

FORDINGBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 23rd September 2020 at 7.30pm held remotely using appropriate technology in accordance with The Local Authorities and Police and Crimes Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 ("the 2020 Regulations") which came into force on 4th April 2020.

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

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

In attendance: Mr P Goddard, Town Clerk
Mrs R Edwards, Asst Town Clerk
Cllr Bellows (NFDC)
A representative of the NFDC
A representative from the Salisbury Journal
12 members of the Public

1. To receive any apologies for absence

No apologies were received.

2. To receive any Declarations of Interest

Cllrs Mouland declared an interest in planning application 20/10522 - LAND NORTH OF, STATION ROAD, SP6 1JW - as the site backs on to his property. He would remain in the meeting but not speak or vote.

3. To consider Planning Application 20/10522

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 20/10522 | LAND NORTH OF, STATION ROAD, SP6 1JW | Mr Kelsey - Infinite Homes Ltd |
| Development of 240 dwellings, a new access off Station Road, 10.7ha of public open space (SANG, formal open space and informal open space), associated private amenity space, off-street car parking and access roads." (Outline Application with details only of Access) | | |
| <p>Cllr Paton advised that once Cllr Anstey had presented on the application there would be an opportunity for Cllrs and members of the public to have their say and ask questions. Cllr Paton said that it was difficult to talk about this application on its own as this and other applications will have such an impact on the town. It was important to give this application due consideration bearing in mind the effect that the traffic and increased population arising from the applications will have on the town as a whole. It is imperative that each site location and their impacts are considered with an overall strategy, most importantly a link road to the A338 as this could lessen the impact on the town. The sequence of the developments needs to be considered in order to restrict the detrimental effects and ensure that Fordingbridge has as much involvement as possible in shaping the town's future.</p> <p>Cllr Anstey presented on the application. Cllr Anstey explained that the Town Council had already been involved with this application having access for review to the submitted comments and having also had two meetings on 13th July and 7th September with the NFDC's planning department at which the NFDC had presented detail and information on the site. Cllr Anstey thanked the NFDC for the information and their time. Cllr Anstey referred to a map showing all of the Strategic Sites for Fordingbridge (Sites 16, 17 and 18) and he explained their relative geographical location. Cllr Anstey then referred to a map showing Site 16 and identified Puddleslosh Lane, Marl Lane and Station Road. Cllr Anstey then referred to a master use plan which set out the proposed areas for residential development, open space and open space suitable for mitigation. Cllr Anstey then referred to the access and movement perimeter plan and identified the proposed new road access to the site from Station Road and the main roadway within the estate. Cllr Anstey then referred to the land perimeter plan pointing out Allenbrook Nursing Home, the proposed open space and SANG and the proposed development area. Cllr</p> | | |

