



**MILBORNE ST ANDREW  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY**

**MEETING HELD ON 12<sup>TH</sup> OCT 2015  
IN THE VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM**

No. 14

1. Present: Mike Brown (MB), Georgina Carrington (GC), Sue Cherry (SC), David Gould (DG), Susan Gould (SG), Ronald Hogg (RH), Michael Hopper (MH), Pam Shults (PS) Jo Witherden (JW). There were no apologies.
2. Informal presentation of possible development of land above Huntley Down – David Wyatt, Andy Ward and Tom Smith attended. The design team have worked with Charminster, where they involved the residents at a very early stage of design, they intend to match this approach with MSA. This was a preliminary discussion about the ideas of the architects for this development. This area is described as in easy reach of the village and amenities, and is easy to “plug into” with existing services. It included the thinking behind the street layout, and the spread of different styles of property. Thought was given to the privacy of neighbouring existing properties, and the style. For instance, the properties nearer Coles Lane would be smaller, to be sympathetic to the sizes existing, the view from Huntley Down could include a couple of properties matching the larger size of existing houses. They plan to match the adjacent housing density where visible. General guidelines are about 30 per hectare, this would be around 28 ph. Questions from the NPG team concerned:
  - a. General
    1. The NPG group asked the DW team why they wished to see us, and what they sought to gain out of this meeting. They replied that they wished to put forward their ideas, and how it had been thought out, that they wanted to make sure they matched any research we had done, and involve the community from the start.
    2. We requested that they share any environmental studies, if carried out.
    3. Multi-Bin Storage: Thought will be given to storage and access to buildings where there is no rear access
  - b. Affordability:
    1. What are your plans to fulfil this requirement - this could be Shared Equity or Rent
    2. Requested that restrictive covenants are put on affordable properties to retain young people in the village.
  - c. Flooding in lower area: Our concerns were that the new properties could add to the difficulties experienced by the village.
    1. Could they investigate the use of grey water systems.
    2. Pointed out the existing sewage capacity and the need to tanker the sewage in bad weather events, design needs to take this into account.
    3. To this end we requested that they investigate use of permeable material and type of drainage.
    4. They will be doing a preliminary assessment for flooding.
    5. Pointed out that the agricultural land behind has been known to flood down when the ploughing was carried out from top to bottom, that some contingency may be needed.
  - d. Parking:
    1. Bearing in mind the problems with off road parking in some areas of the village, what have they designed in?
    2. Most will have 2 car parking, some with garages.
    3. We discussed the issues surrounding the county standards and rural needs.
    4. Parking must go with the property (as opposed to open communal space) and be convenient so that residents do not park nearer their houses rather in the designated area.
  - e. Design: Ensure it in keeping with village properties.
    1. The gravel surfaces on the hill would tend to travel out of the drives. Permeable surfacing is preferred.
    2. Solar Panels installation was raised as a design issue, the design of roofs should make them at the rear or side, and not always suitable, installing during building could make



## MILBORNE ST ANDREW NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY

them less obvious, making them more of a character feature.

3. Pointed out by NPG team that if included, thatched properties should be rendered, this is the most common situation and there is only one fully brick and thatched house in the village.
4. The use of Entrance Pillars splits the community, this was agreed by the DW team

The team from David Wyatt were thanked for their attendance; no comment was made to them about any disapproval/approval or any compliance/noncompliance with our research.

3. The Minutes of Meeting No. 13 on 8th September 2015 were approved
  - a. Item 6i – Grant application – on hold this month due to computer failure and health issues. This will be recommenced on return of the computer.
4. There were no Declarations of Interest based on the Agenda
5. Progress on Scope and Initial Project Plan research:
  - a. Housing – MH – due to computer collapse, this will be completed later.
  - b. Parking – RH – Guidelines on parking places does not depend on parking per house, but depends on the size of development. Examples in the village of lack of parking (Hopsfield) shows houses where the front garden has been converted to parking place to ease congestion, but have no drop curb. It is thought that these probably have no permission. Conclusion lead to the suggestion that parking should go on/with the property, and not communal parking; it should allocated to the property.
  - c. Employment – SG/DG – Although most areas have been researched for data, guidance is needed to show how to complete this topic. JW to assist.
  - d. Facilities – SC – The list of facilities was reviewed, and increased. JW advised that facilitators are contacted to get more information. To this end SC asked to construct a basic letter, forward to JW who will help with format.
  - e. Sites – JW – due to constraints on time, this will be completed later.
  - f. Flooding – GC/MB – MB attended a meeting regarding clearing the stream by Marsh Bridge, however, on investigation, this has already happened (by the Environment Agency), ready to connect the new flood alleviation pipe to the stream. GC has spoken to Environment Agency, they are supportive of any changes to lower risk. Their advice is that the floor level in any new builds is raised, rather than using the flood gates recently installed in flood risk houses. The latter approach is more useful as a retrospective approach. The EA said they get involved when more than 10 houses are being constructed. (We have sent in comments to the NDDC Local Plan suggesting this is reduced to 1 in flood areas).
  - g. Character – RH – A walk round the older part of the village showed a style that remains reasonably consistent with render/ thatch, or brick/tile. RH would like to do a revisit, as his views could be subjective. JW suggested contacting the Conservation Officer to come on a walk round, to fix a date, then inform the team so that others can attend. There is a surprisingly few number of listed buildings, and, other than The Grove, few trees.
  - h. SEA – Strategic Environmental Assessment - which may not be needed, therefore to be reviewed.
6. Any Other Business: There were no other issues raised.
7. Date of Next Meeting. The meeting closed at 9.10 pm. The next meeting is the 10<sup>th</sup> November, 7.00pm, in the VH Committee Room.

### Tasks:

Complete the Draft Project Plan, gather information stated, pull in other villagers if willing. Contact JW for more information.

Parking Walkabout: If not already done - Complete task - Send photos to whole group, with comments, RH heading that area. Please state the roads you have covered.