

Notes of Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan Sites meeting with SDNPA officers
14th December 2015

Present : Sir John Dunt (Chairman))
Cllr Sue Halstead – Sites & Design Working Group)All sites
Veronica Craddock - SDNPA Landscape Officer)
Chris Paterson –SDNPA Community Neighbourhood Plan Officer)
Michael Oakley - Housing Needs Working Group & Steering Group) West Liss
Roger Mullenger - Landscape Working Group & Steering Group) Sites
Paddy Payne - Sites & Design Working Group)

Brows Farm (Site 5)

The SDNPA has significant concerns regarding this site, but does not rule it out completely. They advised strongly against submitting the existing Development Brief proposals and advised involving a landscape architect in the preparation of a much more detailed scheme showing exactly how houses could be designed and located and more accurately demonstrating how much land would be occupied by housing, access road, gardens etc. Landscaping and boundary treatment will be critical. Must give serious consideration as to whether or not houses should front green space without gardens and if so how/where such domestic paraphernalia (such as trampolines, sheds, washing lines, etc.), might be located. We were directed to look at existing developments at East Meon and Singleton which front green space. The benefit of achieving additional green space was recognised and this should be firmly designated so that activities that might in time attract equipment, changing rooms, etc. could be resisted. Therefore serious question marks about provision of Senior Football pitch, allotments and location of parking. Recommended that the opportunity should be taken to enhance the existing footpath through improving the boundary treatment on the northern side.

Eden Lodge (Site 4)

Generally seen as a good site. Concerns expressed about possible impact on mature oak boundary trees recently given TPO protection. This was not seen as a problem at the front of where the access to The Grange already has a tarmac surface. Recommended that an arboricultural assessment is obtained regarding the possible impact/mitigation measures required concerning the tree roots and canopies at the narrowest point and along the southern boundary of the site. If an alternative route could be achieved around the other side of the Grange this would be preferable.

Site 4a – This was seen as a good site with potential for more houses than currently proposed. The layout as proposed was not supported and should be revisited with the developer.

Land next to Stocks Oak

This whole area of Hilliers land is seen as a valuable local gap vulnerable to future larger scale development should any small area be developed at this stage. There would be considerable difficulty defining a defensible boundary. Reference to maps of ancient field boundaries might assist. Not ruled out, but many concerns over development on any part of Hilliers land. Would require very detailed landscape proposals before being considered further.

Hatch Lane (Site 11)

Site is a clear gap between Hill Brow dispersed settlement pattern and edge of Liss. It is poorly connected to Liss both in physical and visual terms. Poor relationship with the settlement pattern of Liss; disconnected from village, poor access. SDNPA opposed.

Clarks Farm (Site 12)

SDNPA remain strongly opposed.

Seen as a critically important component of the Gap between Liss and Hillbrow. A discrete site with lovely distant views, bounded by ancient lanes on 3 sides. Once begun to be eroded, it would be difficult to resist further development across whole site.

Other Issues Discussed

Andlers Ash Road (Sites 3a & 3b)

All noted with some surprise 65m contour along Andlers Ash Road. SDNPA advice was not to ignore discrepancy and risk being undermined at examination. We should be up front and spell out that it had been assessed against all the criteria and had performed well in every other respect.

SDNPA strongly favour a single master plan for both sites to maximise delivering essential co-ordinated infrastructure and landscaping through a single S106.

NB. CP has had another phone call from the resident in the house between the two sites. Have we decided who will speak with her and what to say?

Hillbrow Gap

It was noted that without a Hillbrow SPB, it would no longer be possible to define the gap between settlements. Therefore the policy would need to be re-worded to describe the gap between “built areas”.

Hillbrow Area currently protected by H9 policy – SDNPA Local Plan proposes to be covered by Countryside Policies.

Chris Paterson commented that SDNPA planners are still considering providing “policy hooks” in their Local Plan to enable local policies to strengthen protection. CP & Roni suggested that Liss NDP might include an additional local countryside policy along the lines: *“Where there is scattered development in parts of the village covered by Countryside Policies the only development permitted will be single replacement dwellings on existing plots.”*

Linking Green Spaces

SDNPA recommended a strategic management plan (incorporating proposed new sites) relating to Eco and Biodiversity, demonstrating linkages of green infrastructure, public open space across the whole village. This would enable better maintenance “with the resulting total being greater than the sum of the parts”.