

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 14 AUGUST 2019**

**UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE**

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

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 14 AUGUST 2019

### COMMITTEE UPDATES

#### Item 3 (a) - 1-3 Provost Street Fordingbridge (Application No. 19/10539)

One letter of support has been received from the owner of No. 1 Provost Street stating that the town needs more families to be able to walk in to the town to “keep the town alive and stop more shops going broke”. Asks that there is no further delay to this modest scheme for 8 dwellings.

#### Item 3 (b) – 41 High Ridge Crescent, Ashley, New Milton (Application 19/10618)

Further letter received from Ms Sherree Harris reiterating her concerns with the proposal and impact it would have on the amenities of 43 High Ridge Crescent, and the wider street scene. Also mentions the parking concerns as already stated in original objection.

#### Item 3 (c) - Club House, New Forest Water Park, Ringwood Road, Fordingbridge (Application 18/11690)

##### Page 26

Top of page paragraph should read at line 3

.....this proposal could not ever be seen to add to that cumulative effect.....

##### Page 26

Revised version correcting typos in the report

Amended plans now submitted which show the following changes to the earlier plans

- Proposed Kitchen/family room now shown as kitchen/meeting room
- Proposed Bedroom 4 now shown as office
- Proposed residential store/garage now shown as store
- As existing plan also changed to show lounge now as lounge/meeting room, bedroom 2 now as an office, and hall now shown as office

## 10. REPRESENTATIONS

Revised version correcting typos in printed report

One letter has been received from a planning consultant acting on behalf of the applicant who makes the following points in summary –

1. Emphasises the importance of the site as a recreational venue
2. Considers there was a need for a clubhouse and other facilities to support the use
3. Approved plans showed living accommodation followed by another permission for an extension to that accommodation
4. Manager accommodation is not a separate dwelling so Policy DM 20 is not relevant
5. Site as a whole is a single planning unit with a S106 agreement restricting the residential accommodation element. Envisaged that accommodation would be for manager and his family.
6. Confirms that children have now grown up and are paid managers in their own right
7. Extended family wish to stay together under one roof and need more space but purpose of building will remain the same.
8. Two planning issues are impact of building and if it complies with local policy.
9. Considers design is acceptable and blends well with existing building

10. Site is in the countryside and is a tourist facility with policy DM13 on tourism and visitor facilities more relevant. Requires development to be appropriate in design and scale and in keeping with the rural character with no significant harmful impacts. Considers proposal complies with this policy.
11. Also considers that development complies with policy CS3 and CS2.
12. Report refers to flat above garage which is incorrect.
13. Floorplans are not considered to be inaccurate as stated. Accommodation has a degree of being interchangeable with other functions of the building.
14. Using DM20 is the wrong approach. No original size to accommodation and this was never intended. DM20 is used to control the size of dwellings in the countryside as part of a housing stock.
15. Considers the extension does not need to be justified as stated.
16. No impact on wider landscape is acknowledged Only impact is on applicant's view of the site.
17. Building is for accommodation for a recreational use with no impact on the public.

Further email received from applicant's planning consultant dated 12 August 2019 which has been sent direct to Members in support of the application.

**Para 11.2.9**

Should read at last sentence

He states through his planning consultant that this is incorrect but he does not specifically confirm what the building is used for.

**Item 3(d) - 3-7 Water Lane, Totton (Application 19/10545)**

**9. CONSULTEE COMMENTS**

Totton Town Council

This application was previously recommended for refusal by the Town Council, primarily for the poor amenity space and quality of the flats provided. While the amended application has improved and enlarged a number of the windows while also adding additional windows, it is not felt that this is nearly enough to alter the overall quality attained by the dwellings. It is believed that a reduction in the number of units is required so that the outlook of the flats can be though (*sic*) multiple aspects and the size and amenity space provided can be more significant.

RECOMMENDATION REFUSAL

Hampshire County Council Highway Engineer

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application.

The provision of the Juliet balconies does not alter the Highway Authority's previous recommendation on this proposal of no objection confirmed in my letter dated 15 May 2019.

