



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Meeting of Dogmersfield Parish Council with Vortal Properties Ltd and Hazeley Developments Ltd Monday 6th October 2014, 7pm.

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
Mr Johnathan Humphrey (JH)	MD of Hazeley Developments
Mr Simon Bull	Land Buyer for Hazeley Developments
Mrs Claire Inglis (CI)	Dogmersfield Parish Council

The meeting commenced at 7pm with introductions made by all in attendance.

JH described Hazeley Developments (HD) as a family run, 3rd generation business of some 80 years +. It is a company that diversified from a farming background.

SB introduced himself as the land buyer for HD with some 9 years in the industry. HD aims to build 'nice houses in nice locations'.

Council representatives introduced themselves and GB commented that the parish council were here to listen and asked for the current status of the plans to develop along Chatter Alley.

DH reported that having taken on board the comments from the landowners and concerns voiced by people of the Dogmersfield community a number of developers were shortlisted. Those shortlisted were companies that understood village developments. HD was chosen based on design principles and not just income.

GB asked the nature of HD commitment at this stage.

It was confirmed that an offer has been made subject to planning being achieved.

SB introduced the proposed scheme for three bespoke family homes. The pre-application comments that had been received in relation to Church Lane of infill properties to the front of the plot had been taken on board. Low density was another factor and the properties will be designed within the character of other properties along the road. Morse Webb is the architect chosen for the scheme who has local knowledge and are based in Basingstoke and Reading. They have been involved in projects within Dogmersfield for example The Oast House. The size of the three properties has also been considered not making them too large and the footprint is expected to be 2,700 sq. ft., 2 storey houses. Commercially there is no gain in building a larger footprint. This size would provide three comfortable 4 bedroom houses with double garages.

GB clarified that pre-application advice had not been sought on Chatter Alley.

GB asked what consideration has been given to Highways/Water/Foul drainage.

SB answered. HD have familiarised themselves with the constraints of the locality such as the proximity to the school, the 30mph limit (GB commented that there has been a request for a 20mph limit) and the road narrowings and these have been considered as part of the design.

From the highways perspective the three properties themselves will not significantly increase output. Surface water and drainage has been considered. A search has highlighted the foul system and at this time GB stated that if the development was to link into the local system it should be routed towards Fleet and not to the self-contained Chatter Alley system. There are capacity issues in both cases.

SB confirmed that this is being looked at very carefully as they are aware of the limitations and that capacity checks will be carried out and consideration will be given to installing treatment plants on site.

Regarding surface water increased soak-aways will be installed with the aim to create benefit to this issue and not make the situation worse.

AJC spoke of the current state of the ditches with some culverts blocked and that the ditch to the side of Chatter Alley where development is proposed disappears underground further down the road so the state of it is unknown. GB further commented



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

that if any development did not add to the water run-off that would be ideal. AJC further commented that a lot of water runs from the back to front of the proposed site.

JH confirmed that developers are under obligation to do better in relation to surface water. GB stated that the long-term interest in this is high.

DH also commented that the developers do not intend to develop all the proposed site and HD will soon be writing to the school to inform them of the proposals and discuss the prospect of casual parking in the remaining strip of land adjacent to the school playing field.

AJC inquired whether there would be a covenant in place to ensure that this area is maintained. It was agreed that this area would be regularly maintained.

GB commented on the concern voiced by neighbouring residents of being overlooked and the profile of the side elevation was discussed. At another property where this was a problem Hart DC insisted that windows in this elevation must have obscure glass and therefore it was suggested that in any design detail a bedroom window should not be sited on this profile.

SB pointed out that HD is aware of a right of way alongside the Troquain House boundary which consists of an approx. 1.5m strip. JH also confirmed that this information pertaining to windows on this profile would be worked into the design detail.

GB asked DH what had happened to the Self-build option. DH responded by stating that HD will build and sell the properties. The complexities of self-build in so much as getting three buyers and the potential for a rolling building site limited this as being a viable option. GB then commented that this would have avoided CIL if adopted.

CIL has not yet been adopted by Hart District Council but may by the end of the financial year. JH confirmed that S106 would apply.

Questions were asked about specifics of the design diagrams provided which included-

Does the entrance to the three properties use the existing entrance to the field? It may do or it may have to shift slightly depending on analysis from the road layout, the specifics of this have not yet been designed A meeting has been held with the Highways dept. and no major concerns have been raised. The width of the entrance is likely to be approx. 4.1-4.8m wide with parking off road in front of the properties.

AJC asked whether the land at the side remains the property of the Trust. This was confirmed as being the case.

What would be the access situation for the casual parking? A new entrance would be created for access. Highways again did not see this as an issue and this has also yet to be designed.

AJC and GB both asked for consideration to be given to construction traffic movements and school timings suggesting that construction vehicles not park on the roadway during any potential construction as the area is under extreme pressure during school times.

JH confirmed that HD would schedule deliveries accordingly. There may also be the possibility for access to additional casual parking for one-off occasions.

AJC asked if HD were aware of a transformer on a power line in front of the site. HD is aware and this will be considered as part of the logistics. This was thought to be the supply for the school and communication has already been made with SSE to ensure that this is dealt with correctly.

AJC also commented on the supply of the broadband cabling into the school which is located along this stretch also and HD agreed to make enquiries.

GB asked what are the next steps?

DH confirmed that a pre-application meeting would be held with HDC to which the Parish Council would be invited. This would allow HD to understand what the planning officer would require and therefore any changes could be dealt with up front. There would then be a public presentation in the format of a display of the proposal and representatives on hand to answer questions and gain feedback. This would be done over a time period that allows the majority of the demographic the opportunity to view the proposals e.g. late afternoon and early evening. SB confirmed that it is also the intention of HD to talk to all of the immediate neighbours.

The meeting closed at 8.45pm