

Notes of an Informal Meeting about the proposed Spyway Orchard development, between members of Langton Matravers Parish Council and Aster and their representatives, held at the Memorial Room, Langton Matravers Village Hall on Thursday 25th July, 2019 at 6pm.

Present : Cllrs Knight (Chair), Bell, Christie, White, Loudoun and Pearson; Mr James Atterbury (Built Environment Communications Group), Ms Zoe Wensley-Smith (Aster) and Mr Nigel Jarvis of Luken Beck Planning Consultancy, who is managing the planning on behalf of Aster.

The Clerk attended the meeting to take notes.

There was no formal agenda.

1) **Introductions.** Cllr Knight emphasised that the meeting was intended as an information-gathering exercise, and that no decisions from the Council can either be expected or will be forthcoming. Any formal decisions will be made in public; no individual can represent Council's views. He warned Cllrs not to exhibit any predetermined views on any aspect of what might follow, as it would rule them out of future discussion on the matter. Those present introduced themselves briefly to the meeting.

Ms Wensley-Smith (ZWS) explained that Drew Smith remain the contractors for the project, and that Aster are keen to have a 2-way conversation with the community as the development progresses. Mr Jarvis (NJ) said that, despite lack of effective communication with the parish in the recent past, Aster are firmly committed to bringing the housing forward and that it is important for people to understand what is happening. Aster want to communicate and take on board local concerns and questions. Mr Atterbury (JA) might be actively involved as a 'site contact' for the community. He will be writing shortly to neighbours.

2) **Proposed Plans.**

a) Layout. NJ showed the meeting copies of the 2015 outline planning permission plans for background context. Though he was aware of Council's previous comments on the development at the outline stage, he had not seen LMPC's latest recorded concerns about Trees on the site, (related to the Biodiversity report, [LMPC Minutes 9th May, Item 14.2.c]). **ACTION:** Clerk to forward Minutes to JA and NJ for information. NJ then showed copies of the plans which are presently before Dorset Council, dated 8.2.2019; there were perceived to be issues with car spaces, lack of pavement and the overall shape of the layout. He then showed work-in-progress plans (10.6.2019) for a layout with a more curved access road, and gardens at front and back, with driveways/parking at the sides of the buildings: 2 per household plus visitor space, and a turning head. NJ explained the housing still included 1 and 2 bedroom homes, mostly as two storey housing with a small group of apartments designed to appear as a terrace/group. The road will not be adopted. Colin Graham (DC Highways) would like some pedestrian refuge, and a possible 1 ½ metre wide footway might be included along the road. Cllr Bell noted that the access to busy Spyway car park adjoins the entry to the development, and NJ suggested that a footway might be created to reflect the inclusion at the outline permission stage which joins up to Durnford Drove. Cllr Loudoun noted that the latest plans showed no provision for a play area; this is because of the biodiversity and other contra-indications on the site.

Cllr Knight asked if the right sort of housing was being built to directly address Langton's housing need, as laid out in the Housing Needs Survey, with the greatest requirement being for 1-bed units.

It was agreed that this is important. There will be 22 Local Needs units, with 20 rented and 2 shared ownership, and 6 open market. Cllr Knight asked if these could be mixed around the site. Cllr Pearson asked if the open market housing could be for a principal residence only. ZWS responded that though there is a signed s106 in place, Dorset Council has not put a restriction on the open market dwellings at the outline stage which would have been the only appropriate time to do so. Despite the PR policy being in the local plan, NJ said that this would not affect this stage of application (Reserved Matters), as the outline stage of the process is now complete.

b) Materials. NJ explained that the latest plans include materials for elevations based on houses in the vicinity; they are proposing stonework on buildings visible at the entry to the site. Cllr Loudoun suggested that local stonemasons who know stone laying be used. Cllr Bell would like to see examples of the type of brick to be used. She asked about the carbon status of the materials used in construction; are solar panels or slates an option? Awareness of Climate concerns should form part of the development process. NJ said that all houses will meet the national requirements. ZWS noted that solar panels might be too expensive. Windows are likely to be PVC which is easier to maintain.

c) Water management. Cllr Bell expressed concern about the permeability of surfaces on the site. NJ explained that boreholes are still a part of the proposed plan; any water coming off the site will be dealt with through an attenuation tank. Cllr Knight outlined historic flooding concerns within the wider area. NJ said that the tank would have 40% more capacity than would be expected for the uptake of water on a greenfield site, with built-in allowance for climate change, and there will be three boreholes.

NJ explained that the latest plans are not yet in the public domain as Dorset Council have not yet had sight of them: LMPC received no copies of plans or other documentation from BECG, Mr Jarvis or Aster.

d) Trees. NJ explained that the Biodiversity Report gave a misleading impression of the number of trees which might need to be felled in order to facilitate the layout; this will include only about 20 B or C class trees. The large majority of tree felling reflects recommendations for woodland management. It would not be in Aster's interest to undertake if not for this. NJ agreed that there had been a weakness in the documentation; Aster will get their tree consultant and ecologist to prepare updated information. NJ noted that a TPO on a tree need not be a constraint to development, though they try to avoid felling TPO trees, and replace where necessary. NJ confirmed that James Bennett (DC TO) has asked for additional planting in his consultation response. LMPC's concerns are noted and ZWS and NJ will refer back to their arboricultural team in the light of comments made.

3. **Conclusion**. JA will be doing a newsletter for immediate neighbours (including at least Durnford Drove, Gypshayes and the Hyde), and has analysed comments already on file. He wants to build up a good relationship between Aster and the village. He intends to update LMPC and the local community as the process goes forward, and will let us know when structural work might start. As the latest plans are not yet finalised, the Reserved Matters will not be heard at the July 31st Dorset Council Planning meeting.

Cllr Knight thanked everyone for their attendance.