

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 10 JULY 2019**

**UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE**

**5. COMMITTEE UPDATES (Pages 1 - 2)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10 JULY 2019

### COMMITTEE UPDATES

#### **Item 3 (a) – Ringwood Social Club, 19 West Street, Ringwood (Application 19/10223)**

The applicant has submitted further information regarding implemented works on site, as follows:

- Drainage works were commenced in order to preserve the planning consent.
- It has not been possible to undertake any significant further work. The two conditions – 22 and 28 are directly linked to work ceasing; Ringwood Social Club need to discharge these conditions relating to land in their ownership and at present the applicant cannot get a loan because the scheme cannot be built out, which is dependent on the actions of another party.

The following amendments are proposed to the report:

- End of para 11.12 add 'control measures'.
- Section 13 – Equality – points 6. 7. And 8. To read 1. 2. And 3.

#### **Item 3 (b) – Flanders Farm, Silver Street, Sway, Hordle (Application 19/10378)**

Environmental Health comments: No objection in principle to the proposal but I would ask for conditions relating to the following to be attached to any consent granted:

- No works shall commence until a dust management plan has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall contain measures to suppress and reduce dust emissions during demolition and construction to a minimum.
- No horses shall be brought onto site until details of how stable waste is to be handled, stored and removed from site, have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority.
- Note- It may be necessary to move the location of the muck pit from the location shown to a location more remote from neighbouring properties.

Reason- To protect the amenity of the neighbourhood.

#### **Item 3 (d) – 7 Hursley Drive, Langley, Fawley (Application 19/10500)**

Letter of support from applicant's agent submitted (on website):

- Existing neighbours window overlooks No 7 to a greater extent than that proposed
- Nearest point to boundary is 4.5m, existing neighbours window approx. 2.2m from boundary
- Proposed window position will not make a dramatic difference
- Do not overly impact on neighbours privacy who have not commented or objected
- Provide photo and block plan

### **Item 3 (e) – 21 The Fallows, Ashley, New Milton (Application 19/10584)**

Extra comment from applicant (on website):

1. Timing of report availability
2. There are no neighbour amenity issues - Para 11.1 contradicts 11.21
3. Extension beyond ridge of garage is no greater than one brick – this is not stipulated in the report
4. 2 reasons for proposals -
  - a. replicates other designs in The Fallows – in keeping with other properties
  - b. Represents good building practice as prevents water penetration
5. Para 11.19 explanation of why cannot reduce floorspace. Size dictated by design of neighbouring properties. No re-configuration of first floor would allow for 4 bedrooms. This would only result if pre app advice adhered to which would result in the design of the property being out of keeping in the area.

Correction to Para 11.1- Line 2 amend 500mm to 600 mm

### **Item 3 (f) - Land rear of the White Horse, Keyhaven Road, Milford-on-Sea (Application 18/11614)**

- At the last paragraph of Section 9.2, the last sentence is an error and should be deleted.
- Updated comments on the revised plans from Parish Council: The Parish Council considers this a poor design that does not meet the needs either of the existing residents or the new residents. The access through Grebe Close is very tight, with no pavements and single carriageway in places. Currently refuse lorries cannot regularly access the properties due to parked cars. There is a dispute over the ownership of the fence bordering 37 Grebe Close which will affect visibility for cars leaving the new development and would be potentially dangerous. The Parish Council regrets that this site could not be looked at in conjunction with the developer's neighbouring site at 2-4 Keyhaven Road, with access made available through there. This scheme makes no provision for affordable housing which the village desperately needs and which, if the two schemes had been considered together, could have been provided. It is a missed opportunity as well as unneighbourly overdevelopment of the site.
- 5 letter of objections, including a petition with 20 signatures which state that the revised plans do not address their concerns previously raised.