



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Informal Meeting of Dogmersfield Parish Councillors to discuss
Schoolfield Corner Land Proposal with the Landowners
Monday 29th February 2016
[6.30pm Church Crookham Community Centre]

In attendance:

Cllr Geoff Beaven	(GB)	Dogmersfield Parish Council
Cllr Alastair Clark	(AC)	Dogmersfield Parish Council
Cllr Graham Leach	(GL)	Dogmersfield Parish Council
Cllr Jo Thomas	(JT)	Dogmersfield Parish Council
Mr Dave Fuller	(DF)	Land owner
Mrs Leslie Crumplin	(LC)	Land owner
Mr Rob McLennan	(RM)	Planning Agent
Mr Guy Everson	(GE)	Architect
Mrs Claire Inglis	(CI)	Dogmersfield Parish Council

Introductions were made to open the meeting.

GB explained that the meeting was suggested as a semi-formal pre-application meeting to allow the landowners to explain their proposal for the land known in the village as Schoolfield Corner prior to any engagement with HDC in the form of a pre-application advice meeting.

RM explained that the land in question was referred to by HDC as SHLAA site 55 and a red line map was shown. The site benefits from strong and mature boundaries predominantly to hedge. Access to the land is via a single tarmac track and the land contains a few outbuildings. The site historically has been a caravan site and it is this that classifies it as a brownfield site. The only (current) neighbouring property Kersfield has limited views across the site. The land sits in the Conservation area with no notations on the site.

Planning permission has been granted on the neighbouring plots for three houses with conditions, one of which is to commence building within one year. The plan for these three properties shows a parcel of land at the rear retained which GB explained reduced the size of the plots to within a certain threshold for the density of properties.

DF explained that he and LF have family connections with the village. DF's father was a local farrier working out of the Crookham Village forge. LF has connections with the Crumplin's, some relatives are laid to rest in the village churchyard. DF confirmed that the desire to build on the land is not purely speculative as his intention is to build properties that he will live in and also his son. An outline site plan (sketch) was shared with DPC which showed 4 properties that would be accessed from the single lane into the land. The sketch showed two properties sitting two at the front of the land parcel close to the road with two behind. This was purely indicative and no formal drawings have been made yet. DF also stated that he would want to be able to defend any design intent as he will be living in the village and would only want to build properties that would be fitting based on the surrounding architecture.

GB asked whether the current access would be adequate. GE considered that some pruning to the hedge along the lane would be required but not much substantially more than this. GB considered that the impact of such a plan would be fairly minimal in comparison to other plots where the view is more open from the road. GE also commented that the roof lines would be consistent with surrounding properties and would therefore not be too visible. The sq footage of the properties will be guided with reference to those of surrounding properties likely to be 2,500sq ft. Ridge heights and eave height would be sensitively designed.

GB made reference to the numerous conditions that have been applied to the planning consent for the three properties on Church Lane and therefore any consent given to Schoolfield Corner may also be impacted in this way.

DF confirmed that he would welcome conditions. He explained that he runs a conservation charity and is used to working with the constraints that come with conservation areas and welcomes this.



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

GB highlighted some of the planning issues that arose out of the planning application on Church Lane and that consent was not a given. Some of the planning committee considered the three properties not good use of the land and tried to push for greater density. Therefore this may be an issue for any Schoolfield application. HDC's opinion would have to be gauged very carefully prior to submitting a planning application.

GB also commented on the information that has come to light at the commencement of the Parish preparing a neighbourhood plan. Surprisingly there appears to be a demand for smaller properties as some residents are looking to down size but still remain in the area. There has been very little turnover in the past for properties in the village but the population is an ageing one and there are no smaller properties to move to. Therefore opinion is not what was originally thought but this does not mean that the village needs a small estate.

Planning permission on Church Lane has broken some barriers to the lack of new build in the village for which there has been none for a significant time period but the situation as we all know is changing. To succeed on Schoolfield Corner will require careful planning especially in relation to density. Three smaller properties at the rear of the site may for example work better than two. The aim of any pre-application advice from HDC would be without committing to anything getting close to what HDC would expect from the site.

S106 was discussed as DPC had tried to mitigate against the Church Lane development in relation to improving the ditch and water run-off in the area with the flooding prevalent in front of the pub in the village. No gestures were forthcoming though and DPC does not have any approved leisure projects which would attract S106 funding.

DF asked about the status of the Chatter Alley proposal that he was aware of. GB confirmed that no planning permission has been sought on this. GB explained that in response to a pre-application request HDC officials considered that the views from Chatter Alley across this parcel of land were of significance whilst interestingly the same was not said of the Church Lane planning application. This was because of the remaining open view between these plots and the next existing property on Church Lane. GL also considered that landowners are waiting to see what happens with the threat of the Winchfield development as this will have a significant impact on traffic flows with little supporting infrastructure promised. Plus there is the "141 factor" within Dogmersfield with the remaining SHLAA land amassed in HDC's eyes with the potential for 141 dwellings.

The larger £1m + properties have been very slow to move in the village in the past year of property sales. It was considered that a small number of properties of appropriate size would suit Dogmersfield better. It was also agreed that development should be sustainable as Dogmersfield would probably not suit social housing because of the lack of facilities and amenities. DF asked if there was any value in providing employment opportunities on the land at the rear of the site, but it was thought that there would be little or no interest/demand for this.

AJC requested that DPC be invited to any HDC pre-application advice meeting.

CI also stated that minutes deriving from the meeting would be published on the DPC website to keep the residents informed this would follow GB reporting the essence of the meeting at the next Parish Council meeting.

The meeting closed at 7.30pm

HDC – Hart District Council

DPC – Dogmersfield Parish Council