

FORDINGBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

**Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Planning Committee held on Thursday 6th
January 2022 at 7.30pm remotely via Zoom under a scheme of delegation approved on 5th
January 2022**

(Minutes subject to approval at the next meeting of the Council)

Present: Cllr Paton - Chairman
Cllrs Adams, Anstey, Hale, Goldsmith, Jackson, Lewendon, White and Wilson

In attendance: Rachel Edwards, Asst Town Clerk
Cllr Annie Bellows (NFDC)
A reporter from The Salisbury Journal
29 Members of the Public

1. To receive any apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs Earth, Moulard and Perkins

2. To receive any Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest.

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

No matters raised.

4. To consider Planning Applications 21/11237 (NFDC) and 21/00849 (NFNPA)

21/11237	LAND WEST OF BURGATE, SALISBURY STREET, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1LX	Pennyfarthing Homes
<p>Hybrid planning application comprising: Outline planning application (all matters reserved except means of access only in relation to new points of vehicular access into the site) for residential development and change of use of land to Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace, together with a community hub (to comprise a mix of some or all of; local food retail, local non-food retail, community use and business use) and all other necessary on-site infrastructure. Full planning application for the first phase of development comprising 111 dwellings, public open space, Alternative Natural Recreational Greenspace, surface water attenuation and all other necessary on site infrastructure</p>		
<p>Cllr Hale presented this application.</p>		
<p>Application 21/11237</p>		
<p>Cllr Hale advised that the application was an outline application for residential development, change of use to ANRG, a community hub and all necessary site infrastructure and also a full application for first phase of development of 111 dwellings, ANRG, surface water attenuation and site infrastructure (“a hybrid application”).</p>		
<p>At the time Cllr Hale prepared for this meeting there were 221 documents on the NFDC planning website. Around 160 had been submitted by developer and its consultants mainly in August and Sept 2021. There were also around 25 objections.</p>		
<p>Outline Application 21/11237</p>		
<p>Cllr Hale advised that the area is Site 18 designated in Local Plan for 2016 to 2036. Cllr Hale said that the developer’s proposals have changed from layout set out in the Local Plan and noted the housing at the north of the proposal had moved closer to the housing at Burgate. Cllr Hale suggested that the flood area identified may be the reason for the change in layout, with a raised causeway across the flood area and the housing be placed further north reducing the buffer zone.</p>		

Full Application 21/11237

Cllr Hale summarised the details of the full application, its location, the areas of green space and noted it was very similar to the development that the developer, Pennyfarthing had already built. There are three main blocks on the development including flats and some bungalows. He talked through the detail of the elevations.

The details of the application are as follows:

- Full application for 111 new homes
- 9 x 1 bedroom apartments
- 12 x 2 bedroom apartments
- 34 x 2 bedroom houses
- 41 x 3 bedroom houses
- 15 x 4 bedroom houses

Cllr Hale provided details of the drainage proposals and spoke about the ANRG which is principally in the northwest corner of the site and has a play area in the middle.

The road and causeway is part of the full application. Concerns have been raised about how this will look.

Consultee Responses

- **Archaeology** have said there is no evidence found so no further requirements.
- **The Conservation Officer's** report details concerns about loss of green space between existing rural properties and new development and also the height of the properties, which are raised up due to flood issues, and the closeness of the new housing to properties at Burgate, which would impact on listed buildings.
- **Cranborne Chase AONB's** main concerns relate to light pollution and the development generating additional visitors to the AONB.
- **The Ecologist's** report raises concerns regarding bats and badgers on the site and has requested additional bat and badger surveys.
- **Environmental Health** said no contamination was found on the site but raised concerns regarding noise and requested further noise assessment and an acoustic design statement due to the additional traffic that would be generated.
- **Fire and Rescue** responded with a standard letter regarding access to the site.
- **HCC Education** has indicated that it will need a £634,095 contribution for 33 additional primary school children. Unless this is provided they would object to the scheme.
- **HCC Highways:** The overall layout of the roads does match that set out in the Local Plan but they have asked for further details on phasing of link to A338 and the use of current access through Augustus Park.
- **HCC Water Management** has requested for more details regarding the flood modelling.
- **Rights of Way** – HCC supports the proposed improvements to foot and cycle paths.
- **Strategic Housing** state that there is a requirement for 40% affordable housing.
- **Waste and Minerals** want more information and requested a full mineral report.

