

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY,
12 OCTOBER 2016**

UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE

6. COMMITTEE UPDATES (Pages 1 - 8)

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING - 12 OCTOBER 2016

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Item 3(c) - 51 High Street ,Lymington (Application 16/10451)

Lymington and Pennington Town Council have commented further and now recommend permission.

Item 3(e) - Land at Buckland Manor Farm, Alexandra Road, Lymington (Application 65/10764)

Further comments have been received from the Urban Design Officer who states that the design is acceptable in general terms and that further details can be secured by an appropriately worded condition. As a result condition no. 7 is revised as below:

Natural England has commented further and raise no objection to the proposals.

Condition No. 7 is revised to read as follows:

7. Notwithstanding the submitted landscape and SANGS strategic planting details, and before development commences, a detailed scheme of landscaping of the site shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include
- a) the existing trees and shrubs which have been agreed to be retained;
 - b) a specification for new planting (species, size, spacing and location) for the whole site including individual dwellings;
 - c) the detailed design of all areas of public open space and SANGS to include details of the play equipment
 - d) the details of a landscape management and maintenance plan
 - e) a method and programme for its implementation and the means to provide for its future maintenance.
 - f) the details of the enclosure to the allotment

No development shall take place unless these details have been approved and then only in accordance with those details.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in an appropriate way and to prevent inappropriate car parking to comply with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.

Condition No. 12 needs to be revised in the second sentence of the last paragraph to read:

“The development shall not be commenced until....” rather than “occupied”.

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“The application is for the erection of 87 new dwellings to be accessed from 2 new junctions onto Alexandra Road.

The Highway Authority originally raised a holding objection based on a lack of information in respect of how the increased vehicular movements to be generated at the site would affect the existing local highway network and also how the proposed new accesses would safely accommodate vehicular traffic entering and leaving the site in Alexandra Road.

The applicant subsequently provided an amended Transport Statement which has adequately demonstrated that the increased traffic at the site would be safely accommodated within the local highway network.

The Highway Authority would however wish to see a footway link provided between the western access to the site and the existing footway along the western side of Alexandra Road to the south of the site. This would provide a useful link for pedestrians from the site to the schools in Pennington to the south.

The route of this footway would be on land which already forms part of the highway and therefore could be delivered as part of a suitable S278 agreement with the Highway Authority together with the right turn facility and pedestrian crossing facilities to be provided to the east of the site.

The Highway Authority has subsequently been made aware that proposals might come forward at a later date for further development on land to the north which might require access onto the highway via the proposed spine road to the west of the site.

On further consideration of the suitability of the spine road to adequately accommodate any further vehicle movements the Highway Authority would wish to see the "triandem" on plot parking arrangements shown on the current plans revised to allow tandem parking only as part of the current application, although this would result in the loss of a number of parking spaces provided at the site the remaining spaces would still be in excess of those recommended by the SPD and would therefore be acceptable.

Given the timescale the Highway Authority would not wish to raise a late objection to the current parking arrangements but understands that this issue might be dealt with by a suitable condition should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant permission.

Any future proposals to increase the number of dwellings using the proposed spine road and impact this might have on the local highway network would be assessed when such proposals are received and the Highway Authority would not wish to comment further on any possible further developments at this time."

The applicant has submitted a further Heritage Statement in response to the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer. The Statement concludes that the impact of the proposals on the Grade II Listed Buckland Manor, the Buckland Conservation Area and Buckland Rings Ancient Monument would be at the lower end of "less than substantial harm". The public benefits of the development proposals are considered to sufficiently offset this degree of harm. As a result the report concludes that the development proposals comply with legislative and planning policy framework at national and local level. Further comments have been sought from the Conservation Officer and a response is awaited.

Item 3(f) - Land of 19 Hale Avenue, New Milton (Application 16/11144)

New Milton Town Council object as the proposal would be contrary to the Local Distinctiveness SPD; it would set a precedent; they have highway concerns; and concerns about overlooking and a lack of amenity space for both the existing and proposed dwellings.

A further objection has been received raising concerns about the loss of wildlife and the loss of their view.

Item 3(h) - 5 Bingham Drive, Lymington (Application 16/11176)

The application is for the redevelopment of the site to provide 2 new three bedroom dwellings and 2 new four bedroom dwellings at the site which is located at and accessed from the existing turning head at the end of Bingham Drive. The Highway Authority would wish to see the facilities for the turning of vehicles and in particular refuse and larger vehicles maintained to avoid the possibility of such vehicles being forced to reverse the length of Bingham Drive and thus enter Church Lane in a reverse gear.

