature and character of Dogmersfield is large houses situated on large plots and this is reflected in the schematic. When asked to confirm that this arrangement would feature in a planning application, DH reported that HDC had said that the argument would take place as to the under- utilisation of land and they may require more dwellings on each plot.

DH continued in relation to the Chatter Alley schematic where changes have been made in response to concerns about privacy of the existing houses and the feedback that the previous car parking provision is not adequate to make a noticeable difference to the traffic situation along this road. The foot print for the schematic requires more land than the Fisk Field but this concept had not been discussed with the land owner concerned.

GL queried why the design had been set out with a need for cars to pass the 2 'Affordable' plots to access the car parking shown on the diagram. DH responded by saying that at this end of the Fisk field there is not as much depth to the plot and the design is a generality at the moment to seek what is desired.

DH then presented a schematic for a much larger scheme incorporating much of the SHLAA land and including provision for community facilities such as a Village Green, a Village Hall and sports facilities including a football pitch. DH wanted to make DPC aware of the potential for using the land available and that if such benefits are to be realised in the longer term this would need to be taken into account in all development proposals. The schematic was at this stage 'stylised' and not a true representation of any immediate plan.

GB commented that there would be very little if any desire by residents for a sports field and village hall types of facilities that would realistically bring more traffic into the village. There would not be enough demand from within the village to be financially viable. GL voiced his concern on the larger schematic whilst only a stylised diagram at the moment it appears to supersede the smaller Chatter Alley and Church Lane schemes.

DH agreed but it would be remiss of him not to put on the table at this time Vortal's desire to bring a larger scheme forward in the future and to highlight that the stand alone schemes may constrain what residents would like to gain from such a larger scheme in the future.



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

GB said that there was no demand in the village for a large number of affordable homes and any local development should enhance the conservation area, whereas the scale and content of the larger scheme illustrated by the schematic would not provide such an enhancement.

DH asked what facilities would?

GB responded that since Christmas the main concerns have been for the state of the sewers and the gas pipeline through the village. An upgrade is required to both of these as the current sewer system is unable to cope with the current demand and the gas main needs upgrading to prevent water ingress. There is also a need for ditches to be overhauled.

Some residents are against the presence of the school for the troubles it causes with parking. The provision of parking as part of the Chatter Alley scheme will only relieve the staff parking and do nothing to alleviate the parents parking situation. GB also asked whether consideration has been given to the traffic calming measures that exist currently in Chatter Alley?

DH confirmed that the next stage is to carry out surveys as to the level changes between the roadway and access to the land parcels in question and the current road layout. AJC commented that the additional properties and access to the parking area creates additional hazards with junctions to the road where the children will be walking away from the school. GB further commented that the provision of the parking area is not sufficient to encourage parents to drop-off their children there as the turning capacity will be very restricted.

GB asked DH to confirm the status of the stand-alone Church Lane scheme. DH confirmed that further discussions will be had with the landowners and that the provided schematic is again stylised, but that this scheme fits in to the nature and character of the village.

GB commented that a conservation area cannot be treated the same as any other area for development. Furthermore that the villagers will want to know what is happening at all stages.

DH felt it inappropriate to share the full details of schematics at this stage but that suggestions have got to be put forward to enable a starting point to be established. He would be happy to look into the need for better sewers and renewed gas pipeline but would anticipate any scheme to be self-sustainable in relation to use of renewable energies.

The shortcomings of the infrastructure were discussed and summarised as requiring significant investment by Thames Water and British Gas and public investment was not appropriate.

GB continued by commenting that DH would probably be aware of the Council's suggestion that the character of Dogmersfield should be that of a linear settlement and that any development in the village which would be in keeping.

GB also considered the revised layout of the Fisk Field schematic took better account of the privacy of the existing properties but there were still shortcomings with the layout overall. GL again queried the need for affordable housing on this site. DH again quoted the 'policy' relating to >0.2 hectares mentioned above.

DH continued that the need for affordable housing was driven by Hart DC policies and not developers desires. As the sites in Dogmersfield are close to the area threshold there may be some flexibility but this would need to be debated fully as the pre-application advice stage. DH would be happy to invite representatives of DPC to the Pre-application meeting with HDC but this may not be welcomed. He had successfully arranged for Crookham Village Parish Council to attend the pre-application meeting for the Knights Close scheme. DH agreed to email the Clerk the Hart requirement policy for affordable housing.

GL sought clarification on the self-build aspect of the proposal and the S106/CIL contributions. DH commented that Vortal are very relaxed about this method of approach to development in Dogmersfield. Discussions with the Fisk Trust have resulted in Vortal being prepared to make a community contribution. There are various options with the self-build method, a builder can be employed to build both plots or each individual future plot owner would employ their own builder. The affordable plots have no land value and would be given over to a housing association (usually Sentinel in this area). GB stated that the self-build approach would create a waiver on the recognised route of S106/CIL contributions. AJC also added that there is the 'moral' dimension as any developer contributions made direct to a Parish Council could be viewed by residents as corrupt rewards. This is human nature and by circumnavigating the normal arrangement it appears that developers are avoiding the contributions that are needed by Hart DC to compensate for the increase in housing by improving infrastructure or offsetting damage to the environment.



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

DH confirmed that he had experienced this difficulty in other areas and it would need to be proved to be above board even if the money was say to be used to improve sewers and gas mains. GB responded by saying that this would be the responsibility of the Utility Companies to make an investment to accommodate any new development.

GB at this point summarised the schematics put forward at the meeting. The Fisk Field schematic shows some improvements but there are still elements of the layout that do not work. In relation to the generic layout of the larger schematic, there is no demand in Dogmersfield for the sports facilities and village hall, and residents would not view these as worthwhile compensatory benefits for a development scheme on this scale. The Church Lane schematic was consistent with the linear settlement character.

GB said that as the larger schematic had not even been seen by all the landowners it would be wrong to consider it any further and give it any wider publicity. DH agreed and all copies were returned. With the Fisk Field schematic DH agreed that there is a need to look again at the parking situation and that source documents for the schematics should be checked as there are existing houses missed off or shown with incorrect orientations. The schematics as they stand at the moment would lack creditability.

DH confirmed that Vortal would be looking to move to Pre-application stage with the Church Lane proposal but further work was needed for the Fisk Field.

GB asked in closing what information could be shared with residents at this stage?

DH confirmed that Vortal would need check back with the landowners but he expected to be able to provide updated schematics for both the Fisk Field and Church Lane within the next few days that could be shared with residents.

Meeting close at 8.30pm