Public Responses

Cllr Hale then summarised the main issues and concerns raised on the NFDC planning site by the public, which were as follows:

- Traffic through existing Augustus Park
- Noise affecting Augustus Park and existing Burgate properties
- Lack of amenities for new residents (doctors, dentists, schools)
- Pollution and the increased carbon footprint arising from more development in this town
- Construction traffic using Fryern Court Road and Waverley Road
- The road in Augustus Park not being wide enough for buses and extra traffic

Information to be Provided

Cllr Hale then summarised the information that he felt needed to be provided:

- Roads: How will link road be phased in relation to this scheme? HCC Highways have asked for more information and impact assessments. Will the construction traffic for the new development have to go through the existing development?
- Affordable Housing. How much will be provided? There is a statement in letter of 14th September from the developer saying there is 'a policy compliant level of affordable housing will be provided in accordance with viability information to be submitted in due course'. This does not match the Strategic Housing requirement referred to earlier.
- The Conservation Officer has raised serious concerns regarding the proximity to existing properties and concerns as to how the damage to existing rural setting of Burgate might be reduced. The officer also has concerns regarding the height of the properties and the loss of the green space buffer.
- Additional information in relation to flood modelling, a mineral report, bat and badger surveys has been requested which should be available to the Town Council when considering the information.

Cllr Paton thanked Cllr Hale for his comments. She added that a resident had submitted some comments that would suggest that the NFDC should have given further consideration before including the site in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the highways report says that the access road from the A338 should be completed before any of the houses are occupied. If the site was to be developed in phases highways would want to see further reports as to how this could be achieved. Cllr Paton felt that there should not be any deviation from this and the road should be in place before any of the houses are occupied and, if nothing else, there should be a site access road for the development. The NFDC has suggested in a report that the scheme is laudable but Cllr Paton could not see how the scheme could be commended with so many design faults identified and information outstanding. The Local Plan recommended an access point to the site from Salisbury Road but did not recommend a roundabout and the highways authority were not contacted, which they should have been when the NFDC were looking at the Local Plan.

Cllr Jackson referred to the recently received objection from the National Park, as part of the proposed roundabout is in the National Park. He felt that there should have been consideration of the fact that part of the roundabout is in the National Park.

Cllr Anstey thanked Cllr Hale for his report. He added that comments had been submitted by consultees in respect of the relation to Upper Burgate that were reinforced by the environmental design report that said it is problematic in that it does not deliver an acceptable setting for heritage assets at Burgate Cross, a point that Cllr Hale had already identified. This area under the Local Plan had a gap of 145m between the settlements whilst this development proposal reduces the gap to 85m and this impact on the Burgate Cross area has already been highlighted by the NFDC planning officer and the Conservation Officer has also raised the impact on identified heritage assets. This and the other issues identified all suggest that there is a need for more information, surveys and modelling. However, what has been provided also causes concern. Cllr Paton added that in the information that became available late this afternoon there were concerns about the management of the ground and surface water and the winter water levels interfering with the ANRG use. Also, it was brought up about the development boundary and it is concerning that the planners merely want to discuss these issues as there is a principle of development accepted. If there is a principle of development accepted, the Town Council needs to be firm about the issues that it feels need to be addressed before any decision is made.

Cllr Wilson gave the following presentation.

1. Why a Hybrid Application

I object to the idea. It leaves the rest of the site with outline planning permission

The reserved matters can end up being markedly different from what was envisaged at the time outline. The outline plans, as they are, already take the number of dwellings to 531 when the Local Plan said 400.

Hybrid applications are not defined in statute it is the planning authority's discretion whether to accept such an application.

Why is the planning authority trying to "steamroller" the plans through?

2. The Local Plan shows a footpath from Fryern Court Road to a meadow with footpaths running round it for residents' use. This has not been included in the developer's application even though the applicant owns this land. Why is this not included in the application and what is the developer proposing to do with it?
3. The settlement boundary is very important to the character of Fryern Court Road. The boundary was put there for good reason. The application goes over the boundary by approximately 60 metres.
4. With no legal agreement in place we are not able to see the details of:
 - Affordable and social housing
 - Arrangements for the management and maintenance of Open Spaces
 - SuDs management arrangements.

