

**Planning**

Executive Head of Planning, Regeneration  
and Economy: Claire Upton-Brown

Mr G Moir  
CL Planning  
Unit 5, Designer House  
Sandford Lane  
Wareham  
BH20 4DY

Our Ref: ENQ/22/20022/ERES

Your Ref:

07 April 2022

Dear Mr Moir

**Request for pre application advice**

**Site Address:** ORCHARD GATE, NOADS WAY, DIBDEN PURLIEU, HYTHE, SO45  
4PD

**Proposal:** 25 dwellings

Thank you for your recent request for pre-application advice, We met on 11th February to discuss the revised scheme, submitted to address the concerns of the refused application. At that meeting areas of concern were highlighted and solutions discussed. Our response is based on the following revised plans and information:

Technical Site Plan Ref:21110.04 rev G received 07/03/22

Proposed Site Plan Ref:21110.05 rev D received 07/03/22

**Planning History that refers to your property or is relevant to the proposal**

2021. Planning application to demolish the existing and erect 37 dwellings was refused.  
(21/11201)

**Planning Considerations**

At our meeting we discussed areas of concern with the proposals as submitted in January, this response will focus on the amended plans presented subsequently, on 7th March.

As advised at the meeting the reduced scheme makes significant improvements over the scheme refused planning permission.

I felt the discussion around the density and layout of the portion of the site occupied by units 1-5 relating to the character of Noads Way was sensible and an appropriate approach to the site's development, unfortunately I don't feel the revision presents an appropriate solution. Houses fronting the access road was a positive feature of the original pre-app submission, but it was the extent of cars along the edge of the road that was the problem and needed attention.

I do not accept that the courtyard of parking and the rear of the terrace of four houses is an appropriate design response for the entrance in to the site or the character of Noads Way. The scheme would benefit from returning to the original layout, for this pre-app, of houses fronting the access drive and may have to accept a reduction in numbers of units in order to accommodate the required level of parking, within the plots, as discussed at our meeting.

Whilst the layout of the north corner works better for parking accessibility, the continuous built form of parking and building frontage along that whole length from unit 6 to 14 is particularly harsh. It needs breaking with a landscape separation, or at least a more generous gap between buildings.

I acknowledge that the character of the centre of the site could take a different approach, being higher density as shown. I am still not comfortable with the approach of 3 sets of tandem parking spaces (parking 18-20) being an appropriate design solution.

In all cases of parking being placed between flank walls, access for bikes, buggies and potentially wheeled bins is particularly constrained and likely to lead to conflicts.

I believe the revised layout largely addresses the concerns of the relationship between the dwellings and the trees and the impact on amenity of residents and poor tree-building relationship raised in the refused application. However the presence of trees at the front of the site and highway visibility has not been reviewed at this time.

However I am very skeptical about the chances for tree planting to be successful between the parking spaces 22-25. They look very vulnerable and would compromise manoeuvrability, to the extent of being readily at risk of driven over, which based on a standard landscape maintenance/replacement condition would require regular replacement. The principle of courtyard/street trees has merit, but they need to have chance for success.

Subject to drainage design and calculations, demonstrating how surface water would enter the attenuation 'pond', its depth, bank gradient and ultimate size, the larger greenspace in the centre of the site, along with the ribbon along the south boundary, would provide space for informal recreation and play. At this stage it is not clear what role the space at the front of the site would play, however Bio-Diversity Net Gain, needs to be considered and expecting spaces on site to play multiple roles has the potential to undermine its success.

The scheme would need to make provision for mitigating its effect on habitats in the New Forest and Solent, from increased recreational pressure and water quality. The former would take the form of financial contributions towards mitigation projects, the latter a condition, satisfied by your purchase of credits from one of the nutrient neutrality offsetting schemes. Contributions towards monitoring Air Quality throughout the New Forest are also required.

The scheme would be expected to contribute towards the provision of Affordable Housing in the District. In the event a policy compliant 50% provision isn't achievable then a financial appraisal should be provided to demonstrate what contribution would be viable.

By the time an application based on this pre-app is received the Council is likely to have implemented a schedule of fees associated with monitoring delivery of on and off site

mitigation. These costs will relate to the specifics of the obligations sought and the triggers, such as checking commencement has occurred and payments received or regular monitoring of BNG over its 30 year lifespan, for example. A full report on the proposals can be found at item 5 here: [S.106 monitoring](#)

## **Conclusions**

The principle of the reduced scheme has addressed some aspects of the reasons the 2021 scheme was refused, however I believe the plans require further review to address concerns expressed at our meeting in order to deliver an acceptable development.

The above comments represent the informal views of the planning officer and are not binding on the elected Council Members of the Authority or the Chief Planning Officer. The views are based on the information provided and the research undertaken. Should a planning application be submitted the Council must take into account any views expressed by statutory and non-statutory consultees and other interested 3rd parties. The eventual recommendation and decision may therefore change when more detailed consideration is given at application stage. You will be advised if that is the case prior to the decision being sent out. The decision notice and case officer's report will set out in detail the reasons for the decision.

Further information on how to submit an application, the information required, how we publicise the application, and the fee to be paid along with the eventual decision and case officer's report can be accessed on our planning web site pages by following this link <https://newforest.gov.uk/article/1051/View-or-Comment-on-a-Planning-Application>

If you do have any queries or are unsure about anything in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me. However, please note that if you require any further written advice this is likely to incur an additional pre-application fee.

Yours sincerely

JRG

James Gilfillan  
Senior Development Management Officer

Direct Line: 02380 28 5797  
General: 023 8028 5345 Option 1  
Email: [planning@nfdc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@nfdc.gov.uk)