

11 JULY 2018

NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber,
Appletree Court, Lyndhurst on Wednesday, 11 July 2018

* Cllr W G Andrews (Chairman)

* Cllr P J Armstrong (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

* Mrs S M Bennison
* Mrs F Carpenter
* Ms K V Crisell
* A H G Davis
* R L Frampton
* A T Glass
* L E Harris
* D Harrison
Mrs M D Holding

Councillors:

* Mrs C Hopkins
* J M Olliff-Cooper
* A K Penson
* Miss A Sevier
* Mrs B J Thorne
* Mrs C V Ward
* M L White
* Mrs P A Wyeth

*Present

In attendance:

Councillors:

Mrs A M Rostand

Officers Attending:

J Bennett, Miss J Debnam, Mrs C Eyles, Mrs J Garrity, D Groom, A Kinghorn,
Miss G O'Rourke, I Barker, S Belli, W Lever, M Mortimer, R Payne, Mrs V Potter,
N Straw and Ms A Wade

Apologies:

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Holding.

8 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2018 be signed by the Chairman
as a correct record.

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Armstrong disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in applications 18/10050,
18/10594 and 17/11646 as a member of Hythe and Dibden Parish Council which
had commented on the applications.

Cllr Penson disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 18/10571 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application.

Cllr Rostand disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 18/10571 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application.

Cllr White disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in application 18/10571 as a member of Lymington and Pennington Town Council which had commented on the application.

10 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR COMMITTEE DECISION

a Land north of School Lane, Milford-on-Sea (Application 17/10606)

Details:

Development of 42 dwellings comprised: 17 detached houses; 8 semi-detached houses; 11 terraced houses; 6 flats; garages; parking; landscaping; estate roads; junction access; footpaths; open space; play area; 5 allotments; cycleway

Public Participants:

Mr Holmes – Applicant's Agent
Parish Cllr Banks – Milford on Sea Parish Council.

Additional Representations:

19 further letters of objection, which raised further concerns at crime, the isolated street layout, lack of shops and impact on tourism.
1 letter that commented on the application.
Southern Water would prefer a combined foul and surface water drainage condition due to the need to assess both networks at the same time.
Natural England raised no objection subject to appropriate mitigation being secured.
The applicant had circulated additional information directly to members of the Committee.

Comment:

Members were advised of additional information that should be taken into account in the consideration of this application, together with consequent additional and amended conditions, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Members noted that the application site had been released from the Green Belt, under policy MOS1, as an exception site. The basis for the release of the land had been specifically to address identified local needs

for affordable housing and low cost market housing, with a target minimum of 70% affordable housing, the rest being low cost market housing, together with other community benefits. This viewpoint had been confirmed by the Inspector when considering Policies CS12 and CS15 of the Local Plan Part 1 and subsequently by a different Inspector considering Policy MOS1 within Part 2 of the Council's Local Plan. The Committee considered that, as the land had been released from the Green Belt for a specific purpose, and the proposed scheme did not meet that specific purpose, it should be refused.

The Committee did not accept that the provision of starter homes for first time buyers complied with the definition of affordable housing. The proposed development therefore offered only 6 flats for rent and 6 dwellings for shared ownership, which was considerably less than the 70% mentioned in the site specific policy and did not meet the requirements in terms of satisfying the local housing need for affordable and low cost market housing that had led to the allocation of the site in the first place.

For these reasons the proposal should be refused as it was a wholly non-compliant scheme in policy terms on this important edge of settlement site.

Decision:

Refused

Refusal reasons:

The proportion of affordable housing proposed falls significantly below that specified in Policy CS15 of the Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy 2009) and Policy MOS1 of the Local Plan Part 2 (Sites and Development Management Plan 2014). Additionally the remainder is not wholly low cost market housing as required by Policy CS15. The site was only released from the Green Belt and allocated for housing on the basis that its development would meet local housing needs which would not otherwise be provided for and this alone provided the exceptional circumstances which justified the alteration of the Green Belt boundary. Having regard to the exceptional circumstances which underlie the site's

allocation for development, it would not be appropriate to allow such a limited provision of affordable housing and low cost market housing. The proposal is considered to be an unsustainable form of development which would seriously prejudice the objectives of the Development Plan.

b Former Police Station, Jones Lane, Hythe (Application 18/10050)

Details: Part 3- part 4-storey block of 35 retirement flats; communal facilities; refuse and buggy stores; sub- station; parking; landscaping; demolition of existing buildings (amended plans; heritage statement and streetscape)

Public Participants: Miss Fulgoni – Applicant's Agent
Mr Cox - Objector

Additional Representations: 3 further letters of support
1 further letter of objection
The Police and Crime Commissioner had confirmed that the police station was surplus to requirements and alternative provision had been made with Hampshire Fire and Rescue in Hardley.
The University of Southampton NHS Foundation Trust has requested a commuted payment to pay for additional service to meet patient demand in the local hospital.
Further details were set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Comment: Cllr Armstrong disclosed a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Hythe and Dibden 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.

