

Parish Discussion Forum re Planning Application 22/00498 - held on Sept 27 2022

Summary of points raised by attendees in order they made (circa 35 people present)

Carly Cochrane (Development Control Case Officer) present as NFNPA representative.

TRAFFIC – The survey was undertaken during lockdown, doesn't take into account full volumes. Jackie Rhodes (chair of meeting) – Thank you to those who have sent photos.
(see added comment 1 at end of these notes)

PLANNING POLICY - I believe application is contrary to planning policy. The Public transport required by SP28 does not exist. If the application is agreed then it has impact for other requests.

TRAFFIC – I am a long time resident; enjoy our community; have rising concerns about traffic issues. School parking already an issue. Infrastructure not in place to cope with current levels let alone more traffic.

SITE PLAN ISSUE – The site plan submitted doesn't correctly reflect the extent of the proposed development which is shown edged in red. The extension of the footway from outside Oakfield House to the new site entrance should be included within the red edging as it is clearly part of the development proposals. Following an actual measurement taken on site: with a 5.5m carriageway width for New Inn Road and a (new) 2m footway the TPO'd tree will encroach slightly into this footway. Any work near this tree has been the subject of comment in the report submitted by the tree office. See comments on the NFNPA Planning Portal d/d September 12th 2022 made by Mr John Goodwin.

Carly Cochrane Comment: I have raised this issue with the applicant.

RANGE OF POINTS - Issues around large quantity of reports. Wrong road name quoted in transport survey. Proposal a disaster; looks like prison block; further phases might follow; issues for flooding due to land levels. Main point though is the relationship of site to location of various required services and amenities. Crossing of Southampton Road. If application is withdrawn or refused then there is a need to look at smaller infill locations for Affordable Housing. Completion of a Village (Parish) Design Statement is essential.

TREES – A number of TPO's in place on site. Oak tree at bottom of our nearby garden necessitated piling to protect house. Will the applicant have to do the same.

Carly Cochrane Comment – Trees officer has sought additional information on impact of trees within the site.

PROVEN NEED? - Yet to see current need for Affordable Housing, previous Housing Need Survey (2014) is somewhat dated.

Carly Cochrane Comment – Housing Initiative Officer at NFDC has provided details.

Action for Carly Cochrane - Will arrange to add details to the Planning Portal.

DESIGN - Proposed site is too urban for location. Units proposed do not match the details of need supplied by NFDC. Also, the details supplied by NFDC are not very specific. Overlooking of existing houses.

LOCATION - Why does Bartley have to have all of the Affordable Housing.

CLERK COMMENT – It doesn't, it just so happens that is where the applicants chosen site is located. NFNPA Local Plan SP28 explains the Rural Exception Site criteria.

ECOLOGY - Habitats Assessment needs to be taken into consideration. What are their two Natural England comments CC- Natural England comments have been passed to the applicant for comments. Once those comments are received by the NFNPA they will be sent to Natural England.

Action for Carly Cochrane - I will chase why two letters loaded onto Planning Portal.

TRAFFIC - Another junction in New Inn Road would make it eight in a short road. Junction location is subject to heavy usage at school times. Traffic needs to mount kerb to cope already.

PARKING - We are advised by Hampshire Police that there isn't a problem with parking in New Inn Road.

DRAINAGE - I grew up in village, knowledge of field and concerned about suitability of land, very wet in winter. Borehole survey couldn't be undertaken at first due to wetness of fields. Second survey was in a very dry period. The land is reclaimed wetlands.

Carly Cochrane Comment – NFNPA doesn't undertake its own surveys but takes guidance from Hampshire County Council ("HCC") the Lead Local Flood Authority ("LLFA") on appropriateness of the surveys provided by the applicant.

NEED - Why is an application being considered in Copythorne when thousands of new houses (many Affordable) in Totton?

TRAFFIC – I live opposite the site. Traffic issues occur every day when school buses use the road. Trees and bushes around the proposed site will make matters worse

FLOODING - Flooding report do not accurately reflect the nature of the site and have been done in a very dry period. Surface water is a major issue on the site.

FLOODING - Underpinning has been necessary for nearby houses. Housing on the proposed site will result in the water displaced impacting of other local houses.

NEED - Additional 13 houses suggested by NFDC how has that been arrived at?

Carly Cochrane Comment – I will need to check that with NFDC.

SCHOOLS - Where will the additional children go as schools are currently full? Together with more needing to cross Southampton Road. The distance of the infant school will result in residents on the site having to drive.

SEWAGE - Infrastructure locally will not cope (sewage)

PREVIOUS SCHEMES - Are affordable houses in Bartley still affordable?

CLERK COMMENT - The Housing Association for Rockram Close had to follow a process laid down in a “Section 106 agreement” as to who could be a tenant and all units there remain for rent. Unable to advise on position of Pundle Green.

FLOODING – I live in Oakfield Road every year we have flooding, use pumps to move it on. Flooding is appalling.

DRAINAGE – The SUDS scheme proposed by the application. No one has undertaken site tests to confirm actual situation in winter. The data supplied is based on theoretical information.

Carly Cochrane Comment - This point has been raised with HCC as the LLFA.

PARKING – The impact of parking for Bartley School on New Inn Road (and other local roads) has not been mentioned in the transport statement which makes it misleading.

Carly Cochrane Comment – This point of concern raised with HCC for further comment although the applicant cannot control issues outside of the site.

TRAFFIC - Timing of transport reports do not reflect the peak times when the greatest danger happens. Reports should be re-done now that traffic volumes are back to normal.
(see added comment 1 at end of these notes)

FLOODING – The flooding report doesn't reflect the reality of the issues.

