

12 APRIL 2017

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 April 2017

- * 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
* L E Harris
* D Harrison
* Mrs A J Hoare
* Mrs M D Holding
J M Olliff-Cooper

Councillors:

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
* Ms K V Crisell

*Present

Officers Attending:

T Barnett, J Bennett, Miss J Debnam, Mrs C Eyles, Ms L Fawkes (New Forest National Park Authority), D Groom, A Kinghorn, R Natt, I Rayner and Ms M Stephens

Apologies:

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Armstrong, Wappet and Wyeth.

46 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

47 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Harrison disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 16/11137 as a member of the New Forest National Park Authority which had commented on the application.

Cllr Rostand disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 17/10018 and 17/10037 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the applications. She disclosed an indirect pecuniary interest in application 16/10764 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which was an adjacent landowner that could benefit from the development.

Cllr White disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 17/10018 and 17/10037 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the applications. He disclosed an indirect pecuniary interest in application 16/10764 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which was an adjacent landowner that could benefit from the development. Cllr White also disclosed a personal interest in applications 17/10037 and 16/11116 on the grounds that he knew the public speakers who would be addressing the Committee.

48 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR COMMITTEE DECISION

- a Old Forge, Salisbury Road, Breamore (Application 16/10602)**
- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Details: | Use as 1 holiday let; retention of 1 st floor side window |
| Public Participants: | Mrs Harling - Objector |
| Additional Representations: | Additional evidence had been submitted by the Applicant's agent in respect of the marketing of the site. |
| Comment: | In light of the additional evidence that had been submitted by the applicant's agent, the officer's recommendation was amended to deferral to allow further consultation with the Parish Council, neighbours and the Council's Estates and Valuation team. |
| Decision: | That consideration of this application be deferred to allow evaluation of the additional evidence and further consultation with the Parish Council, neighbours and the Council's Estates and Valuation team. |
-
- b Martin Club, Martin Road, Martin (Application 16/11097)**
- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Details: | House and garage; clubhouse; parking; landscaping; bin stores; demolition of existing club house and flat |
| Public Participants: | Mrs Sampson – Martin Parish Council |
| Additional Representations: | None |
| Comment: | The Committee concluded that proposed condition 12 should be strengthened to make it explicit that all elements of the proposed new Club building must be complete and available for use prior to the occupation of the new dwelling. |

Decision: Planning consent

Conditions: As per report (Item 3b), with condition 12 amended to make it explicit that all elements of the proposed new Club building must be complete and available for use prior to the occupation of the new dwelling.

c Shorefield Country Park, Shorefield Road, Downton, Milford-on-Sea (Application 16/11116)

Details: Alterations and extension to access road; gates; bund

Public Participants: Mr Pollock - Applicant's Representative.

Additional Representations: None

Comment: Cllr White disclosed a non-pecuniary interest on the grounds that he knew the applicant's representative. He concluded that the degree of acquaintance was sufficient that there could be an impression of bias. He consequently took no part in the consideration and did not vote.

Decision: Planning consent.

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

d Land South of Old Ferry House, Undershore Road, Boldre (Application 16/11137)

Details: Access road to Haven Marine Park and Island Point flats

Public Participants: Mr Pearson - Supporter

Additional Representations: The Conservation Officer had submitted additional comments, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Comment: Cllr Harrison disclosed a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the New Forest National Park Authority 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(d)).

e	30 Newbridge Way, Pennington, Lymington (Application 17/10018)	
	Details:	Raising roof height and roof lights in association with new first floor; Juliet balcony; side and rear extensions; oak front porch; flue
	Public Participants:	Mr Hawkins – Applicant’s Agent Mrs Case – Objector Town Cllr Southerland – Lymington and Pennington Town Council.
	Additional Representations:	None
	Comment:	Cllrs 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. The Committee concluded that the position of the proposed extension and its proximity No 28 Newbridge Way meant that it would be unduly intrusive and have a detrimental effect on the outlook from and the enjoyment of the residential amenities of that property.
	Decision:	Refused.
	Refusal Reasons:	By reason of its forward siting, height and close relationship with no.28 Newbridge Way, the proposed extension would have an intrusive and imposing impact to the detriment of the amenities and outlook of the occupiers of that property. For this reason, the proposals are contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest outside the National Park.

f	Field Rear of Paddock Close, Dark Lane, Hinton St Michael, Bransgore (Application 17/10036)	
	Details:	Agricultural storage barn
	Public Participants:	Mr Lloyd - Objector
	Additional Representations:	None.

