

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE –
WEDNESDAY, 14 JUNE 2017**

UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE

5. COMMITTEE UPDATES (Pages 1 - 4)

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 14 JUNE 2017

UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE

Item 3(a) - 144 Northfield Road, Ringwood (Application 15/11069)

The Highways Engineer maintains no objection to the application and has commented further as follows:

“Following initial concerns regarding the parking and turning arrangements the applicant provided further plans indicating the current parking layout at the site.

Although these plans indicate that 5 on site spaces are provided to the north of the driveway these spaces are not formally laid out and it is apparent that the space available would only accommodate 4 cars, thus any remaining vehicles wishing to park within the site would be forced to park within the area to the south for the turning of vehicles.

The Highway Authority visited the site in June last year when the current parking arrangements had already been implemented, at which time it was observed that between 4 and 6 cars were parked within the site. It was noted that from time to time the arrangement resulted in vehicles reversing out onto and turning within the shared verge crossing to the east, however it was determined that these vehicular movements could not be considered to result in a severe impact on the operation or safety of the local highway network and with due regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Document any recommendation for refusal on this basis would be unlikely to be sustained on appeal.

The Highway Authority is however conscious of local concerns regarding the current operation of the site and how this affects the use of the vehicular access. It is further noted that the plans submitted appear to show that sufficient space exists within the front garden of the property to accommodate additional vehicles whilst maintaining adequate facilities for the turning of vehicles within the curtilage of the site.

Therefore although the Highway Authority would not wish to raise any formal objections to the proposals the applicant should be encouraged to provide further space within the site for the parking and turning of vehicles in line with the above comments.

Also to minimise the demand for the car parking facilities provided and to encourage other modes of transport other than the motor car, the Highway Authority would wish to see cycle parking facilities provided at the site at least to the level recommended within the NFDC document 'Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)' adopted in October 2012.”

While the comments of the Highways Engineer in relation to the potential to provide additional parking spaces in the front garden are noted, your Officers are of the view that this would not be acceptable due to the adverse impact this would be likely to have on the visual amenities of the area. The front garden that remains provides a valuable green area on this corner plot which is important to retain.

Item 3(b) - Old Forge, Salisbury Road, Breamore (Application 16/10602)

Breamore Parish Council has written to confirm that they object most strongly to the application and that their previous comments still apply.

The applicant has written to Members of this Committee in support of the application, stating that the proposed use would be appropriate and bring this Listed Building back in to use.

In essence the recommendation to approve this application is felt to be justified on the basis that the holiday let use would have the benefit of bringing this Listed Building in to use, which would help to prevent further decline of the building. The fact that the building could be converted to residential use through the prior approval process were it not a Listed Building and in the Conservation Area also weighs in its favour. While the marketing exercise is not conclusive it is felt that the building has limited potential for other commercial uses and that the holiday let proposed would be acceptable in these circumstances.

Item 3(h)- Bus Station, High Street, Lymington (Application 17/10359)

Two further letters of objection have been received (one of which has been sent to Councillors) raising concerns already referred to in paragraph 10.1 of the report.

Item 3(j)- Fordingbridge Club, Roundhill, Fordingbridge (Application 17/10426)

Councillor Sevier has requested Committee consideration and comments that the Quakers of Fordingbridge have asked for assurances that the graves on the site will not be disturbed.

Fordingbridge Town Council has commented further, maintaining their support for the application, however concerns remain over insufficient parking provision; and the necessity of the pedestrian access should be clarified.

The Archaeologist has commented further in respect of the human remains that are likely to be present on the site. He has commented that in respect of granting planning permission human remains are a separate legislative issue which is dealt with by the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) and that a licence will be required before any work is started. This is a matter that must be resolved between the MOJ, the developer, the archaeological contractor and any contractors working on the site. This issue should not therefore hold up the determination of this planning application. The informative note no. 4 in the recommendation at the end of Section 15 of the report is to be revised as follows which covers this point:

Informative Note No. 4: The applicant is advised that the appropriate legislation must be followed in the event that human remains need to be removed from the site.

The Highway Engineer maintains no objection to the application and comments further as follows:

“The application is for the demolition of the existing social club totalling 640 square metres and the erection of 8 two bedroom dwellings together with a 21 square metre retail unit.

A total of 3 on site car parking spaces would be provided which would be accessed from the highway in Roundhill. The application contains no details of any cycle parking facilities to be provided in respect of the proposals.

The NFDC document 'Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)' adopted in October 2012, provides a recommended average provision of 2 spaces for each of the 8 proposed two -bed dwellings and 1 space for each 20 square metres of retail space. Applying these standards this would result in a total on site car parking requirement of 17 spaces. The proposals would therefore result in a shortfall of 14 spaces calculated in accordance with the SPD.

The site is located close to the centre of town with access to amenities and public transport links. Public off street car parking provision exists in close proximity to the site although this does not present a viable alternative to on site facilities as maximum time restrictions apply. On street parking is time regulated during the daytime and double yellow lines exist in the vicinity to prevent parking in areas where it is undesirable for safety reasons.

Given the above and the nature and scale of the proposals it is considered that in this instance the shortfall in off street parking provision will not result in any detrimental effect on users of the local highway network.

Having due regard to the location of the site, together with the fact that the parking SPD does not set minimum car parking standards, the Highway Authority consider that an objection based upon an under-provision of car parking would be neither appropriate nor sustainable.

In coming to this view the Highway Authority have had due regard to the written statement to Parliament dated March 2015 by the Department for Communities and Local Government which includes the following addition to paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework:

'Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network'.

In order to promote alternative modes of transport to the private car the applicant should be advised of the need to provide secure cycle parking, both long and short stay, at least to the minimum standards contained within the parking SPD.

The applicant should also be aware that the new access will include works within the highway and as such these works will be required to be undertaken in accordance with standards laid down by, and under a license agreement with, the Highway Authority."

Item 3(k) - St Barbe Museum and Art Gallery, New Street, Lymington (Application 17/10428)

The details of the proposed information sign referred to in paragraph 14.3 (iii) of the report are incorrect (the application was submitted with details of two alternatives). The sign would be the same size as the alternative but would be in the form of an acrylic sign comprising a standard Tourist Information sign, a list of the opening times and facilities icons. This has no impact on the assessment of the merits of the sign which remains that it is unacceptable for the reasons set out in paragraph 14.7 of the report.

This page is intentionally left blank