TRAFFIC - Many cyclists come through the village (both organised events and clubs). These also impact.

POLICY – I am an Oakfield Road resident. If we allow this development, it has implications for the rest of the New Forest National Park and other National Parks.

DESIGN - Drawing: Proposed Elevations E-H: Elevation E on layout plan and top Elevation E - South shows, on right, the rear elevation of plots 3, 4, and 5 & 6. This is also the view from the gardens of the homes at the top of Oakfield Road. As well as having ground floor levels higher than the existing homes, plots 5 & 6, the block of two flats, sits unnecessarily high related to the existing site levels, making the relationship between a) the main level access into ground floor flat 5; b) the adjoining footpath and car parking area; c) the rear garden door access from the ground floor flat 5 into the garden; d) the side access garden gate from the garden for plot 5 and finally e) the existing site levels on the eastern boundary adjacent to the parking area for flats 5 & 6 all very problematic! This would all seem to arise because of the level of the foul sewer connection in New Inn Road.

Also, the use of vertical dark stained weatherboarding at first floor level with a recessed illusion of non-existing windows will surely introduce a totally unwanted urban industrial/prison appearance to these south facing elevations that should be benefiting from the solar gain noted in the report submitted by the conservation officer. See comments on the NFNPA Planning Portal d/d September 2nd 2022 made by Mr John Goodwin.

POLICY – SP28 says that four conditions “SHOULD” be met. Where does “should” lie in terms of the application when compared in relation to “must”. I have concerns about how conditions are satisfied, transport for example says it is served when in reality it isn't.

Action for Carly Cochrane – I will take away to obtain response from the NFNPA Planning Policy Team.

SEWAGE – Has thought been given as to where waste water will go. Sewers are already at capacity in New Inn Road.

RECREATION - Horse riders are a regular sight in New Inn Road, they will be impacted by further growth in vehicle movements.

ENVIRONMENT - Who do you trust – issue with Nitrate levels within reports. If real data is not used then how can the report be trusted?

Carly Cochrane Comment – Clarification will be obtained from Natural England

TRAFFIC - New Inn Road cut through when issues occur elsewhere in the local transport network (A31/M27 jams etc).

LOCATION - Problems with building in the area. Previously said couldn't build within certain distance of Cattle grids. Is that right?

Carly Cochrane Comment - Natural England don't want housing within 400m of a SSSI. So allocated sites closer than that could not be considered within the NFNPA Local Plan.

POLICY - CLERK explained planning process. Policy questions can be raised through him to be passed to NFNPA.

DESIGN – Decent amount of parking but much of it is “tandem”. Will parents use the road junction to turn round causing even more issues. Density of site if reduced would lower the level of need for “tandem” parking. Existing residents will be impacted as well as those within the proposed development. Proposed crossing is a good thing but poor parking will abuse this.

DESIGN - Rules re preserving the local area. Will NFNPA Design Guide be applied to this application in the same way it is for existing resident applications.

Carly Cochrane Comment – Yes it will.

DESIGN - Local vernacular within the NFNPA Design Guide, there is nothing locally that matches the proposed materials and design.

Carly Cochrane Comment - Vertical cladding is not acceptable.

TRAFFIC - Can local residents submit surveys undertaken for them which conflict with those supplied by the applicant would they be considered of merit. In particular a fresh traffic survey.

Carly Cochrane Comment– We would share these with HCC Highways or the relevant body for comment.

(see added comment 1 at end of these notes)

TRAFFIC - Can I send you the video of traffic issues in New Inn Road?

CLERK COMMENT - Yes, try e-mail first (video has since been received).

LOCAL SERVICES - Medical needs - who will be the GP for the residents of the proposed site.

CLERK COMMENT - It will be the existing GP practices (Lyndhurst, Totton. Romsey)

PROVIDER - Have the "Council" been involved in discussion with possible AH providers.

Carly Cochrane Comment – ERHA, the developer, would be the provider.

TRAFFIC - Why are you accepting the traffic survey supplied by the applicant? Why can't it be challenged.?

Carly Cochrane Comment – We haven't , we have asked HCC Highways in their role as Highway Authority to comment upon the survey supplied.

(see added comment 1 at end of these notes)

TRAFFIC - You said that application may not go to Planning Committee until December.

Why should we as a community go to the expense of commissioning our own traffic survey, why don't we ask the applicant to do it again.

Carly Cochrane Comment – I can ask this question of the applicant.

(see added comment 1 at end of these notes)

FLOODING/DRAINAGE - We know that three water surveys have been undertaken, why do we have to accept only the one that suits their case?

Carly Cochrane Comment – We can ask for another survey. HCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority have already said that they don't have enough information and until they do they will not comment on the drainage reports and would want 21 days from receipt to be able to comment. Water from the site goes into a main river which the LLFA will need to consider.

Notes made by David Rigby, Clerk to Copythorne Parish Council

Added Comment 1 received from Carly Cochrane – October 12th 2022

In relation to the transport statement, I have discussed this with the applicant, and they will not be carrying out any further survey work. Since the Parish meeting, we have received the comments of Hampshire Highways who are in support of the application, subject to conditions. These are not yet on the website due to the system upgrade but will be added as soon as possible. I would point out that HCC assess the application against their own criteria, and do not solely rely on the information provided by an applicant. Should the community wish to commission their own survey, I would recommend that they engage the Highways Authority. I would also require an indication of timescales with regard this, as, whilst I am more than happy to look at any findings, if it were that we got to a stage where the application was ready to be determined, I could not delay this to wait for any such survey I am afraid. Unhelpfully, I do not know yet which Planning Committee the application may be heard at, however if it were to be December, I would need to have the survey results and HCC's comments by the end of November.