Anstey the referred to the Green Infrastructure plan and highlighted the proposed formal open space to the north of the site. He said the Town Council welcomes any formal open space but questioned the proposed location of and access to this space. Cllr Anstey then called up the Scale Perimeter plan which set out the proposed heights of the buildings and noted concerns about buildings with a ridge height of 13m that were referred to in the Environmental Design report. Cllr Anstey then called up the illustrative site plan and turned to the comments on the application by consultees, which where necessary Cllr Anstey had summarised. The tree officer had said that it was unlikely to assess the full likely impact until further information was provided and at the moment the proposed development is likely to significantly impact on mature trees. The proposal does not go far enough to protect important and protected trees. The ecologist's report recognised that the applicant's survey was dated: the bat survey was dated January 2017 and other consultees had suggested a more up to date survey would be needed. The report noted that no information had been provided regarding achieving the bio-diversity net gain required and from correspondence it was noted that currently a net loss was expected. For applications such as this, demonstration of a bio-diverstiy net gain of 10% would be expected. New Forest District Council Conservation report commented that at this stage the heritage design access statement needed more work and noted numerous observations and concerns regarding omissions and errors in the heritage statement. The Environmental Project team commented that at the current time their position had to be reserved until the information and correct air quality assessments were submitted. The Environment Agency stated that they had no objections to the flood risk assessment. Sandleheath Council raised concerns over traffic, flooding and the environmental issues. Wessex Water said the issue of sewage had yet to be resolved. Ringwood & Fordingbridge Footpath Society raised concern that the use of the footpath at Marl Lane during construction may cause damage. Environmental Health had no objections regarding contaminated land. NFDC Waste raised concerns regarding the site layout which would cause refuse vehicles to have to reverse. The Environmental Design report commented on the master plan and the design and access statement and stated that they objected to the application because although this is an outline submission the proposed number of dwellings requires a convincing design case to be made for their inclusion. In addition, the master plan and design access statement weren at odds with draft supplementary planning documents and failed to satisfy requirements within the local plan and environmental policies, one of which covers density and height. Further concerns were raised regarding design quality and local distinctiveness. The report further commented that they could not see how such an uplift in houses as proposed could possibly be accommodated in the contextual, appropriate or practical manner, which certainly had not been demonstrated by the design of this application. The last consultee's report, which was crucial and was the reason consideration of this application was deferred by the Town Council, was from the Highways authority. The Highways authority concluded the proposal involved development that cannot be reconciled with National Planning Policy framework in that the proposal would result in significant movements that could not be accommodated adequately on the existing transport network and the users of the development being unable to make use of sustainable transport opportunities. This would result in greater numbers of trips by private car which would create a severe impact on the local transport network and environment contrary to the NPPF and local policies. Moreover there were insufficient details on a range of issues which reflects the comments of most of the other consultees. In this particular case information was lacking on a significant number of issues. Cllr Wilson commented on the impact on the landscape of the proposed density and height of the development exacerbated by the removal of mature trees and hedges. The proposed development would dominate important viewpoints from Marl Lane in conflict with the Town Design Statement. Cllr Jackson suggested that the highways issues were the key issues for residents and there were no proposed attempts to improve the existing issues which this new development would add to. Cllr Wilson raised ecological concerns and noted that the comments of Natural England were still awaited. A member of the public who is a Sandleheath Cllr referred to the concerns raised by the Sandleheath Parish Council and in particular the location of the proposed road access to the site and its proximity to an existing junction. He also commented on the requirement to improve the footpath on Station Road, which he said would not be possible and gave rise to safety concerns. Cllr Paton agreed that this issue has been raised as a major concern and that there was a need for footpaths within the site to

allow safe pedestrian access into town. Cllr Jackson raised the potential for a spine road through the strategic sites from Station Road to the A338 to alleviate some of the traffic issues. Cllr Paton agreed and stated this was a reason why all of the applications should be considered as a whole. Cllr Jackson said this approach should be taken not just regarding highways issues but also regarding open spaces. A member of the public spoke of her concerns regarding: (i) traffic and the number of likely additional vehicles, which would put further pressure on an already overburdened and inadequate road system; (ii) the proposed positioning of the junction particularly given the hazardous nature of the road and the speed of vehicles using it; (iii) the number of new residents and the additional strain this will put on existing services which already cannot cope; and (iv) the impact of the proposed development on the environment and the further loss of green spaces. Given these concerns, the resident was opposed to the development. Cllr Jackson commented on the potential adverse impact of additional traffic on Ashford Road travelling to and through Alderholt.

Cllr Hale proposed and it was seconded by Cllr Lewendon and therefore **RESOLVED**: to recommend refusal under PAR4 due to (i) the traffic impact based on the report from the Highways Authority that clearly states the roads are not suitable for this additional development, (ii) the increase in number of houses over and above the number of proposed houses in the Local Plan, which the New Forest District Council has said is not justified in its Environmental Design report and (iii) the environmental impact, where there is not sufficient information at the moment and it appears that it will not be possible to provide the necessary information. Eleven in favour and one abstention.

4. To consider Planning Application 20/10693

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| 20/10693 | Bracken, 7 Bushells Farm, Fordingbridge SP6 1BH | Mr John Gillanders |
| Side extension to existing bungalow | | |
| <p>Cllr Lewendon presented on the application. He explained that the proposed extension was a small ensuite bathroom to the side of the building for the bedroom at the front of the property. The proposed extension is close (0.35m) to the boundary, with the boundary being a brick built structure behind the houses on the road to Alderholt. Cllr Lewendon suggested that it was a neat solution to putting on an en suite and he believed that if the extension was proposed to the rear of the house then planning permission would not be required. Cllr Lewendon confirmed that there had been no objections to the application.</p> <p>Cllr Paton proposed and it was seconded by Cllr White and therefore RESOLVED: to recommend permission under PAR3 for application 20/10693. All in favour.</p> | | |

5. To note the date of the next meeting as Wednesday 14th October 2020.

The meeting closed at 8.04pm.