

**Application Number:** 15/10177 Outline Planning Permission

**Site:** 50 PYLEWELL ROAD, HYTHE SO45 6AQ

**Development:** 2 retail units; 3 flats; balconies; roof terraces; cycle & bin store  
(Outline Application with details only of appearance, layout & scale)

**Applicant:** H & H Developments Ltd

**Target Date:** 03/04/2015

---

**1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

Contrary to policy; to agree the waiving of the affordable housing contribution

**2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS**

Built-up area, Primary Shopping Area

**3 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES**

**Core Strategy**

Objectives

1. Special qualities, local distinctiveness and a high quality living environment
2. Climate change and environmental sustainability
3. Housing
6. Towns, villages and built environment quality

Policies

- CS1: Sustainable development principles
- CS2: Design quality
- CS3: Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation)
- CS4: Energy and resource use
- CS6: Flood risk
- CS7: Open spaces, sport and recreation
- CS15: Affordable housing contribution requirements from developments
- CS20: Town, district, village and local centres
- CS24: Transport considerations
- CS25: Developers contributions

**Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document**

- DM1: Heritage and Conservation
- DM3: Mitigation of impacts on European nature conservation sites
- DM14: Primary shopping frontages

#### **4 RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT ADVICE**

Section 38 Development Plan  
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004  
National Planning Policy Framework

#### **5 RELEVANT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE AND DOCUMENTS**

SPG - Hythe - A Conservation Area Appraisal  
SPD - Mitigation Strategy for European Sites

#### **6 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 6.1 1 three-storey block comprised of ground floor retail; first and second floor offices (94014) - refused 13/10/09 - appeal dismissed 16/11/10
- 6.2 2-storey building to create ground floor shop and first floor offices (97710) - refused 15/12/11
- 6.3 2-storey building to create ground floor shop and first floor offices (12/98367) - granted 25/4/12

#### **7 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Hythe & Dibden Parish Council:- Recommend permission

#### **8 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS**

None

#### **9 CONSULTEE COMMENTS**

- 9.1 Hampshire County Council Highway Engineer:- No objection subject to cycle parking condition
- 9.2 Environment Agency:- No objection, provided the Local Planning Authority are satisfied that the proposed development is safe; the Council must be satisfied that the Sequential Test is satisfied; if the local planning authority is not satisfied that the development can be considered safe without the provision of safe access and exit then planning permission should be refused.
- 9.3 Natural England:- No objection subject to mitigation of impacts on European sites
- 9.4 Land Drainage:- no comment
- 9.5 NFDC Waste Management: - there needs to be separate bin storage for the flats and shops, which will need to be of an adequate size.
- 9.6 Southern Gas Networks:- No comment
- 9.7 Estates & Valuation: - Consider that it would not be viable for the proposed development to make a contribution to affordable housing.

9.8 Conservation Officer: - Recommends refusal - design is felt to be inappropriate on the boundary of the Hythe Conservation Area; scheme feels awkward and incongruous, and the rear of the scheme appears confused.

9.9 Hampshire County Council (Emergency Planning):- Views awaited

## **10 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

1 letter of objection from neighbouring dwelling:- concerns about impact on foundations and walls of adjacent building; concerns about boundaries and impact of construction on service road; applicant does not have a right of way to the rear of the building

## **11 CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

No relevant considerations

## **12 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

If this development is granted permission and the dwellings built, the Council will receive £3456 in each of the following six years from the dwellings' completion, and as a result, a total of £20,736 in government grant under the New Homes Bonus will be received.

From the 6 April 2015 New Forest District Council began charging the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on new residential developments.

Based on the information provided at the time of this report this development has a CIL liability of £14,377.60p

Tables setting out all contributions are at the end of this report

## **13 WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT/AGENT**

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Article 31 of Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, New Forest District Council take a positive and proactive approach, seeking solutions to any problems arising in the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome.

This is achieved by

- Strongly encouraging those proposing development to use the very thorough pre application advice service the Council provides.
- Working together with applicants/agents to ensure planning applications are registered as expeditiously as possible.
- Advising agents/applicants early on in the processing of an application (through the release of a Parish Briefing Note) as to the key issues relevant to the application.
- Updating applicants/agents of issues that arise in the processing of their applications through the availability of comments received on the web or by direct contact when relevant.

- Working together with applicants/agents to closely manage the planning application process to allow an opportunity to negotiate and accept amendments on applications (particularly those that best support the Core Strategy Objectives) when this can be done without compromising government performance requirements.
- Advising applicants/agents as soon as possible as to concerns that cannot be dealt with during the processing of an application allowing for a timely withdrawal and re-submission or decision based on the scheme as originally submitted if this is what the applicant/agent requires.
- When necessary discussing with applicants/agents proposed conditions especially those that would restrict the use of commercial properties or land when this can be done without compromising government performance requirements.