The Town Council would wish to comment on these

5. Without some sort of business strategy we are not able to see if the Community Hub is viable or sustainable. Empty Shops and businesses are not good for any community

The Town Council would wish to comment on this.

6. The design and architecture of Phase 1 is not of the high standard anticipated by the National Planning Policy Framework National Design Guide 2019 (after Augustus Park was designed).
 - It's appearance does not reflect the heritage and character of the area, by reason of the increased levels making the height of the buildings appear as a cliff-face. In particular in the area now very close (which has moved) to the Glasshouse studios.
 - These designs are not responsive to their surroundings and nearby architecture. These designs are mostly of a standard type imported from developments in Dorset and Wiltshire.
7. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations place significant responsibilities on NFDC as the competent authority for the protection of ecology. The Regulation requires authorities to undertake a Habitat Regulations Assessment' of the implications of the permission, if it is likely to have a significant effect on a European site.
 - It seems that our Local Planning Authority is not going to produce a Habitat Regulations assessment but will adopt the shadow assessment produced by the applicant.
 - This does not say much about NFDC's respect for our environment
8. Water Quality in the Solent – Concerns about nutrients
 - NFDC are aware that:

- Mitigation for water quality is not secured at the present time but will be secured via a Grampian condition.
- Thereby Planning permission can be granted

(SEPTEMBER 2019– INTERIM NITROGEN MITIGATION SOLUTION recommendation to NFDC Planning Cabinet)

- New Forest District Council's proposes that the wording of the Grampian condition should be:-
- 'The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until:
- b) A mitigation package addressing the additional nutrient input arising from the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority; That could be very expensive for the developer.
- I can see no correspondence indicating an agreement from the applicant to this condition which may incur a huge unknown cost to them. They have to agree to this condition. NFDC cannot just impose such a condition. If they do it will not be lawfully imposed or to put it another way there would be no such condition.

9. Loss of amenity for the residents of Whitsbury Road in terms of noise from Heavy Traffic and impact on Air quality caused by queuing traffic.

The road through to the A338 may never be built

10. Surface Water. The holding ponds will only slow the water being discharged into Sweatford Water. It will certainly end up there at some time.

- Fordingbridge has regular incidents of groundwater flooding in particular Sweatford Water.
- The excess from these ponds should only be discharged into a straight length of river.
- Sweatford water has a right-angled bend that goes through a restricted bridge arch.
- What happens if the holding ponds over flow. These ponds should be designed to flood onto a playing field or such like. We all know that the geology of this land makes surface water run off the top.
- Looking at the map you can see which way the water will go.
Straight towards the Junior School

A resident said that the comments already made were extremely valid and she endorsed them. She added the NFDC Local Plan on page 24 has the policy STR1 'Achieving Sustainable Development' states meeting most development needs within settlement boundaries in a manner that is appropriate for and proportionate to the nature and size of the settlement and where there is or will be sufficient supporting infrastructure and services. The resident's opinion was this development when added to the other projected development adding 1,325 homes to the current number of approximately 3,000 homes goes directly against this policy, it is neither appropriate or proportionate to the size of Fordingbridge. The housing need that the Local Plan states is being met by the houses in Fordingbridge is to provide housing for Salisbury, Southampton and Bournemouth. Fordingbridge will become a dormitory town for those cities. She added again it stated in the Local Plan ensuring that new development that is adaptable to the future needs of the occupiers and future proofed for climate change and innovations in transport and communications technology – The resident noted that in its sustainability energy statement for this particular development that the developer has made a few simple

