

12 OCTOBER 2016

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee held in the Council Chamber, Appletree Court, Lyndhurst on Wednesday, 12 October 2016

- * Cllr Mrs D E Andrews (Chairman)
- * Cllr Mrs C V Ward (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

- * P J Armstrong
- * Mrs S M Bennison
- * Mrs F Carpenter
- * A H G Davis
- * R L Frampton
- * L E Harris
- * D Harrison
- * Mrs A J Hoare
- Mrs M D Holding

Councillors:

- * J M Olliff-Cooper
- * A K Penson
- * W S Rippon-Swaine
- * Mrs A M Rostand
- * Miss A Sevier
- M H Thierry
- * R A Wappet
- * M L White
- Mrs P A Wyeth

*Present

Officers Attending:

C Elliott, S Clothier, Miss J Debnam, Mrs C Eyles, D Groom, Mrs A Wilson and for part of the morning aserssion Mrs V Baxter, T Barnett, J Bennett, Ms L Fawkes, R Natt, R Payne and I Rayner

Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllrs Holding and Wyeth.

18 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2016 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Bennison disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/11098 and 16/11099 as a member of Marchwood Parish Council which had commented on the applications.

Cllr Davis disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/11048, 16/11064 and 16/11130 as a member of Totton and Eling Town Council which had commented on the application.

Cllr Frampton disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/10956 as a member of Bransgore Parish Council which had commented on the application.

Cllr Harris disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/11048, 16/11064 and 16/11130 as a member of Totton and Eling Town Council which had commented on the applications.

Cllr Harrison disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 16/11064 on the grounds that his neighbour owned the property and he could therefore be perceived to be biased.

Cllr Hoare disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/11098 and 16/11099 as a member of Marchwood Parish Council which had commented on the application.

Cllr Olliff-Cooper disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 16/11115 on the grounds that he knew the applicant and the degree of acquaintance was sufficient that he could be perceived to be biased.

Cllr Penson disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/10282, 16/10130, 16/10451, 16/10452, 16/11176, 16/10943, 16/11090, 16/11091, 16/11106, 16/11107, 16/11114, 16/11115 and 16/11119 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the applications. He also disclosed a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of application 16/10764 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which was an adjacent land owner and would derive a financial benefit.

Cllr Rippon-Swaine disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 16/11025 as a member of Ringwood Town Council which had commented on the application. He also disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 16/11063 on the grounds that he knew the owner of the property.

Cllr Rostand disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/10282, 16/10130, 16/10451, 16/10452, 16/11176, 16/10943, 16/11090, 16/11091, 16/11106, 16/11107, 16/11114, 16/11115 and 16/11119 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. She also disclosed a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of application 16/10764 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which was an adjacent land owner and would derive a financial benefit in respect of application 16/10764.

Cllr White disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 16/10282, 16/10130, 16/10451, 16/10452, 16/11176, 16/10943, 16/11090, 16/11091, 16/11106, 16/11107, 16/11114, 16/11115 and 16/11119 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the applications. He disclosed a further interest in application 16/11119 on the grounds that he knew the applicant. He also disclosed a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of application 16/10764 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which was an adjacent land owner and would derive a financial benefit.

20 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR COMMITTEE DECISION

Applications 16/10130, 16/10282, 16/10451, 16/10452, 16/10869, 16/10943, 16/10956, 16/11022, 16/11064, 16/11085 and 16/11134 were determined after the adjournment for lunch.

Application 16/11047 had been withdrawn by the applicants.