•  
In this case, there have been discussions and negotiations with the applicants to secure an acceptable and viable design solution. Amended plans have been submitted during the course of the application to address initial design concerns.

## 14 ASSESSMENT

- 14.1 The application site fronts onto Pylewell Precinct, close to the corner of Pylewell Road and The Marsh. The rear of the site faces onto the New Road Car Park. The site is situated immediately adjacent to the Hythe Conservation Area boundary, and indeed a small part of the site is within the Conservation Area. The neighbouring 2-storey corner building (54 Pylewell Road) is identified as a Key / Important unlisted building within the Hythe Conservation Area Appraisal. This has a retail use on part of the ground floor and 4 residential flats occupy the remaining part of the ground floor and the whole of the first floor. The application site itself was previously occupied by a single-storey retail building, although this was demolished some time ago, and the site is now surrounded by hoardings. To the west of the site is a 3-storey terrace (38-48 Pylewell Road), which is in commercial use at ground floor, and with residential uses above. Other nearby premises are predominantly in commercial use, although there are some residential flats on upper floors. Cooper House to the south-east is 3-storeys high whilst properties on the north side of Pylewell Road are 2-storeys high.
- 14.2 There have been a number of previous planning applications affecting this site. In October 2009, planning permission was refused for a proposal to erect a 3-storey building on the site, with the ground floor in retail use and the upper 2 floors in office use. The application was considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the Hythe Conservation Area and harmful to the amenities of neighbouring residential flats at 54 Pylewell Road. A subsequent appeal was dismissed. The appeal inspector agreed that "due to its height, massing, scale and appearance" this scheme would have had "an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the Hythe Conservation Area". The appeal inspector also felt that "due to its height, massing and siting" the proposal would have had an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of adjacent flats. Concern was also expressed that a first floor terrace would lead to unsatisfactory loss of privacy for the occupiers of 48 Pylewell Road. Subsequently, an application for a 2-storey building to create a ground floor shop and first floor offices was refused planning permission in December 2011. As a result of its design it was felt this proposal would have been harmful to the character and appearance of

the Hythe Conservation Area and again it was felt the development would have been detrimental to residential amenities. Thereafter, a further application was submitted for a 2-storey building to create a ground floor shop and first floor offices. The amount of first floor accommodation was reduced from the earlier refused proposal and the design was amended. With these changes, it was concluded that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact and the application was duly granted in April 2012.

- 14.3 The application that has now been submitted has similarities to the scheme approved in 2012. However, there are also material differences. Firstly, the application has been submitted as an outline application rather than as a full application. However, as the application seeks approval of appearance, scale and layout, the development is a fairly detailed outline application. Secondly, 2 smaller shops are proposed instead of 1 large retail unit. Thirdly, and more significantly, the application is proposing residential development by way of 3 flats on 2 upper floors rather than office development on a single upper floor. Externally, window designs have been amended and the roof has been modified to accommodate the additional second floor accommodation, thereby resulting in more significant areas of flat-topped roof that would be lit by rooflights. The application introduces roof terraces at the rear of the building. Cycle and bin store areas would also be given a different treatment. This all results in a materially different treatment to the rear aspect of the building.
- 14.4 There would be no policy objection to the mix of uses that are proposed. Residential uses are acceptable on upper floors within Primary Shopping Areas as part of a mixed use development.
- 14.5 In assessing this development proposal, it is first important to recognise the negative townscape impact the site has in its current condition. Since its demolition many years ago, the site has formed an unsightly gap in the streetscene. The hoardings surrounding the site are an incongruous intrusion within one of Hythe's main pedestrian streets. The hoardings screen a site that has a rather shabby appearance, with various materials strewn across the site, and weeds breaking through the hard surfaces. In its current, rather neglected state, the site significantly detracts from the character and appearance of the area including the character and appearance of the adjacent Hythe Conservation Area. The site's adverse visual impact has now been a feature of Hythe Town Centre for almost a decade. The site is one that needs to be developed, if the existing significant visual harm is to be addressed.
- 14.6 In assessing this proposal's design impact, it needs to be recognised that the scheme approved in 2012 was considered to be of an acceptable design quality. Policies on design have not changed materially since 2012, and therefore the 2012 scheme is very much a benchmark against which this scheme needs to be assessed. The Council's Conservation Officer has expressed concern with the treatment of the rear of the building, concluding that the flat roof terraces are cumbersome and too extensive in area. Whilst the flat roof terraces are indeed quite large, it is not felt that their visual impact would be any less appropriate than the single-storey flat-roofed projections that were accepted in 2012. Indeed, the flat roof terraces now proposed have more articulation than the previously approved flat roofs. They include pitched roofed features and

steel railings, which help to break up the mass of the rear projections. In addition, the bin storage and bike storage areas are considered to be better proportioned than the corresponding element of the previously approved scheme. Furthermore, a proposed brick wall enclosure on the rear boundary of the site (that was not previously proposed) would help to improve the rear aspect of this development as seen from the adjacent public car park. Therefore, as a whole, it is felt the rear projections would have an acceptable appearance, subject to the use of good quality materials and detailing.