The plans indicate that a total of 8 spaces would be provided at the site, which is 3 spaces less than that recommended by the SPD. Should the development result in any displaced parking within the turning head this is likely to adversely affect the existing limited facilities for the turning of larger vehicles which currently exist.

The access to the site would be widened to 3.5 metres which would not be considered wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass each other. An objection was raised in respect of this however it is considered that the site could accommodate a wider access of 4.5 metres for a distance of not less than 6 metres from the highway boundary which would overcome the Highway Authority's objection in respect of this matter, however no revised plans were received to address this concern.

Item 3(k) - Land south of Gore Road, New Milton (Application 16/10994)

The following additional comments have been received:

Mr Reid (New Milton Town Councillor): raises concern over the current flooding problem on this stretch of Gore Road and the potential impact of the development. While it should not be the responsibility of the applicant to resolve current issues, due to the possibility of flooding the development site from Gore Road, it would be irresponsible to grant planning permission for development on this site until the current issue has been resolved. To this end he has gained the support of HCC highways who do a drain check and clean if necessary in the near future. This issue should be given full consideration when reviewing the subject application.

The Council's Land Drainage Section was consulted specifically on the applicant's drainage proposals for the site and considers that the surface water disposal from the proposed site has been given proper consideration and looks of sound design and capacity. This is vital as there are significant flooding issues in the vicinity. Should the development go ahead, it would appear that no. 67 Gore Road is better protected from flooding than it is currently. Furthermore, the response from HCC's Flood and Water Management Team is positive. They have no objections, subject to there being a clear future maintenance plan/responsibility, specifically for the proposed swale, which would be ensured by condition No. 10.

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

"The proposals are for the development of a parcel of land to provide 28 new dwellings, a new junction would be formed onto the highway in Gore Road to provide vehicular access to the site. It is proposed that a new shared surface footway /cycleway 2.0 metres wide would be provided across the frontage of the site and continued eastwards to join with the existing

footway just to the west of Milton Mead, the Highway Authority would however wish to see this facility increased to 2.5 metres in width secured by way of a S106 agreement and implemented as part of a S278 agreement with the Highway Authority.

The Highway Authority would consider the new access road for adoption subject to a suitable S38 agreement with the Highway Authority.

Given the level of development proposed the SPD recommends that a total of 65 on site car parking spaces should be provided if all the spaces were allocated to individual dwellings, should any spaces be unallocated then the SPD recommends lower levels of parking provision, as any available spaces might be fully utilised.

The application provides for only 59 spaces, given that the parking spaces in the vicinity of plots 5 to 17 have the potential to be shared/unallocated the Highway Authority would wish to see these conditioned as allocated to make more efficient use of the available parking at the site.”

Item 3(l) - Land adjacent 10 Linford Close, New Milton (Application 16/11005)

Further correspondence has been received from the Applicant advising on changes made since the pre-application submission and that together with appropriate landscaping informally discussed with the Tree Officer, the proposal would not affect residential amenity.

Mr Short (New Milton Town Councillor) has commented further on behalf of New Milton Town Council and recommends approval of the application based on the removal of a window that could cause overlooking and planting on the eastern boundary to replace trees removed due to storm damage. The moving of the proposed property westwards takes it further away from 9 Linford Close and was seen as an improvement compared to the approved scheme.

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“Following initial concerns in respect of the turning facilities to be provided at the site the applicant subsequently provided additional plans clarifying the areas for parking and turning within the site.

The Highway Authority would wish to see these areas conditioned to remain together with the gates set back at least 6 metres from the edge of the carriageway in Fernhill Lane and open inwards so that cars may stop clear of the road when entering and leaving the site in a forward gear.

The provision of cycle parking facilities should also be conditioned.”

Item (3m) - 25 Sea Road, Milford on Sea (Application 16/11022)

Further comments have been received from Milford on Sea Parish Council in respect of the amended plans, they maintain their recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons already set out in the report and also raise concerns about loss of light to neighbouring properties.

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“Although the access to the south of the site is referred to as an existing one this is not the case as there are no dropped kerbs here and the field gate on the site boundary was introduced only very recently. The introduction of this new vehicular access which would serve the dwelling to the south would be acceptable to the Highway Authority as it is similar to many others in the vicinity and records show no injury accidents within the last 5 years.