-
- a 12 High Street, Lymington (Application 16/10282)**
- Details:** Application for the Modification or Discharge of a Section 106 Obligation in respect of Planning Permission 16/10282 for creation of 1 flat; partial demolition; extend shop; one and two storey rear extension; 1 pair semi-detached houses; landscaping
- Public Participants:** None
- Additional Representations:** None
- Comment:** Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.
- Decision:** That the Section 106 affordable housing obligation be discharged in full and that the Service Manager Planning and Building Control be authorised to vary the Section 106 Agreement accordingly.
-
- b 57/59 High Street, Milford-on-Sea (Application 16/10130)**
- Details:** Application for the Modification or Discharge of a Section 106 Obligation in respect of Planning Permission 16/10130 for Attached house to rear; pitched roofs to existing flat roof extension; window alterations to 57a
- Public Participants:** None
- Additional Representations:** None
- Comment:** None
- Decision:** That the Section 106 affordable housing obligation be discharged in full and that the Service Manager Planning and Building Control be authorised to vary the Section 106 Agreement accordingly.

c	51 High Street, Lymington (Application 16/10451)												
	<table> <tr> <td>Details:</td><td>Shopfront alterations</td></tr> <tr> <td>Public Participants:</td><td>None</td></tr> <tr> <td>Additional Representations:</td><td>Lymington and Pennington Town Council now recommended that consent be granted.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Comment:</td><td>Cllrs Penson and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr Rostand was not present for the determination of this application.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Decision:</td><td>Planning consent.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Conditions:</td><td>As per report (Item 3(c)).</td></tr> </table>	Details:	Shopfront alterations	Public Participants:	None	Additional Representations:	Lymington and Pennington Town Council now recommended that consent be granted.	Comment:	Cllrs Penson and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr Rostand was not present for the determination of this application.	Decision:	Planning consent.	Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(c)).
Details:	Shopfront alterations												
Public Participants:	None												
Additional Representations:	Lymington and Pennington Town Council now recommended that consent be granted.												
Comment:	Cllrs Penson and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr Rostand was not present for the determination of this application.												
Decision:	Planning consent.												
Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(c)).												

d	51 High Street, Lymington (Application 16/10452)												
	<table> <tr> <td>Details:</td><td>Display 2 wall-mounted signs; 1 vinyl door sign; 1 fascia sign</td></tr> <tr> <td>Public Participants:</td><td>None</td></tr> <tr> <td>Additional Representations:</td><td>None</td></tr> <tr> <td>Comment:</td><td>Cllrs Penson and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr Rostand was not present for the determination of this application.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Decision:</td><td>Advertisement consent.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Conditions:</td><td>As per report (Item 3(d)).</td></tr> </table>	Details:	Display 2 wall-mounted signs; 1 vinyl door sign; 1 fascia sign	Public Participants:	None	Additional Representations:	None	Comment:	Cllrs Penson and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr Rostand was not present for the determination of this application.	Decision:	Advertisement consent.	Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(d)).
Details:	Display 2 wall-mounted signs; 1 vinyl door sign; 1 fascia sign												
Public Participants:	None												
Additional Representations:	None												
Comment:	Cllrs Penson and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr Rostand was not present for the determination of this application.												
Decision:	Advertisement consent.												
Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(d)).												

e	Land at Buckland Manor Farm, Alexandra Road, Lymington (Application 16/10764)				
	<table> <tr> <td>Details:</td><td>Development of 87 dwellings comprised; 21 detached houses; 5 bungalows; 26 pairs of semi-detached houses; 3 terraces of 3 houses; garages; parking; landscaping; junction access; estate roads; footpaths, SANG; open space, 10 allotments</td></tr> <tr> <td>Public Participants:</td><td>Mr Hirsch – Applicant's Agent Mrs Vallence - Objector</td></tr> </table>	Details:	Development of 87 dwellings comprised; 21 detached houses; 5 bungalows; 26 pairs of semi-detached houses; 3 terraces of 3 houses; garages; parking; landscaping; junction access; estate roads; footpaths, SANG; open space, 10 allotments	Public Participants:	Mr Hirsch – Applicant's Agent Mrs Vallence - Objector
Details:	Development of 87 dwellings comprised; 21 detached houses; 5 bungalows; 26 pairs of semi-detached houses; 3 terraces of 3 houses; garages; parking; landscaping; junction access; estate roads; footpaths, SANG; open space, 10 allotments				
Public Participants:	Mr Hirsch – Applicant's Agent Mrs Vallence - Objector				

