

Deer Park meeting notes

9 – 10 a.m. Saturday 25th April 2015 at The Vine Church, London Road, Odiham

In attendance: Mark Faulkner, Jeremy Fellows, Jon Hale from OPC; Craig Worboys prospective parish councillor for the Odiham Ward, Richard Revell and Graham Bell. John Champion had said he would not be attending.

We made it clear we were there as individuals and any questions and comments were not reflective of any OPC view, agreed or otherwise.

RR seemed to have been rather taken aback by the strength of feeling against his proposals from some quarters. He said that after the first day of the consultation he had started to appreciate some of the concerns and as a result, unknown to GB until then, he was prepared to modify some aspects of the plan. Three things he mentioned were:

- moving the night-time sanctuary for the deer to the field nearest the canal (subject to his purchase of it), which he thought gave scope for a better arrangement of the footpaths;
- not having so many trees along 'The Gallops' so that the views were more open; and
- re-visiting some aspects of the proposals guided by thinking what is the maximum public enjoyment the proposal could generate commensurate with what he felt would be his family's private enjoyment, rather than thinking what was the least he could offer.

Questions that were asked of RR

How could it be ensured that no further houses would be put in the land he owns? This was a major concern of residents.

1. The enabling scheme itself would cap the number of houses;
2. Although initially the thinking was about leasing land he was not now against gifting a perimeter strip of land to OPC or Hart to address concerns that e.g. someone could buy a house, demolish it and create a new access, providing that he in turn could have covenants from the new owner forbidding development and limiting e.g. the number of village events where the land might be used other than for informal recreation;
3. He was thinking a family trust might be created to safeguard the land for future generations of the Revell family and deter sale;
4. Covenants were an option to stop development.

Why can't the scheme deliver some sort of affordable housing? This is an issue that would be raised by many residents

GB said this would affect the economics of the development and so mean more houses. This was not however an impossibility. RR said this had been mentioned to him during the previous day's

consultation and he was prepared to think of doing something; a suggestion was to include an additional site in the village where affordable housing could be built. There appeared to be some confusion over the NPs stance on affordable housing dating back to November, with GB and RR thinking they were not being expected or encouraged to consider this.

Any legal agreements could cost OPC a lot of money. How would this be funded?

GB said that Hart would pay for it and then get the money off RR as is usual in planning.

What was the current thinking about his house?

He has engaged the services of Robert Adam as an architect and there was a first draft of a possible design. Robert Adam is the 'go to' architect for large houses set in a landscape. The draft design on display was not in the Georgian-style that characterises most of RA's work but was said to take references from King John's Hunting Lodge at Broad Oak. In RR's eyes it would not be a 'mansion' and the only outbuilding would be a garage but the final planning application might include some ancillary buildings, for example to house the machinery required for maintaining the Park. RR said that RA starts executing his brief by assessing a house's setting and the mass/height/design follow from that.

Once completed what would be the status of the Park e.g. would the CA status be at risk, would it still be vulnerable to farming activities and associated infrastructure not subject to planning controls?

GB's view was that as an enabling scheme it would be unlikely that the CA status would subsequently be withdrawn. RR was happy to consider repudiating permitted development rights to stop the risk of farming activities leading to a deterioration of the views and public enjoyment.

Could he give more detail about the fencing?

There would be a pale, an internal ditch and a bund which would mean fencing need not be as high as originally planned. RR felt the visual impact would not be as stark as many feared.

Managing any gifted or leased land would be financially and administratively burdensome for OPC. How would this be addressed?

There is the option of Hart taking this over. A joint management plan involving RR's maintenance of some areas and trees might be possible.

Other points:

1. The listed wall to the south would be restored as part of the plan. He says nobody owns it and so nobody other than him will pay for this work;
2. There will be another meeting with OPC to review the consultation feedback;
3. GB said feedback to the community would be modelled on the NP's approach e.g. leaflets through doors, use of social media, another consultation, a mailing;
4. GB said that he had not talked to the canal authority, canal society or English Nature about the proposals. As they were statutory consultees they would be talked to in due course. I expressed surprise at this as the canal is a CA, an SSSI and highly valued by Odiham residents as the NP had discovered;
5. RR volunteered the idea of a footpath on the southern side of the canal to link with the existing canal bridge and the footpath there;

6. Some residents had already raised the issue of the suggested visitor car park by the doctors being free and not over-managing 'The Gallops' so that it looked too manicured.
7. The community building is a suggestion from RR; the funds could be applied for something else in the parish as determined by OPC/the community if that was preferred.

Matters not raised due to lack of time:

Light pollution/guarantees about completion/archaeological work pre-development/ tie-in with the NP's vision and proposals regarding land other than the DP/ impact of having the DP as a visitor destination for people outside the parish

Neither RR nor GB made notes during the meeting.

Jeremy Fellows

Sunday 26th April