Comment:	The Committee considered that they had insufficient information to allow them to form an accurate assessment of the effect of this proposal, combined with other development on the site.
Decision:	That consideration of this application be deferred to allow additional information to be sought.

g 47 Stanley Road, Lymington (Application 17/10037)

Details:	Two-storey and single-storey rear extension; single-storey side extension; fenestration; alterations
Public Participants:	Mr Dench – Applicant’s Agent Mr Markby – Objector’s representative
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	Cllrs Rostand and White disclosed non-pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application. Cllr Rostand concluded that there were no grounds under common law to prevent her from remaining in the meeting to speak and to vote. Cllr White disclosed a further interest on the grounds that he knew both the public speakers. He concluded that the degree of acquaintance was sufficient that there was the danger of a perception of bias. He consequently took no part in the consideration and did not vote.
Decision:	Refused
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(g)).

h 3 The Close, Whitsbury (Application 17/10063)

Details:	Two-storey extension, retaining wall/steps, landscaping
Public Participants:	Mr O’Lone – Applicant.
Additional Representations:	1 additional letter from the applicant, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	None
Decision:	Refused.
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(h)).

i	3 The Close, Whitsbury (Application 17/10064)	
	Details:	Two-storey extension; stud wall to create wc; remove stud wall; fireplace alterations; create door and ensuite; stud wall to create cupboard; create door into extension (Application for Listed Building Consent)
	Public Participants:	Mr O'Lone - Applicant
	Additional Representations:	1 additional letter from the applicant and 2 letters of support as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
	Comment:	None
	Decision:	Listed Building consent refused.
	Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(i)).

j	38 Oakwood Avenue, Ashley, New Milton (Application 17/10217)	
	Details:	Single-storey rear extension; front porch; fenestration alterations
	Public Participants:	None
	Additional Representations:	None
	Comment:	None
	Decision:	Planning consent
	Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(j)).

k	Limewood, Lime Walk, Dibden Purlieu, Hythe (Application 17/10108)	
	Details:	Single-storey side and rear extension; rooflights
	Public Participants:	None
	Additional Representations:	1 further letter of objection from a neighbour, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
	Comment:	None
	Decision:	Planning consent
	Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(k)).

I	Langstone, Lime Walk, Dibden Purlieu, Hythe (Application 17/10198)
Details:	Raise ridge height; two-storey rear extension; front porch; chimney; fenestration alterations
Public Participants:	Mr Cunningham - Objector
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	Members concluded that the bulk of the proposed extension, together with its position forwards of the neighbouring dwelling, meant that the proposal would have an unduly detrimental effect on the residential amenities and outlook enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring property.
Decision:	Refused
Refusal Reasons:	The proposed first floor extension, together with the subservient two storey rear element of the existing building would result in an excessively long two storey projection which would adversely compete for dominance with the main front part of the existing dwelling, thereby detracting from the proportions of the building. This would be further exacerbated by the additional single storey rear extension which would extend the linear footprint of the building. Together, the proposed extensions would be unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and be harmful to its appearance, and the street scene and as such would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Kings Saltern Conservation Area. For this reason, the proposed development is contrary to Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan and Chap 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework

**m Land at Buckland Manor Farm, Alexandra Road, Lymington
(Application 16/10764)**

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:	None
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	Cllrs Rostand and White disclosed indirect pecuniary interests as members of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which, as an adjacent land owner, could gain benefit from the granting of consent. They left the meeting for the consideration and voting.
Decision:	Planning consent
Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(m)).

49 HOUSING WHITE PAPER

The Committee considered the proposed response to be made in respect of the Government's Housing White Paper. The following points were made:

- The Committee welcomed potential proposals to strengthen their ability to encourage developers to implement planning consents for new houses.
- There was not currently any realistic mechanism through which a local authority could require a developer to bring forwards a development and it would therefore be most unfair if mechanisms were put in place that penalised a local authority for the non-implementation of consent.
- It was important that high quality Green Belt, that served important purposes for areas, continued to be protected from development
- The legislation needed to recognise the particular problems arising where there was a high proportion of the local authority's area that was designated as, for example, a National Park, with the restrictions that this entailed displacing their assessed housing need into the residual, non-protected area.
- The current Right to Buy legislation was significantly hampering the ability of local authorities to provide affordable housing for rent to serve their local communities. Local authorities should receive the full market value of any dwelling that was disposed of through this route, allowing it to be replaced on a like for like basis. It was unfair that the value of local authority assets was benefitting the subsidised purchaser and the government, but not the local community that had paid for the asset.

- It needed to be recognised that not everyone would be in a position to buy a home in their local community and that it was essential that there was greater recognition of the need for affordable housing to rent, with good security of tenure, and protected from unreasonable rent increases and administration charges.
- The assessment of housing need should take account of the demographics of an area and the type of housing that would be needed.
- Where there was a high proportion of second homes, holiday homes or properties bought as investments but kept empty, it was increasingly difficult to meet the needs of local people for housing and to maintain vibrant communities.
- It was essential that development was supported by the necessary infrastructure.
- While housing land allocations were important, it was also important to retain employment land so that communities were sustainable and offered local, good quality, employment.

RESOLVED:

That the Portfolio Holders be advised of the Committee's comments as set out above.

50 HIGHWAY AUTHORITY CONSULTATION

The Committee was advised of the new arrangements being put in place by the County Council with respect to giving advice on highway matters in respect of planning applications. While they would continue to give advice in respect of developments of more than 5 dwellings and all commercial developments, they would no longer give advice in respect of smaller residential proposals. They would give basic training on their guidance and standards and would expect planning officers to assess the proposal in the light of this information.

Members expressed some reservations about the need for continued access to technical advice where a smaller development raised more complex issues; and also about the shift of work which was the responsibility of the County Council onto this District.

CHAIRMAN