Additional Representations:	<p>The Urban Design Officer considered the design was acceptable subject to a condition to secure further details.</p> <p>The Highways Engineer had expanded on their comments.</p> <p>Natural England raised no objection.</p> <p>The applicant had submitted a further Heritage Statement.</p> <p>Further details of the additional representations were set out in the update published prior to the meeting.</p>
Comment:	<p>Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed disclosable pecuniary interests on the grounds that they were members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which owned an adjacent parcel of land and would benefit should planning consent be granted. They left the meeting for the consideration and voting.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was amended by revised wording for conditions 7 and 12, as circulated in the update prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The Committee noted the concerns of the objector regarding the landscaping on the eastern boundary of the site and concluded that the Service Manager Planning and Building Control should be authorised to amend the suggested conditions should that be necessary.</p>
Decision:	<p>Service Manager Planning and Building Control authorised to grant planning consent subject to the completion by 30 January 2017 of the requisite S106 agreement and with the imposition of conditions. If the Agreement has not been completed by that date, Service Manager Planning and Building Control authorised to refuse consent.</p>
Conditions/Agreements/Negotiations:	<p>As per report (Item 3(e)), as amended by the update circulated prior to the meeting and with such other amendments as the Service Manager Planning and Building Control deems appropriate.</p>
Refusal reasons:	<p>As per report (Item 3 (e))</p>

f	Land of 19 Hale Avenue, New Milton (Application 16/11144)
Details:	Detached house; associated parking
Public Participants:	Mr Elliott – Applicant's Agent Mrs Fisher - Objector
Additional Representations:	New Milton Town Council objected as the proposal would be contrary to the local distinctiveness SPD; set a precedent; they had highway concerns; and considered there would be overlooking and lack of amenity space for both existing and proposed dwellings. 1 additional letter of objection on the grounds of loss of wildlife and loss of view.
Comment:	None
Decision:	Refused
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(f)).

g	49 Old Milton Road, New Milton (Application 16/10869)
Details:	Use of first and second floor as 2 flats
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	None
Decision:	Planning consent.
Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(g)).

h	5 Bingham Drive, Lymington (Application 16/11176)
Details:	One pair of semi-detached houses; 2 detached houses; parking; landscaping, demolition of existing
Public Participants:	Mr Holmes – Applicant's Agent
Additional Representations:	The Highways Authority had expanded their comments, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.

Decision: Refused

Refusal Reasons: As per report (Item 3(h)).

- i 3 Filton Road, Lymington (Application 16/10943)**
- Details:** Two-storey and rear extension; single-storey rear extension; front porch; roof lights
- Public Participants:** None
- Additional Representations:** None
- Comment:** Cllrs Penson and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr Rostand was not present for the determination of this application.
- Decision:** Planning consent.
- Conditions:** As per report (Item 3(i)).

- j 4 Tucks Close, Bransgore (Application 16/10956)**
- Details:** Single-storey front, side and rear extensions; detached garage/store; use of existing garage as living accommodation
- Public Participants:** None
- Additional Representations:** None
- Comment:** Cllr Frampton disclosed a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Bransgore Parish Council which had commented on the application. He concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent him from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.
- Decision:** Refused
- Refusal Reasons:** As per report (Item 3(j)).

k	Land south of Gore Road, New Milton (Application 16/10994)
Details:	Development of 28 dwellings comprised, four pairs of link detached, semi-detached houses; 2 detached houses; one pair of semi-detached houses; two terraces of 3 houses; one terrace of 4 houses; garage block with flat over; one terrace of 4 houses; 3 garages and flat over; detached garages; carports; shed/cycle stores; roads; parking; landscaping; public open space
Public Participants:	Mr Holmes – Applicant's Agent
Additional Representations:	New Milton Town Cllr Reid expressed concerns about drainage. The Council's Land Drainage Section considered that surface water drainage had been given proper consideration and the proposals were sound. The Highways Engineer had expanded on their comments. Further details of these representations were set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	None
Decision:	Service Manager Planning and Building Control authorised to grant planning consent subject to the completion by 30 December 2016 of the requisite S106 Agreement, provided that no further substantive objections were received by the expiration of the consultation period on 13 October 2016. If the agreement was not been completed by that time, Service Manager Planning and Building Control authorised to refuse consent.
Conditions/Agreements/Negotiations:	As per report (Item 3(k)).
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item (3k))

