

FORDINGBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 22nd March 2017 at 7.30pm in the Town Hall (Minutes subject to approval at the next meeting of the Committee)

Present: Cllr Fulford – Chairman

Cllrs, Adams, Lewendon, Earth, Connolly, Paton, Bailey, Wilson, Perkins, Hale & Anstey (Part of meeting)

In attendance: Mrs H Richards, Town Clerk
Mr R Gosden, The Fordingbridge Society
Katy Griffin, Salisbury/Forest Journal
Stuart Crickett, Turley
Steve Jenkins, iTransport
Representatives of applicant Pennyfarthing Homes & The Highwood Group Limited
50 Members of the Public

1. To receive any apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs Price & Anstey

2. To receive any Declarations of Interest

No declarations of Interest were made

3. To receive any matters raised by Members of the Public

No matters were raised by Members of the Public

The chairman then requested a minutes silence to remember those killed or affected by the Westminster Terrorist Attack

4. To consider Planning application 17/10150

LAND in WHITSBURY ROAD, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1NQ

**Development of 145 dwellings comprised: 39 detached houses; 31 pairs of semi-detached houses; 1 block of 8 flats; 1 block of 7 flats with terrace of 3 houses; 1 block of 6 flats; 1 terrace of 6 houses; 2 terrace of 5 houses; 1 terrace of 3 houses; garage block with flat over; garages; parking; SANG; public open space; access onto Whitsbury Road; associated infrastructure; associated development works; landscaping
Pennyfarthing Homes and The Highwood Group Limited**

Cllr Fulford advised the meeting of the approach taken in considering this application by dividing the details into 3 subject areas; design/layout; Conservation/Open Space & Traffic/Roads. Cllr Fulford reported that while 3 members had led the groups, all Members had had an input into the discussion and assessment of the application.

The key points from each subject group were summarised for the meeting:

Design/Layout – Cllr Fulford reported:

- Number of dwellings – Allocation for site in existing local plan, 70-100 dwellings
- Density – higher density than existing adjacent residential developments
- Housing Need – Does Fordingbridge need 145 new dwellings? Considered reasonable over time, not immediate need
- Infrastructure – Impact of 145 new dwellings on existing infrastructure, education & medical. Local Infant & junior schools are full already – Hampshire County Council looking for £800k

contributions towards Infant and Junior School provision, what about secondary school?

Doctors surgery already at capacity & long wait for appointments

- Affordability/Social Housing – Local Plan allocation for this site, (FORD 1) for 70% affordable, New Forest DC now accept 50% (developers state 70% not viable)
- Starter homes should be built on brownfield sites (not greenfield)
- Open Space – Fordingbridge short of green/open space. If density reduced to 100 dwellings, more open space could be provided within the main development site (better design as parents close by for children playing on-site)
- Car Parking & effect of 300+ vehicles generated from development – public transport not adequate, cars are needed local roads will be unsafe particularly for children and less able-bodied persons
- School Drop off zone – no parking available at school premises – conflict will arise with residents parking in drop off zone
- Design of some properties – Small & cramped

Conservation & Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) – Cllr Hale reported:

- Main provision now moved across Whitsbury Road resulting in smaller amount of open space on development site
 - SANGS site has high flood risk (recent flooding in area) and is poor quality land
 - Assessment appears to have missing data – wildlife not mentioned and proposed ponds will be harmful to existing wildlife
 - Report prepared by Graham Long, Chairman of the Fordingbridge Trust for Conservation Volunteers
- Main Site –
- o Bats Present
 - o Lighting will cause issues
 - o Birds – proposal to remove some hedges (cannot be carried out in nesting season)
 - o Slow Worms present – can only be moved to an alternative site if better environment
- SANGS –
- o Sweatsford Water is an existing Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) & is a chalk stream originating from Rockbourne Downs – no works can be carried out within 8m without Environment Agency permission
 - o Water Voles sighted in area

Traffic & Roads – Cllr Connolly reported:

- Despite residents views previously expressed about traffic, 145 new dwellings proposed which will exacerbate problems
- Traffic Assessments – issues and concerns are not addressed
- Local Road Network – already overused by Heavy Goods Vehicles servicing Industrial Estates & Supermarkets
- Existing Rat Runs through residential streets, Whitsbury Road & Fryern Court Road already serve as access routes to Glass House Studios (50 + staff vehicles). Alexandra & Park Roads have tight entry/exit corners at their junction with Salisbury Road and Whitsbury Road with residents parking on both sides of the streets
- Statistics quoted do not reflect the reality of the impact & are not site specific (national reporting mechanism across 17 locations throughout UK)
- Cumulative impact with other proposed sites being considered in Local Plan Review should be contemplated – unfair to be consulted on this site in isolation
- Impact of development outside of area should also be considered – Alderholt, (East Dorset DC) current proposal for 60 dwellings recently refused, appeal lodged
- Town Council has spent 10 years trying to resolve traffic issues – need A338 link road
- Access for construction traffic – residential streets not suitable

The Chairman then invited the applicants Agent, Stuart Crickett, (Turley) to address the meeting, who responded to some of the points raised as follows:

- Density – Comparable to other existing developments (nearby)
- SANGS – Low grade land however works will be undertaken to upgrade the land – Natural England have been consulted
- Housing Need – NFDC Strategic Housing Assessment (not just Fordingbridge need)
- Viability – Appraisal submitted being assessed by District Valuer
- Open Space & SANGS provision – complies with policy requirements
- Ongoing discussions with New Forest DC