The Committee was advised of additional information that should be taken into account when determining this application, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Decision: Refused

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

c	Olive Cottage, Park Lane, Marchwood (Application 18/10595)
Details:	Two-storey rear extension; single-storey rear extension; front porch; flue
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	None
Decision:	Permission
Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(c)).

d	21 Kennard Road, New Milton (Application 18/10198)
Details:	1 block of 9 flats and 1 maisonette; cycle and bin store; parking
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	1 letter asking for additional information about parking provision. The Highway Authority confirmed they raised no objection, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the report.
Comment:	The Committee was advised of additional information that should be taken into account in the consideration of this application, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting. As a consequence, the officer's recommendation was amended to authorise the Service Manager Planning Development Control to grant permission, subject to no objection being received from Natural England by 19 July 2018.
Decision:	Service Manager Planning Development Control authorised to grant permission.
Conditions/Agreements/Negotiations:	Subject to: (i) No objections being received from Natural England by 19 July 2018; and (ii) The imposition of the conditions set out in the report (Item 3 (d))

e	Land at Avery Lodge, Long Lane, Marchwood (Application 18/10311)
Details:	House; associated parking
Public Participants:	Mr Davies – Applicant's Agent Mrs Bell – Objector Mr Rolph - Objector
Additional Representations:	1 additional letter from a neighbour.
Comment:	<p>The Committee was advised of additional information that should be taken into account in the consideration of this application, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting. As a consequence, the officer's recommendation was amended to authorise the Service Manager Planning Development Control to grant permission, subject to no objection being received from Natural England by 19 July 2018.</p> <p>The Committee noted the close proximity of the proposed new dwelling to both the existing and neighbouring properties and considered it would be prudent to remove permitted development rights.</p>
Decision:	Service Manager Planning Development Control authorised to grant permission.
Conditions/Agreements/Negotiations:	<p>Subject to:</p> <p>(i) No objections being received from Natural England by 19 July 2018; and</p> <p>(ii) The imposition of the conditions set out in the report (Item 3 (e)), together with an additional condition to remove permitted development rights from the new property.</p>

f	23-25 High Street, Fordingbridge (Application 18/10331)
Details:	Use first floor as 2 flats; first-floor rear extension; roof terrace; Juliet balcony; window alterations; rooflights
Public Participants:	Mr Avient - Applicant's Agent
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	The Committee was advised of additional information that should be taken into account in the consideration of this

application, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting. As a consequence, the officer's recommendation was amended to authorise the Service Manager Planning Development Control to grant permission, subject to no objection being received from Natural England by 19 July 2018.

Decision: Service Manager Planning Development Control authorised to grant permission.

Conditions/Agreements/Negotiations: Subject to:
 (i) No objections being received from Natural England by 19 July 2018; and
 (ii) The imposition of the conditions set out in the report (Item 3 (f)).

g	Outwick Farm, Outwick, Breamore (Application 18/10366)
Details:	Single-storey rear extension
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	The Ecologist raised no objection, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out in the report.
Comment:	The Committee was advised that the additional floorspace proposed, without the inclusion of the attached outbuilding, was 9.47%.
Decision:	Permission
Conditions:	As per report (Item 3(g)).

h	Ship Inn, 68 High Street, Fordingbridge (Application 18/10433)
Details:	Kitchen intake and extract ducting (retrospective)
Public Participants:	Mr Cooper – Applicant's Agent
Additional Representations:	None
Comment:	The officer's recommendation was amended by updating Condition 1, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Decision:	Permission

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(h)), with condition 1 updated as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

i	12 St Georges Crescent, Fordingbridge (Application 18/10481)
Details:	1 pair semi-detached bungalows; parking; demolish existing
Public Participants:	None
Additional Representations:	1 additional letter, together with an amended plan, from the applicant's agent, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.
Comment:	<p>The Committee was advised of additional information that should be taken into account in considering this application, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Members were advised of a typographical correction in the reason for refusal, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.</p>
Decision:	Refused
Refusal Reasons:	As per report (Item 3(i)), but amended to refer to "...overly intensive and cramped form of development...."

j	7 Viney Road, Lymington (Application 18/10571)
Details:	House; detached garage/store; demolition of existing
Public Participants:	Miss Slade - Applicant's Agent
Additional Representations:	The applicant had submitted amended plans clarifying distances between dwellings in Viney Road and correcting the roof plan of the proposed outbuilding.
Comment:	<p>Cllrs Penson and White disclosed on-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</p>

determination of this item.

The Committee was advised of amendments to the proposed conditions, as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

Decision: Permission

Conditions: As per report (Item 3(j)), with conditions 2 and 7 amended as set out in the update circulated prior to the meeting.

k 61 South Street, Hythe (Application 18/10594)

Details: Single-storey and first-floor rear extensions (part retrospective)

Public Participants: Mr Lawrence – Applicant's Agent

Additional Representations: The applicant's agent had sent photographs directly to members of the Committee.

Comment: Cllr Armstrong disclosed a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Hythe and Dibden 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.

The Committee was advised that section 2 of the report should refer to the Hythe Conservation area, not Hyde as stated.

Decision: Refused

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

11 2 SOUTH STREET, HYTHE (APPLICATION 17/11646)

Cllr Armstrong disclosed a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Hythe and Dibden 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.

Members recalled that on 14 March 2018 they had refused this application, for the erection of a block of 43 retirement apartments, communal facilities, access, parking and landscaping (Minute 38 (b) refers). The refusal had been on the grounds of the inappropriate scale and design of the building; and also that no contribution had been secured towards the cost of providing affordable housing. At that time a reduced level of financial contribution, on viability grounds, had been

agreed with the applicant, but as it had not been secured by a S106 agreement, the reason for refusal remained. The application was the subject of an appeal that would be heard in January 2019.

The applicant had subsequently submitted a revised viability report to the effect that increased costs associated with the construction and also increased contributions to this Council for other purposes, meant that the scheme could no longer support any contribution towards affordable housing. The District Valuer had been consulted and had agreed that the scheme would not be viable if a social housing contribution was paid. On this basis the officers were recommending that no evidence should be submitted to the forthcoming planning appeal to maintain the Council's objection to the lack of an affordable housing contribution.

The Council would continue to defend its refusal on the grounds of the inappropriate scale and design of the building.

RESOLVED:

That no evidence be submitted at the forthcoming appeal in support of the second reason for refusal for planning application 17/11646 in relation to affordable housing contributions.

CHAIRMAN