l	Land adjacent to 10 Linford Close, New Milton (Application 16/11005)
Details:	Detached house
Public Participants:	Mr Legg - Applicant
Additional Representations:	1 further letter in support from the applicant. New Milton Town Cllr Short recommended planning consent. The Highways Engineer had expanded on their comments. Further details of these representations were set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Comment:	The Committee considered that the design of the proposed dwelling was acceptable and, in the light of existing overlooking of adjacent properties, the relationship with the proposed dwelling would not exacerbate the situation.
Decision:	Planning consent
Conditions:	Subject to such conditions as the Service Manager Planning and Building Control deems appropriate.

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

Details:	1 detached house; 1 detached chalet bungalow; detached single garage; associated parking; landscaping; decking; demolition of existing
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	Milford on Sea Parish Council maintained their objection to the proposal. The Highways Engineer had expanded on their comments. Further details of the representations were set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	Mr Groom, Service Manager Planning and Building Control, disclosed an interest on the grounds that the applicant was a friend of long standing. He left the meeting for the consideration and voting.
Decision:	Refused
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(m)).

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

Details:	House; access alterations; parking
Public Participants:	Mr Cain – Applicant's Agent
Additional Representations:	The Highways Engineer had expanded on their comments as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	Cllr Rippon-Swaine disclosed a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Ringwood Town Council which had commented on the application. He concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent him from remaining in the meeting to speak and to

vote.

Decision: Planning consent.

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(n)).

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

Details: Two-storey and single-storey rear extensions; front porch; detached double garage

This application was withdrawn by the applicants by e-mail dated 10 October 2016.

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

Details: Block of 10 flats; cycle store; landscaping; parking; access

Public Participants: Mr Ward - Applicant's Agent

Additional Representations: The Highways Engineer had expanded their comments, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Comment: Cllrs Davis and Harris disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Totton and Eling Town Council which had commented on the application. As they had taken part in the debate on those views they considered that there was a danger of the perception that they had a pre-determined view and consequently took no part in the consideration. They requested that their abstention from voting was recorded.

Decision: Refused

Refusal Reasons: As per report (Item 3(p)).

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

Details: House; detached garage; pergola; parking; landscaping

Public Participants: Mr Bottomley - Applicant

Additional Representations: The Highways Engineer had expanded on their comments as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Comment: Cllr Rippon-Swaine disclosed a non-pecuniary interest on the grounds that he knew the owner of the property. He concluded that there was a

danger that there could be a perception that he was biased and took no part in the consideration and did not vote.

The reason for refusal had been amended as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Decision: Refused

Refusal Reasons: 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.

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

Details: Use as residential dwelling

Public Participants: None

Additional Representations: None

Comment: Cllr Harrison disclosed a non-pecuniary interest on the grounds that his neighbour owned the property. He concluded that there was a danger of perception of bias and left the meeting for the consideration and voting.

Cllrs Davis and Harris disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Totton and Eling Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them

from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.

The Committee was advised that the CIL liability had been reviewed and no CIL payment was due.

Decision: Planning consent.

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(r)).

s Land of Little Orchard, 28 Compton Road, New Milton (Application 16/11085)

Details: House; alterations to existing dwelling; access alterations

Public Participants: None

Additional Representations: None

Comment: None

Decision: Planning consent.

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(s)).

t 43 Southampton Road, Lymington (Application 16/11090)

Details: Repainting of exterior, boundary railing; shed (demolition of existing); replacement timber windows at front

Public Participants: None

Additional Representations: None

Comment: Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.