NFDC Environmental Health (Pollution)

Thank you for re-consulting Environmental Health (Pollution) in relation to this application- I have no further comments to make.

**10. REPRESENTATIONS**

No public comments received to the amended plans re-consultation.

**Item 3 (f) – Arrachar, Fox Pond Lane, Lymington (Application No. 19/10437)**

A neighbour has written to Members setting out concerns about the scheme.

Ms Heidi Ashworth, homeowner response: Variation of condition 2 of 17/10532  
**ARRACHAR, FOX POND LANE, PENNINGTON, LYMINGTON SO41 8FW**

I believe that my application should be granted for the following reasons:

1. **This application was the result of a collaborative effort by NFDC and a Planning Consultant incorporating advice from two Government Planning Inspectors. Neighbour concerns were addressed and it conformed fully to planning policy**
  2. **The application was previously dismissed at appeal based on only two items but the Inspector was clear that he had no other concerns regarding the rest of this application.** NFDC Case Officer Report to this Committee (Item 14) and Consultant's Report demonstrates that the two items of concern to the Inspector were fully addressed in this application and any further concerns by Members could be easily addressed by a simple condition.
  3. **Parish Counsellors were presented with emotive representations from neighbours mixing up previous applications with a focus on repeating objections that Inspectors had acknowledged and not raised concerns with. Consequently Parish Council recommended refusal on two points that had already been addressed in the revised application.** Despite Case Officer recommendation for approval, refusal was given on two points – overlooking and ancillary use of outbuilding – but the Inspector's comments on overlooking were restricted to one velux only and the necessary change had already been incorporated into the revised application. Similarly ancillary use was already in place for the outbuilding so Parish refusal was unexpected.
1. Neighbour objections repeated but already commented on as having raised no concern by NFDC and Inspectors at Appeal: **high level velux's, use of cedar cladding, ancillary use of approved outbuilding, loft areas, overlooking from first floor extension and size of dormer glazing.** This shows a lack of understanding of process from Neighbours and makes it difficult to move forward. This continues to cause confusion.
  2. **I believe neighbours presented information at both Parish meetings in a way to promote hostility to my house build** and create a sense of outrage, portraying me as a vandal and ruthless property developer. False and inappropriate statements were made (evidence available). These have subsequently been redacted or disproved in writing to NFDC but not until after the Parish meetings where they had the desired effect. The Inspectorate saw the comments but was thankfully able to focus on the relevant planning law. I imagine it was almost impossible for Parish counsellors to make considered judgements in such a short amount of time faced with such a barrage of emotive and damning representations, irrespective of their truthfulness or accuracy.
  3. **Neighbour Greenways have further contested my Planning Consultant's Report online.** This confusing response has no merit and yet again cross references incorrect applications with no logical argument. In fact it demonstrates perfectly the lack of understanding of the planning process according to my Consultant and NFDC. This is indicative of the type of reporting that caused confusion at the Parish Meetings.

**I hope the Committee will support the NFDC recommendation for approval and judge this application on the basis that despite the history of the site, and it's rocky journey, my new team has worked hard with NFDC to ensure full compliance in accordance with Inspector comments and the evidence supports this.**

**Reason for variations to original build:** I live alone with my two children and we designed the house for our specific needs as a family. The reasons for variations to the original build plan were due to a significant change in our personal circumstances and not some initial Machiavellian master plan on my part as has unkindly and irrationally been suggested online and presented to Parish Meetings. This also accounts for my taking a back seat on the build and supervision of planning matters. I placed my trust in a team. The application process and timings could have been handled better and multiple mistakes were made resulting in the number of applications for the project. **This upset the neighbours and I am sorry for this, but when I invited the Chief Planning Officer and Enforcement Team to my home and NFDC explained the mistakes to me, I brought in a Planning Consultant and new team to address any outstanding issues and this has resulted in the collaborative effort with NFDC that has brought about this revised application.**

