

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 8  
NOVEMBER 2017**

**UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE**

**6. COMMITTEE UPDATES (Pages 1 - 4)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 8 NOVEMBER 2017

### COMMITTEE UPDATES

#### **Item 3(a) Land of 99 Wainsford Road, Pennington, Lymington (Application 17/10906)**

As stated in the report, the previous plant nursery use of the site ceased several years ago and only a few modest structures associated with the use remain. Given the length of time (possibly in excess of 30 years) since the nursery use was operational, and the pressure that there is to provide housing in the District, it is considered that an argument against the proposal based on the loss of employment land would be very difficult to sustain.

The current planning application (for a small part of the access to this site) which has been lodged with the New Forest National Park Authority, referred to in paragraph 6.2 of the report, remains to be determined. The Case Officer at the National Park Authority has written in relation to their current application stating that they are not in a position to indicate its likely decision as the consultation period still remains open. However, they have commented that the mitigation measures proposed are supported, subject to them being secured through any planning permission that may be issued.

Hampshire County Council Countryside Access Development Officer has confirmed that he has no objection to the application subject to the imposition of condition No. 14 included in the recommendation.

The comments of Hampshire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority have not been received. As a result the recommendation at Section 15 of the report is revised to include the need to take in to consideration the comments of the Lead Local Flood Authority and to include any further conditions that may be required.

#### **Item 3 (b) - 38-40 Christchurch Road, Ringwood (Application 17/10937)**

Due to an oversight, the report needs updating to include two further documents under the heading "Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents" which you will find under paragraph 2 of the report. Those documents are :

The Ringwood Conservation Area Appraisal, and  
The Shop Front Design Guide

Additional comments have been received from Ringwood Town Council, who are unfortunately unable to attend:

"The above Application will come before you on Wednesday. The photo attached ("Fish and Chips") is of the new shop front fascia sign for which your Officers claim does not need planning permission, in spite of being - in their words - constructed of "materials and style which would appear inappropriate within a Conservation Area".

In contrast, two shop front facias 150 yards away along the same Road are shown attached ("Connells" and "Koh" respectively). Both these signs were required by Officers to be of traditional materials and of suitable dimensions before they were given planning permission. (See 15/11304 and 15/10356).

In these latter two cases, your own Shop Front Design Guide SPG was used for explaining the criteria of acceptable design. In the case before you, the Design Guide is not even referred to, even though the Officers admit the design is inappropriate.

We ask you to consider not only the inconsistent approach adopted, but the harm (and precedent set) to the Conservation Area by allowing the clearly unsuitable signage of the Fish and Chip shop.”







**Item 3(c) - Rowlands, Farmers Walk, Everton, Hordle (Application 17/11103)**

One further letter has been received raising concerns about the CIL form that was originally submitted, that the floorspace of the proposed dwelling would be four times the size of the original bungalow and that the vegetation around the rear garden was removed before the application was submitted.

The figures in the CIL Summary Table are not correct and should read as follows: the existing floor space should read 60.66, the net floor space 184.78 and therefore the total CIL is £16,260.64. NB: The existing floorspace figure does not include a car port that has already been demolished.

**Item 3(e) - 5 Ditchbury, Lymington (Application 17/11183)**

Two letters of objection have been received raising concerns about the fence looking out of character and the loss of public land.