Decision: Refused

Refusal Reasons: As per report (Item 3(t)).

u	43 Southampton Road, Lymington (Application 16/11091)
Details:	Repainting of exterior; boundary railing; shed (demolition of existing); replacement timber windows at front
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.
Decision:	Listed Building Consent Refused
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(u)).

v	Land rear of 4 Kennard Road, New Milton (Application 16/11028)
Details:	Detached bungalow; parking; landscaping
Public Participants:	Mr Whild – Applicant's Agent Mr Stone - Objector
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	None
Decision:	Refused
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(v)).

w	8 Brackens Way, Lymington (Application 16/11106)
Details:	Removal of Condition 3 of Planning Permission 09/93569 to allow clear glazing to the first floor east elevation
Public Participants:	Mrs Tremain - Objector
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.

Decision: Planning consent.

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(w)).

x **3 Kingsfield, Lymington (Application 16/11107)**

Details: Single-storey extension; two-storey extension; lantern rooflight; fenestration alterations

Public Participants: Mr Kavanagh – Applicant
Mr Davies – Applicant's Agent
Mr Pettit – Objector
Mr Adams - Objector

Additional Representations: None

Comment: Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.

Decision: Refused

Refusal Reasons: As per report (Item 3(x)).

y **Copper Beech, Fox Pond Lane, Pennington, Lymington (Application 16/11114)**

Details: Single-storey rear extension; first-floor rear extension

Public Participants: Mr Russell - Applicant

Additional Representations: None

Comment: Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.

Decision: Planning consent.

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(y)).

z	44-46 High Street, Lymington (Application 16/11115)
Details:	Illumination to shop sign
Public Participants:	Mr Welker – Applicant’s representative
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	<p>Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.</p> <p>Cllr Olliff-Cooper disclosed a non-pecuniary interest on the grounds that he knew the applicants. He concluded that the degree of acquaintance was sufficient to create an impression of bias and took no part in the consideration and did not vote.</p> <p>The Committee concluded that the lighting in place was very discrete and minimally visible in the context of existing lighting in the vicinity and on a building of this scale. In view of the previous consent for illuminated signage on this building they concluded that this proposal was acceptable.</p>
Decision:	Advertisement consent
Conditions:	Such conditions as the Service Manager Planning and Building Control deems appropriate.

aa	14 Solent Avenue, Lymington (Application 16/11119)
Details:	Single-storey rear extension; fenestration alterations; cladding
Public Participants:	Miss Skeete – Applicant’s Agent
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	<p>Cllrs Penson, Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. Cllrs Rostand and Penson concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr White disclosed a further</p>

interest on the grounds that he knew the applicants and concluded that the degree of acquaintance was sufficient to create and impression of bias. He took no part in the consideration and did not vote.

Decision: Planning consent.

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(aa)).

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

Details: Development of 20 dwellings; access; parking; landscaping and open space

Public Participants: None

Additional Representations: The Tree Officer requested the imposition of an additional condition following receipt of an Arboricultural Method Statement. The Highways Engineer expanded on their comments. Further details were set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Comment: Cllrs Davis and Harris disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Totton and Eling Town Council which had commented on the application. As they had taken part in the debate on those views they considered that there was a danger there was a danger they could be perceived to have a pre-determined view and consequently took no part in the consideration. They requested that it be recorded that they did not vote. The Officers recommendation was amended by the addition of condition 14, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Decision: Service Manager Planning and Building Control authorised to grant Planning consent subject to the completion by 31 December 2016 of the requisite S106 Agreement

Conditions/Agreements/Negotiations: As per report (Item 3(bb)), with the addition of condition 14 as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

cc	The Colt House, Cottagers Lane, Hordle (Application 16/11134)
Details:	1 pair of semi-detached houses; 2 detached garages; parking; access; landscaping; demolition of existing
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	1 additional letter of objection from a neighbour on the grounds of loss of light/daylight. The Highways Engineer had expanded on their comments. Further details of these representations were set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	None
Decision:	Planning consent.
Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(cc)).