**Efforts undertaken to address neighbour comments:** As Members are aware, immediate neighbour objections are common because change is often unwelcome. Despite comments to the contrary I have consulted and taken comments on board from neighbours from the outset eg. I adjusted the ridge height lower and set back from the building line despite pre-app advice suggesting I could have matched ridge height and built further forward with more impact. Some neighbours wanted render, some brick, some plastic weatherboard. Some didn't like the high fence and gate so I paid to adjust plans to make it smaller, and have subsequently just left without a fence at all as the hedgerow I planted to make it even more rural has grown sufficiently. I have planted five mature trees at 4m to fully obscure my property from rear properties with the rear neighbour providing input on type of trees, I have landscaped to provide further privacy to Bay Tree and Greenways.

**The project is supported by many more neighbours than those objecting:** Many neighbours on the Lane and surrounding roads have been supportive and complimentary about the design. They are keen for the building to be clad in the natural cedar cladding and finished from the street view. I think everyone is sick of looking at an unfinished building after all this time. Both Inspectors commented positively on the appropriateness and extent of the cladding as a suitable material in accordance with planning policy. The process has been exhausting and I would welcome the opportunity to finish the project to everyone's benefit.

**Current neighbour objections:**

- 1. Ancillary outbuilding** - Objections were presented on what my intentions might be in the future eg a sink in the outbuilding for tea and coffee making was provided as a reason for refusal at Parish level. A sink is fully allowed in an ancillary building. **A shower, sink and toilet were not new additions as per Greenways objection, but present in the very first approved plan.** A closer look will show that my design is purely for use as a family home with large glazing making outbuilding interiors clearly visible from the main house and vice versa. It was designed to see my children and for them to see me when they are in the outbuildings and not suitable at all for use by anyone other than a family member. The new outbuilding replaced an existing similar sized outbuilding that was positioned in a far more discrete and favourable location if one were to consider self-contained accommodation. Large ancillary outbuildings are common on the Lane and surrounding roads.

2. **Overlooking to Bay Tree Cottage** - The inspector had one concern only - from the velux in the first floor extension over utility. This was rectified immediately and obscured. No concern was raised relating to the large rear triangle glazing in this room. What has not been recognised is that this large glazing has now been replaced in this application by a very small escape window with a limited oblique view. My existing rear bedroom window offers an uninterrupted view of the whole of Bay Tree Cottage garden. I am equally overlooked by Bay Tree Cottage and Greenways from their rear windows as is the nature of houses in such close proximity.
3. **Overlooking to Greenways** who are suggesting their dining patio is overlooked from my Dormer. From the outset and at the latest inspections we were unable to see any such patio, the view being limited to the bottom half of their garden, so their comment is perplexing. The comment that the Dormer protrudes 30cm more than the original plan is valid but it remains set back from their rear building line. The larger glazing has no impact whatsoever compared to the original approved plan – and the Inspector commented on this in his report.

**Item 3(g) – Parsonage House, Green Lane, Fordingbridge (Application 19/10300)**

Correction to para 11.6 line 7 consultation should read construction  
The applicant has circulated comments in support of his applications direct to the councillors

**Item 3(h) – Parsonage House, Green Lane, Fordingbridge (Application 19/10301)**

11.2 incorrect: 19/10300 is recommended for refusal and forms subject of a separate committee item  
Above 11.11 the heading: ' impact on the character and appearance of the Fordingbridge Conservation Area' should be omitted.  
Unnumbered para after 11.11 is irrelevant so can be disregarded  
The applicant has circulated comments in support of his applications direct to the councillors

**Item 3(i) – Parsonage House, Green Lane, Fordingbridge (Application 19/10339)**

11.12 states it would create an additional bedroom, but there are currently 6 bedrooms and this proposal would enlarge an existing small bedroom  
The applicant has circulated comments in support of his applications direct to the councillors

**Item 3(j) – Parsonage House, Green Lane, Fordingbridge (Application 19/10340)**

11.11 states it would create an additional bedroom, but there are currently 6 bedrooms and this proposal would enlarge an existing small bedroom  
The applicant has circulated comments in support of his applications direct to the councillors

This page is intentionally left blank