The applicant would however need to apply for a license agreement with the Highway Authority for the formation of this access.

The existing vehicular access to the north currently already serves 2 dwellings and would not be modified as part of the proposals.

Parking would be provided in accordance with the SPD for both dwellings and the Highway Authority would wish to see these areas conditioned to remain together with the provision of cycle parking facilities.”

Item 3(n) - Land of 24 North Poulner Road, Ringwood (Application 16/11025)

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“Following initial concerns in respect of the amount of on-site car parking to be provided at the site the applicant subsequently provided additional plans clarifying the areas for parking of vehicles within the site together with clarification as to the continued use of the attached garage to the host dwelling.

The Highway Authority is satisfied that parking would be provided in accordance with the SPD for both dwellings and the Highway Authority would wish to see these areas conditioned to remain including any spaces within garages together with the provision of cycle parking facilities.”

Item 3 (o) - Home Bakery Cottage, Lower Daggons Lane, South End, Damerham (Application 16/11047)

Application withdrawn by the applicants by e-mail dated 10 October 2016.

Item 3(p) - 39 Salisbury Road, Totton (Application 16/11048)

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“The application provides for a total of 9 spaces for the parking of cars within the site, although this is lower than that recommended within the SPD the Highway Authority would not wish to raise an objection on the grounds of insufficient parking given the location of the site which is close to good public transport links and public car parking facilities. This is consistent with the Highway Authority’s response to the previous application at the site ref 12/98500.

The vehicular access is onto a private drive which also serves the public car park, the applicant would therefore need to satisfy themselves that the necessary rights exist to permit both pedestrian and vehicular access to be achieved.

The Highway Authority would wish to see the area of parking of vehicles conditioned to remain together with the provision of the cycle parking facilities.”

Item 3(q) - Land of Harts Farm House, 327 Everton Road, Everton, Hordle (Application 16/11063)

The reason for refusal is revised to read as follows:

By reason of its openness, greenery, trees and views onto the neighbouring historic barns, the application site acts as an important buffer between the Listed Building, known as Harts Farm House, and the surrounding suburban development. It is considered that the proposed development and severance of the plot would be at odds with the historic use of the site and would unacceptably erode and reduce the size and distinctive quality of the curtilage of the listed building. Moreover, by virtue of its siting, scale, footprint and domestic design, the proposed dwelling would be over dominant and out of keeping with the immediate buildings, including the historic barn that would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Listed Building. For this reason the proposed development would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside the National Park and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Document.

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“The application is for the erection of a new dwelling within the grounds of the host property vehicular access would be via the existing access onto Everton road which would be widened to allow 2 cars to pass clear of the highway.

Parking would be provided in accordance with the SPD.

The Highway Authority had initial concerns as to the lack of turning facilities for a fire appliance within the site as the new dwelling was to be located greater than the recommended distance from highway for fire brigade access.

It is however now understood that the applicant has proposed that a suitable sprinkler system would be installed which subject to building regulations approval would overcome any objections the Highway Authority might have in respect of this.

The Highway Authority would wish to see the arrangements for the parking and turning of cars conditioned to remain together with the provision of a suitable bin storage facility located in close proximity to the highway boundary.”

Item 3(r) - Chuckles Day Nursery, 2 Northlands Road, Totton (Application 16/11064)

The CIL figure set out in paragraph 12 and the table at the end of the assessment in the report has been reviewed following the provision of further evidence in relation to the vacancy test. It is now considered that no CIL would be payable.

Item (bb) - Site of Stocklands, Calmore Drive, Calmore, Totton (Application 16/11130)

The applicant has provided the Local Planning Authority with an Arboricultural Method Statement, which the Tree Officer advises is acceptable in addressing the initial concerns raised. The Tree Officer therefore has no objection to the application subject to a condition. The following additional condition is suggested:-

14. The trees/hedges on the site which are shown to be retained on the approved plans shall be protected during all site clearance, demolition and building works in accordance with the measures set out in the submitted arboricultural statement (Ref: SPHG/PJ/AMS-01/30/10 dated 5th October 2016) or alternatively in accordance with an arboricultural method statement that is approved as part of a subsequent reserved matters application.”

Reason: To safeguard trees and natural features which are important to the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National; Park.