dd	Pond 1, East Road, Marchwood Industrial Park, Marchwood (Application 16/11098)
Details:	Variation of Condition 5 of Planning Permission 12/99485 to allow landscaping in stages
Public Participants:	Mr Turner - Applicant's Agent Mrs Wathen – Marchwood Parish Council.
Additional Representations:	Additional information had been received from the applicant, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	<p>Cllrs Bennison and Hoare disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Marchwood Parish Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.</p> <p>The Committee concluded that, while part of the proposed landscaping strip in question was affected by an access that had been granted under a lease expiring in 2020, a significant proportion of it was not so affected. As this landscaping was extremely important to mitigate the effects of the development on the landscape and ecology of the site, and the protection of the amenities of nearby residents they did not consider that there was sufficient justification for none of this landscaping to be provided at this time.</p>

Decision:	Refused.
Refusal reasons:	The proposed variation of condition would result in an unjustified delay in the implementation of the full extent of the landscaping proposals that were agreed in association with the approved pond infill, meaning that the landscape and ecological impact of the pond infill would not be adequately mitigated within a reasonable timescale. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies MAR5 and DM2 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management

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

Details:	Variation of Condition 4 of Planning Permission 12/99450 to allow landscaping in stages
Public Participants:	Mr Turner - Applicant's Agent Mrs Wathen – Marchwood Parish Council.
Additional Representations:	Additional information had been received from the applicant, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	<p>Cllrs Bennison and Hoare disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Marchwood Parish Council which had commented on the application. They concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent them from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote.</p> <p>The Committee concluded that, while part of the proposed landscaping strip in question was affected by an access that had been granted under a lease expiring in 2020, a significant proportion of it was not so affected. As this landscaping was extremely important to mitigate the effects of the development on the landscape and ecology of the site, and the protection of the amenities of nearby residents they did not consider that there was sufficient justification for none of this landscaping to be provided at this time.</p>
Decision:	Refused.
Refusal reasons:	The proposed variation of condition would result in an unjustified delay in the implementation of the full extent of the landscaping proposals that were agreed in association with the approved pond infill,

meaning that the landscape and ecological impact of the pond infill would not be adequately mitigated within a reasonable timescale. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies MAR5 and DM2 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management

21 ADJOURNMENT AND RESUMPTION OF MEETING

The Committee adjourned for lunch at 1305 and resumed at 13.40 with the following members present:

- * Cllr Mrs D E Andrews (Chairman)
- * Cllr Mrs C V Ward (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

- * P J Armstrong
- * Mrs S M Bennison
- * Mrs F Carpenter
- * A H G Davis
- * R L Frampton
- * L E Harris
- * D Harrison
- * Mrs A J Hoare
- Mrs M D Holding

Councillors:

- * J M Olliff-Cooper
- * A K Penson
- * W S Rippon-Swaine
- Mrs A M Rostand
- * Miss A Sevier
- M H Thierry
- * R A Wappet
- * M L White
- Mrs P A Wyeth

*Present

Officers Attending:

T Barnett, S Clothier, Miss J Debnam, D Groom and Mrs A Wilson

Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllrs Holding, Rostand and Wyeth.

22 PROPOSED NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL REVISED 1APP (PLANNING APPLICATION) LOCAL REQUIREMENTS

The Committee reviewed their requirements under the 1 App process as required on a 3 yearly basis. The context within which planning applications were considered had altered since the last review in 2013 with the publication of National Planning Policy Guidance in 2014 and the Council's implementation of CIL. Only minor changes were however needed with respect to the information required to be submitted. The proposed requirements would be subject to a 6 week consultation period and the responses received would be reported back to the December meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed revised 1 APP Local Requirements, as set out as Appendix 2 to the report, be published for consultation with regular planning agents, internal and external consultees and town/parish councils, with a view to considering comments received prior to the adoption of the final revised list.

CHAIRMAN