

FONTMELL MAGNA NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

MONITORING GROUP

Report to Fontmell Magna Parish Council on Planning Application 2/2020/0577/FUL - Land At E 386515 N 116640 South Street

NPMG met on the 3rd June to consider the above application in the light of the Fontmell Magna Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2031 our conclusions are as detailed below.

PLANNING STATEMENT

The photographs on Page 2 are not representative of the village (which is described in the Design and Access Statement as “a mix of Victorian villas and older more varied buildings”).

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

Page 16 deals with Appearance. In order to make the designs compliant with FM8 and FM9, the developer should consider the following:

- 1) Roof pitches to be at least 45 degrees
- 2) Eaves to project beyond external wall faces by a minimum of 400mm
- 3) Project roof over gable ends by 400mm and expose purlins (as shown in the Design and Access Statement perspective on P14).
- 4) Try to achieve greater variation in external materials.
- 5) Window proportions need reconsideration as does the subdivision of glazing which currently is too busy and not well proportioned.
- 6) If PVC window frames must be used, specify flush profile sections.
- 7) 1st floor window heads to rise above eaves level (because the extra projection of the eaves brings the eaves closer to ground level)
- 8) Segmental arches tight beneath eaves are not necessary, (as they carry no load in this situation)
- 9) Try to introduce relief to blank side elevations.

On p.17 there is reference to a two-metre buffer zone. Is this inside or outside the site, and who will be responsible for its maintenance?

TRANSPORT STATEMENT

The access to the A350 as shown in the plan on p.20 does not give any protection to vehicles leaving to the South. There should be a refuge to enable vehicles to wait in the centre lane. This would help to comply with FM10.

The figures for traffic movements do not appear to include school traffic entering and leaving twice a day. This would make a significant difference.

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND DRAINAGE STRATEGY

Para 3.2.3 (second time round) suggests the area is not susceptible to surface water flooding, based on mapping – but mapping does not appear to be done on agricultural land such as this site. The conclusion is therefore based on a false premise, and local observation would suggest that the area is indeed susceptible to surface water flooding. FM11 refers.

FM 12 requires that any necessary upgrades to the sewage treatment works (as advised by Wessex Water) will be in place prior to the site's occupation. This needs to be confirmed for this application.

SECTION 106 AGREEMENT – HEADS OF TERMS

There is reference to the footpath at the northwest of site (it is actually north east). This footpath is also mentioned in Para.4.1.6 of the Transport Statement, as requiring to be upgraded to an all-weather surface. The footpath in question is privately owned, and to our knowledge the owners have not been approached on this matter.

There is reference to open space area being adopted by either PC or a management company. On the assumption that it is beyond the remit of PC to do this, will the developer set up a management company?

Concerning the DMU Clause, we need to be assured that the agreement mentioned follows the policy set out in FM16 and in view of the fact that the HoT document finishes at paragraph 12 and there is no date given for the completion of the agreement we question whether an agreement has been reached.

If there is an agreement we must see it before we give a final opinion on this application.

BIODIVERSITY and ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL

The decision to install either bird or bat boxes should be replaced by bird and bat boxes in every dwelling.

It is disappointing that the introduction of a bat corridor has led to a realignment of the dwellings on the eastern side, leading to a less random and more regulated appearance.

What arrangements will there be to ensure that the boundaries of the site (and the bat corridor) are maintained in the future?

SUSTAINABILITY

The proposed plans contain no provision for solar panels (on non-visible surfaces, as it is in the Conservation Area), nor for electric car charging points. The developer's attention has been drawn to the proximity of high-speed fibre broadband which could be made available to the site. DC policy requires consideration of these issues.

GENERAL POINTS

The general impression was that these proposals lack variety, and do not do justice to the historic character of the village.

More variety is needed, and greater consideration of the Conservation Area, and the rural nature of the site.

RJMcC

4/6/20