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“The proposals are for outline permission with details of access only to be considered. The existing access onto Calmore Drive would be used to provide vehicular access onto the highway, this access which currently serves the existing child care facility (which would remain), would be considered adequate to provide access to the additional proposed level of development of 20 dwellings.”

Item 3(cc) - The Colt House, Cottagers Lane, Hordle (Application 16/11134)

Further correspondence, including photographs, has been submitted by the occupant of Hazelford raising more detailed concerns about loss of light/sunlight.

The Highway Engineer has commented further as follows:

“The application is for the erection of 2 new dwellings within the grounds of the single host property which would be demolished, vehicular access to plot 1 would be via the existing access onto Cottagers Lane and a new access would be formed onto the highway for plot 2. Parking would be provided in accordance with the SPD for both dwellings together with facilities for the turning of vehicles within the site, the Highway Authority would wish to see these facilities conditioned to remain together with suitable arrangements for cycle parking for both dwellings.”

Item (dd) - Pond 1, East Road, Marchwood Industrial Park, Marchwood (Application 16/11098)

Condition 5 needs to be amended to give the correct drawing reference number in part b) of the condition. The correct drawing reference is 962-LP-01-A.

Further questions have been asked of the applicant, these and the response are set out below:

1. When was the lease that allows access across the landscaping strip signed?

The extant lease on the eastern part of the plot known at L6, which grants a right of access across the strip of land to be landscaped, was signed in December 2014 by the previous owners of Marchwood Industrial Park. ABP, therefore, inherited the extant lease when they purchased the Industrial Park in June 2015. Through these current applications ABP are, therefore, seeking to regularise a situation that will enable economic development to be brought forward on other parts of the site in accordance with the permissions that have been granted.

For the avoidance of doubt, ABP remain committed to implementing the outstanding strip of landscaping in accordance with the details approved. The lease is due to expire in 2020, at which

time, if not before, ABP will implement the remaining landscaping and rearrange the access to the adjacent parts of the site to avoid any future conflict with the landscape strip and its ongoing management.

2. Is there any scope to complete some of the landscape strip now, specifically the eastern portion?

Whilst it might be possible to implement a small proportion of the outstanding landscape strip at the eastern most end (tens of metres only), this small area is effectively landlocked by the site boundary, the landscaping that has already been implemented and the area covered by the extant lease and the access into that leased land. However, as set out in our letter dated 9th September 2016, the outstanding strip of landscaping is—in its entirety – a minor element of the overall landscape proposals (91.5% of which has already been implemented) and, for the reasons explained in our letter, is considered to be of limited planning benefit. In ABP's view, trying to implement a small proportion of this landscaping— even if it were achievable – is not, therefore, necessary to make the proposal before the Council acceptable.

Item (ee) - Pond 1, East Road, Marchwood Industrial Park, Marchwood (Application 16/11099)

Condition 4 needs to be amended to give the correct drawing reference number in part b) of the condition. The correct drawing reference is 962-LP-01-A.

Further questions have been asked of the applicant, these and the response are set out below:

1. When was the lease that allows access across the landscaping strip signed?

The extant lease on the eastern part of the plot known at L6, which grants a right of access across the strip of land to be landscaped, was signed in December 2014 by the previous owners of Marchwood Industrial Park. ABP, therefore, inherited the extant lease when they purchased the Industrial Park in June 2015. Through these current applications ABP are, therefore, seeking to regularise a situation that will enable economic development to be brought forward on other parts of the site in accordance with the permissions that have been granted.

For the avoidance of doubt, ABP remain committed to implementing the outstanding strip of landscaping in accordance with the details approved. The lease is due to expire in 2020, at which time, if not before, ABP will implement the remaining landscaping and rearrange the access to the adjacent parts of the site to avoid any future conflict with the landscape strip and its ongoing management.

2. Is there any scope to complete some of the landscape strip now, specifically the eastern portion?

Whilst it might be possible to implement a small proportion of the outstanding landscape strip at the eastern most end (tens of metres only), this small area is effectively landlocked by the site boundary, the landscaping that has already been implemented and the area covered by the extant lease and the access into that leased land. However, as set out in our letter dated 9th September 2016, the outstanding strip of landscaping is—in its entirety – a minor element of the overall landscape proposals (91.5% of which has already been implemented) and, for the reasons explained in our letter, is considered to be of limited planning benefit. In ABP's view, trying to implement a small proportion of this landscaping— even if it were achievable – is not, therefore, necessary to make the proposal before the Council acceptable.