Steve Jenkins, (iTransport) author of the Transport Assessment then spoke to the meeting regarding traffic and transport issues:

- Pre-application advice sought from Hampshire County Council (scoping assessment)
- 17 junctions within the town centre were surveyed
- 300+ vehicles generated from proposed development – not all will travel at same time
- School issues – 25 spaces will be provided for drop-off
- Public Transport – X3 bus route serving Salisbury & Ringwood 10 mins walk away
- Fryern Court Road & Waverley Road issues/concerns raised

The chair then asked for questions/comments from the floor – see table in Appendix A

Cllr Anstey entered the meeting during this item at 8.10pm

Following the public comment session, the chair asked for a proposal for the recommendation to New Forest District Council:

Cllr Wilson proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Connolly and therefore **RESOLVED:** to recommend REFUSAL under PAR4 for reasons of concerns raised including Transport & Traffic, Poor Design and Conservation.

All in favour

The Council's full response is attached as Appendix B.

9. To receive a report from the Clerk or any other relevant planning business

Nothing further to report

10. To note the date of the next meeting as Wednesday 12th April 2017

The meeting closed at 9.23pm

	Question/Comment	Response (A Applicant, FTC Town Council)
1.	SANGS – Infringement	A – No conflict with LP policy
2.	Where will residents vehicles park?	A – 2.5 spaces provided to each dwelling which includes garage as parking space
3.	Cart before horse, need A338 Access First	
4.	Options on other side of road – Hampshire CC & New Forest CC need to take action to provide access link to A338	
5.	How will access to site be gained for construction traffic? HGVs cannot negotiate tight junctions of residential roads.	A – Construction Management Plan will show tracking for construction vehicles
6.	Concern that route for construction traffic not looked at before planning application submitted – older residential properties along route not suitable for increased HGV & traffic. Impact on locals not considered	A – Planned route would be workable – this application for 145 dwellings & applicant cannot be responsible for providing access road/bypass link to A338
7.	No good thinking of where new link road can go after site developed	
8.	Schools – concern of impact that new development traffic and parking will have on existing problems	A – Continuing dialogue with Hampshire CC Working with schools re parking and how scheme will work (drop off) FTC – Asked to assess as part of applicant however application incomplete (no details of how this will work) and response from Highways yet to be received
9.	Who paid for the Transport Survey?	A – Applicant engaged iTransport and they commission other companies to undertake surveys
10.	NFDC should not have validated application as no blue line indicating other land in applicants ownership.	
11.	Was there any allowance for tourist traffic – when was assessment undertaken Sixth formers (car drivers) would have already left at beginning of July	A – Beginning of July to capture schools still in attendance but part tourist season
12.	Where will additional cars park when shopping at Co-op?	FTC – New Forest DC have plans to enhance (enlarge?) car park
13.	Concern raised by Green Lane resident – narrow road with elderly and infirm residents	

14.	Provision of 145 dwellings is not in accordance with the Local Plan Allocation as SANGS not on site	
15.	How long will it take to complete development - Burgate Exhibition stated building elsewhere (New Milton) so experience of timescales	A – No timescale yet once permission received then conditions to be discharged – 1 st Phase to be delivered early 2018 – circa 3 years to complete
16.	Have Emergency services been consulted regarding minimum width of roads?	A – NFDC consult as part of planning process
17.	Analysis of data unstable – (transport) can this be interrogated by another?	A – Available of NFDC website included in Transport Plan
18.	680 new homes planned overall – Pennyfarthing have interest in more sites, more social housing needed in other developments (70% should be required)	A – not for this to be addressed at this meeting
19.	Roundabout shown at junction with Whitsbury Road – why indicate access onto SANGS?	A – Roundabout not to be provided with this development
20.	Fordingbridge Society – 3 years to complete – cannot look at this site in isolation existing roads are useless for construction traffic	FTC Planning Chair – not right to batter applicant and they have to defend position – must put views to NFDC, Highways and other relevant authorities.

Recommend REFUSAL under PAR 4 for the following reasons:

The data submitted to support the application does not adequately or accurately assess the likely impact of the development on the following:

1. The local Highway Network
 - Planned access for construction traffic through residential streets is unviable
 - Traffic generated from the development & associated increase in congestion of the town centre
 - Safety concerns over increased volume of traffic (as this area is a main route to school)
2. Flooding

Issues previously experienced in the area of the site (both main development and SANGS site) SuDS particular concern over whether the plan for surface water run-off from the site into an attenuation pond is sufficient given the flooding history and also concern of the potential danger to children playing in the area.
3. Infrastructure

Education and medical provision
4. Wildlife and conservation on the existing land for the SANGS site. Concern also raised regarding the reduction of Green Open Space within the main development site with higher density of dwellings.

The design of the development gives rise for concern, with a high density and cramped and urban feel. The types of dwelling proposed with a lower percentage of affordable housing provision is not acceptable.

Furthermore, the road layout and parking provision is considered to be unsuitable with concerns raised regarding how the school drop off zone will be protected from residential parking and whether the spine road has been designed to become a future access road (linking to the A338) – this would seriously impair the residential amenity and safety of the occupiers of the site, in particular those directly adjacent to the spine road. The Town Council appreciates that although this application is looked at in isolation, the cumulative impact with other proposed housing allocations in the area cannot be ignored and particularly the issue of access to the various sites and lack of direct links to the A338.