concessions to energy efficiency but not where it counts. They are aiming to achieve an energy efficiency performance of B on average. This is not good enough. We know from COP26 that climate change is here right now and these houses should be fully carbon neutral and zero energy at the point of build. There is no infrastructure even for constructive retrofitting for occupiers. The water drainage system includes an allowance for 40% for climate change impact. This is not good enough given the propensity of the area to flooding and the current level of the water table. It will not meet future climate change impact. Regarding traffic, the traffic plan assesses that for this development alone the amount of traffic using Whitsbury Road south of Augustus Park will increase by 57% and Alexandra Road by 37% including 73 HGV's per day. When taken alongside the traffic increase from the Tinkers Cross and Whitsbury Road developments this will create an 89% increase on Whitsbury road and 50% on Alexandra Road. These roads will be inundated by huge amounts of traffic, which will impact on residents. Whitsbury Road is effectively a single-track road with passing places and no through road at the end. Fordingbridge Town Design Statement, which was adopted as a supplementary planning document, appears to have been ignored by the NFDC in allocating the strategic sites around Fordingbridge. The design statement envisages up to 290 new houses between 2006 and 2026, 170 within the built-up area and the rest on new ground. It recommends this within the Burgate area with a number of recommendations that have been ignored, particularly to retain a gap between Tinkers Cross and Fordingbridge. The design statement delineates separate areas, Ashford, Tinkers Cross and Burgate. By allowing all of this development they will lose their distinction as separate hamlets.

Another resident commented on the fact that the proposed houses had moved towards existing dwellings, which was of concern. This will create noise and light pollution for existing dwellings. The new houses will also be closer to fields that contain chickens and cockerels which may cause noise issues for the proposed new houses. The resident was pleased that the Town Council had identified this as an area of concern. There does appear on the outline master plan put forward by the developer that some of the green space has been moved to address flooding issues that has reduced the gap between the proposed new and existing houses. The resident wondered whether the new houses could be located where originally suggested and still be in a location that would not be flooded.

Another resident expressed concerns regarding the traffic plan which he felt was impractical and relies solely on the fact of trying to encourage new residents to car share. That effectiveness will be evaluated by surveys and questionnaires after 300 houses have been built, which will be too late. He added that the transport plan shows a secondary street going out through Arch Farm Industrial Estate, which creates an additional danger. The turning into that estate is quite sharp and if there is lots of traffic turning into that it will potentially create additional problems on the A338. The ES document (chapter 10) lists a number of tables on average traffic flow over a 24-hour periods, one of which was taken as a base line in 2020 and one which was projected post development in 2025. On their own projected figures, the traffic increase on Whitsbury Road going south is 94.3%, which is horrendous. All the routes listed in those ES tables are increased. They do list a table of 2025 projections without development taking place where the traffic flow is even higher at 112%, which suggests that the modelling is unreliable and at fault. The resident added that raising the road on a causeway was unusual and that it suggested the proposed new houses were going to flood.

Cllr Paton added that the area that required a causeway is an area that is liable to flood part of which is supposed to be ANRG, which won't be usable for part of the year. There are many issues that still need to be addressed.

A resident of Augustus Park has major concerns about the width of Augustus Avenue and, if the road is to become a busy link road, the proximity of the housing to the road in an unsuitable way. In a cul-de-sac that is fine but some of the doors open almost directly on to the road. If you look at the design documents for the newer proposed development, the developer has taken into account that road will be busy and all the houses are off road on other cul-de-sac lanes and they don't have the same design. Augustus Avenue is poorly designed as a link road

and the resident was concerned that this has not been taken into account and there will be a lot of vehicles including buses and potentially construction traffic, where people's houses are right on the road. Another neighbouring resident shared these concerns and also noted a recent comment made by Steve Avery from the National Park who said that this area was already over-developed and further dense development should not be allowed, which is what's being proposed. Moreover the proposed ANRG is not practical and there is already a suggestion that this is going to be altered in Tinkers Cross. The resident also had concern regarding pollution and that there had been no consideration regarding carbon neutral housing. Even efficient boilers produce too much carbon and given the proposed number of homes this impact would be considerable.

Another resident noted that the area had been identified for development but felt that no decision on the hybrid application should be made until the access from the A338 is approved. The National Park are opposed to a roundabout so other means of accessing the A338 would need to be considered. If there is achievable access and the land is developed with 500 houses, there would be no way to come out from the development other than through Augustus Park and on to Whitsbury Road. With the projected 400 houses on the other side of Whitsbury Road and other development there could be the car users of 1,000 houses coming out on to Whitsbury Road. The resident believed that both applications should be refused but a decision would need to be made on the National Park application first. Another resident reiterated these concerns and said the access on the A338 was critical and had to be addressed first, noting the current pressure on Waverley Road from the existing new development.

