

DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Pre-Application Advice Meeting
Oakford Homes
Hart District Council Planning Officer
Vortal Properties
Dogmersfield Parish Council
Thursday 12th March 2015, 9.30am.

This is an informal record of the pre-application meeting provided by the Parish Clerk on behalf of Dogmersfield Parish Council. The definitive pre-application guidance will be produced by Hart DC and this may be found on their planning website under reference 15/00352/PREAPP.

In attendance:

Kerri Crutchfield (KC)	HDC Planning Officer
Mr Chris Coates (CC)	MD of Oakford Homes
Dennis Priestley (DP)	Architect of Pope Priestley Architects
Cllr Geoff Beaven (GB)	Dogmersfield Parish Council
Cllr Alastair Clark (AJC)	Dogmersfield Parish Council
Mrs Claire Inglis (CI)	Dogmersfield Parish Council
Mr David Heron (DH)	Vortal Properties Limited

Introductions – All present introduced themselves

KC asked Oakford Homes to outline their proposal

DP referred to schematics, aerial photographs of the village. He described Dogmersfield as a dispersed settlement with no recognised centre. Church Lane itself is a rural lane on one side with a slightly urban element with properties predominantly to one side. Some properties are set back from the road others sit close to the roadway. Properties are sparsely distributed along Church Lane and all have nice frontages.

The scheme proposed is for three individual properties set back into the plots maintaining the rural approach. The existing hedge line along the roadside does to some degree hide the views across the open fields. The decision to move the body of the property line back into the plot will reduce the impact from the road. Individual accesses will be created to each property. They will be two storey, restrained in the level of variety of materials. The local existing properties demonstrate a nice variety of material and are individual in style. The intention is not to create a copy of these styles.


GB asked KC whether she was aware of the Dogmersfield Conservation Area appraisal document? KC confirmed she was.

KC went on to outline the main planning issues relating to the development of this site.

The site is outside the main settlement area. HDC is confident in its five year land supply so can refuse development if considered a valuable site or the development area is not sustainable. The NPPF requires us to look at economic, social and environmental factors. As far social and economic the amenities include a school and restaurants. In relation to environmental the impact on the conservation area would have to be looked at. Important open spaces need to be retained and the conservation appraisal would have to be reviewed carefully as open spaces and views in Church Lane are mentioned.

GB referred to the Chatter Alley pre-application advice provided which pointed out that it was an important open space and that it would be a shame to spoil the wide open views available on Church Lane.

KC looked more closely at the proposed development area on the aerial view provided and to confirm the land put forward for this development proposal and considered that there would be some open space retained. GB did comment that other land owners in this vicinity have put land forward for the SHLAA. KC considered that developing the larger area nearer to the village may be worth considering but Oakford and DPC confirmed that the land is not available for this to be considered as part of a current proposal.



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

DP agreed that it is clear that gaps do currently exist and that over time they may have decreased and small scale development has evolved over time in this way and some gaps are larger than others. GB also concluded that in relation to KC comment about developing a larger area near to the village a “mini-estate” would not be appropriate in Dogmersfield as development is linear to the frontage of the road.

CC agreed that this is the main reason for setting the properties back in the plots and Oakford would be happy to consider an interlink agreement to safeguard development behind the plots. DH considered that some small scale development would be better than the potential according to the SHLAA of 170 plots in this area with Dogmersfield burdening its share on a small scale.

KC continued by referring to the previous officers comments on the proposed length of the gardens suggesting that permitted rights be removed to be defined as residential curtilage for use as say paddocks. CC agreed that this would be the easiest solution.

KC commented that from the schematics it was difficult to assess the scale of the dwellings and how they would be viewed from the road and whether they would be in keeping with some of the smaller existing dwellings on Church Lane. DH stated that a lot of investigation had been carried out taking into account frontage size/ plot size and footprints of existing dwellings along Church Lane to provide a sound analysis of the average scaling through the whole of Church Lane. A further comment was made as to being sympathetic to the Grade II listed properties and not attempting to copy features.

KC confirmed that there will be a need for a heritage statement to be included as part of any application as well as the impact on the conservation area.

KC further picked up on design details of the units referring to the large gables of one of the units and the positioning of one of the units to be moved further back within the plot to suppress it in scale to the other two units. GB commented that the plots sit above the road level and it would be a concern if the units were to dominate. The forward projections would be relevant with keeping the heights to the front as low as possible to soften the visual.

CC confirmed that the design intent is still a long way from finalising and this meeting today will assist in informing the design and confirmed that Oakford would revisit the units looking especially at the width of one unit and the depth of another unit within the site.

GB confirmed that with regard to the rear of the properties nobody overlooks this site only from gardens. GB asked if a single entrance to the three properties had been considered. CC considered that the properties would benefit from individual access which would also be in keeping with the individual access to existing properties. AJC considered that three short runs of ditches connected by short culverts would be easier from a maintenance point of view than one long culvert.


KC continued regarding access and parking and Oakford would be required to follow the guidelines adopted 2008 requiring four parking spaces per dwelling and two cycle spaces. These would require adequate turning space to leave the plots front facing. CC confirmed that this has been allowed for. There are no local footpaths along Church Lane which adds to the charm of the village as well as the lack of street lighting.

KC requested that tree information be provided as part of any application and a biodiversity phase 1 report would be expected and phase 2 report required up front if phase 1 requires it.

There would be no requirement for affordable provision based on the plot sizes and no S106 contributions unless directly related to that scheme which is unlikely in this case. This site sits within 5k of the SPA with any mitigation funded towards the Hitches Lane SANG.

CC confirmed that in relation to foul and surface water it is currently anticipated that foul will be treated on site by private systems for each individual house and surface water would be dealt with via permeable surfacing. GB suggested that they talk again to Thames water about connection to the main foul sewer as ground water levels were quite high in that area.

DH spoke to research being carried out by Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners into the question of resilience in the HDC 5 year land supply. They will be explaining how the system works and where the faults lie. GB confirmed his discussions with senior planning officers and elected councillors who are more confident than DH about the 5 year supply in Hart. GB asked DH to confirm that he would be happy for DPC to share NLP’s findings with Hart. DH confirmed he was content. In relation to the



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

discussions relating to land supply and deliverability GB commented that he did not understand the logic behind DH's approach to the Chatter Alley site where increasing the number of units has been suggested.

DH confirmed that they do not want to submit planning applications that would create an adversarial relationship but want to negotiate what is best fit for all parties.

KC closed the meeting by stating that HDC being content with a five year land supply it will need to look at the right sites that fall outside of a settlement area. GB asked if KC was aware of the planning officer's views on the Chatter Alley site and she confirmed that she had seen that report.

No further comments were put forward and the meeting was closed.