Another resident who lives in Upper Burgate expressed concerns regarding the reduction of the buffer zone and noted that the water table where his property is located is high and his property has suffered flooding in wet weather. He was concerned that this issue would be exacerbated by the proposed new development. He felt that the proposed design was old fashioned and used a lot of concrete in the foundations, whereas the houses could be built on post and rail (as they are in North America) effectively on stilts so flood water does not flood the houses and the water drains away underneath the properties. The proposed houses have no provision for built in solar panels, photo voltaic tiles. Following COP 26 new regulation are likely to come in and the developers should reconsider their housing design for something that is fit for purpose for the next 50 years. The developer should consider building in wood, which is sustainable, renewable and highly insulative instead of bricks, tile and concrete which us a huge amount of energy.

All Councillors present recommended REFUSAL under PAR4, because

- the area is liable to flooding and the current arrangements to prevent flooding are inadequate,
- the ANRG will be under water for much of the year,
- the movement of the site up towards Fryern Court Road at Burgate is incorrect; we must keep that gap otherwise the hamlet of Burgate will be connected to the main town of Fordingbridge (urban sprawl).

21/00849	Land At A338 Salisbury Road, Upper Burgate, Fordingbridge	Pennyfarthing Homes
<p>Full planning application for alterations to the A338 Salisbury Road (within the public highway) to form part of a roundabout to provide access to land at Burgate, to the north of Fordingbridge (allocated for residential led development through Policy SS18 by New Forest District Council)</p>		
<p>Cllr Hale presented this application.</p>		
<p>Application 21/00849</p>		
<p>Cllr Hale advised that this was a full application for alterations to A338 Salisbury Road to form roundabout to provide access to land at Burgate. A lot of the issues have been discussed as they relate to the previous application discussed, however there are 77 documents on Planning Portal: 7 Drawings, 61 Background Papers and 1 objection from resident. The proposed roundabout is slightly in the National Park. Most of the documents relate to the flow of traffic. Cllr Hale noted the proposed trees and water in the proposed design.</p>		
<p>Consultee Responses</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Archaeologist had no objection as there was unlikely to be remains in this area • The Tree Officer had no objection as there are no tree preservation orders • Natural England had no objection subject to there being appropriate mitigation • The Landscape Officer objected due to the appearance of the roundabout on the wider rural scene and its encroachment into the National Park. The roundabout will be visible from a wide area. • The Conservation Officer objected as the roundabout will have a major impact on the Burgate street scene and adjacent listed properties • Highways felt the layout of the roundabout is acceptable but expressed concerns about drainage, the attenuation pond, and planting 		
<p>Cllr Paton thanked Cllr Hale and reported that in the latest Urban Design Statement (comments from Environmental Design Team 6th January 2022) there were comments about the lighting on the roundabout, the vegetation and the impacts on the SSSI and the National Park and they also weren't happy with the fences that were going to be put up to protect the properties there, saying that they don't fit the countryside scene and also the pumping station sited near the Augustus Park and its impact. Cllr Paton said that at this time, she doesn't think the roundabout is sufficiently designed to be accepted where it is. A roundabout was not specified in the Local Plan. However, without the access route there, there should be no development.</p>		
<p>A member of the public asked if there was any update on the dumping of spoil on this site. Cllr Paton reported that it was being dealt with by the NFDC.</p>		
<p>Cllr Lewendon noted that concerns had been raised by the consultees regarding cars heading out onto roundabout with their lights shining eastwards across the open space. A resident commented that in addition to headlights there will also be lighting to light up the roundabout itself. Another resident mentioned the impact of the lighting of the development on the dark sky area at Cranborne Chase.</p>		
<p>Cllr Goldsmith said the town needs a roundabout or an alternative to route traffic away from High Street.</p>		
<p>A resident neighbouring the site felt that the roundabout was too large and could be reduced in size.</p>		
<p>All Councillors present recommended REFUSAL under PAR4, because it's a really ugly thing and the lighting alone is going to create so much trouble.</p>		

Planning Committee

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

Nothing further to report.

6. To note the date of the next meeting as Wednesday 12th January 2022

The meeting closed at 20.33pm.