- 14.7 The previously approved building was a 2-storey building, and the Council's Conservation Officer has expressed concern at the changes to the roof of the building that have resulted in the 3-storey building that is now proposed. However, it is important to note that the creation of an additional storey within the building has been largely achieved through internal changes (changes to floor heights), rather than through significant changes to the height of the building. The height of the building would still be appropriate and would allow for an appropriate transition between the taller 3-storey building to the west and the more traditional 2-storey building to the east. The more extensive areas of flat-topped roof and the associated roof lights that are proposed may not be ideal from a design perspective. However, these elements would be set fairly well back behind the main front facade and would, from street level, be largely screened by the frontage parapet walls. It is felt that these elements of flat-topped roof would therefore appear sufficiently recessive. The flat-topped roofed elements and rooflights would be appreciated from some longer distant views, but as the building would be seen against a backdrop of some taller flat-roofed buildings, it is not felt that the design would appear discordant.
- 14.8 The changes to window designs would not have a significant impact on the design quality of the building. Overall, notwithstanding the concerns of the Council's Conservation Officer, it is felt the development would be a contextually appropriate development that would be of an acceptable design quality. The development would result in a significant improvement to the site that will be very much beneficial to the visual amenities of the wider area. With appropriate materials and detailing, the development would enhance the appearance of the Pylewell Road precinct and would preserve the character and appearance of the adjacent Hythe Conservation Area.
- 14.9 A key concern is the impact of the development on neighbouring dwellings. As indicated earlier in this report, some previous applications at this site have been refused for their adverse impact on neighbouring dwellings. In particular, there were concerns that some previous applications were harmful to the outlook of 2-4 Meadow Flats to the east of the site. This application has a higher roof at the front of the site than the scheme approved in 2012. However, the eaves height at this point is actually slightly lower than before, and as the roof slopes away from the boundary it is not felt that the impact of this slightly higher front section would be unduly harmful to the amenities of neighbouring flats. The rear projections are also higher than previously (by about 0.7 metres). However, this additional height comes from the balcony railings, much of which would be of an obscure glass finish, and which would therefore be of a relatively lightweight appearance. Whilst the development would undoubtedly have some impact on the light and outlook of the adjacent

flats at 2-4 Meadow flats, it is felt that the size and depth of the development would not be so great as to cause unreasonable harm to the outlook and amenities of 2-4 Meadow Flats. The impact would not be comparable to the adverse neighbour impacts that were identified in the previously refused applications.

- 14.10 Provided the balcony railings are glazed with obscure glass, it is not felt the neighbouring dwellings at 2-4 Meadow flats would be unduly overlooked, also taking into account the height of the wall around the roof terraces. With the application that was dismissed in 2010, the appeal inspector was concerned about overlooking of 48 Pylewell Road due to the close proximity of the first floor roof terrace to that property's kitchen window. The design now proposed is different to the previous application. Because of differences in levels, (the roof terrace of the proposed development being at a lower level than the roof terrace / first floor of 48 Pylewell Road), it is not considered that the privacy of 48 Pylewell Road would be unreasonably affected. Overall, it is considered this development would have an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential and commercial properties.
- 14.11 The proposed development does not seek to provide any off-street parking. As such, the development would be a car free development. In this sustainable town centre location, the highway authority is satisfied that a car free development would have no adverse implications for highway safety. The application includes appropriate on-site cycle parking provision.
- 14.12 The proposed development is within an area at risk of flooding (a flood zone 3 area). The main risk to the site is from tidal flooding, although there is also a fluvial flood risk. In a 1 in 200 year tidal event, it is projected that in future the building could be flooded to a depth of 1.35 metres, leaving the site cut off and the occupants unable to achieve safe access and egress. The depth of flooding that could occur would represent a danger for all affected, including the emergency services. However, whilst the less flood sensitive retail units on the ground floor of the building would flood, the more flood sensitive residential units on the upper floors would be above the 1 in 200 year tidal flood event in 2115. These residential units would therefore have the potential to provide safe refuge. The applicants have submitted a Flood Response Plan, which will require all owners and residents to sign up to the Environment Agency's Flood Warning Scheme. Each residential unit will also have a flood plan in place. Although the views of the County Council's emergency planners are still awaited, the submitted Flood Response Plan is similar to others that have been recently accepted in Hythe Town Centre. Therefore, it is felt reasonable to conclude that the proposed development will be a safe development during a flood risk event.
- 14.13 In line with national and local policies, it is necessary to apply the Sequential Test in respect of flood risk. The purpose of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas at lowest risk of flooding. In essence, the provision of 2 shops and 3 additional dwellings in a Flood Zone 3 area would not satisfy the Sequential Test if there are reasonably available alternative sites where those 2 shops and 3 dwellings could be provided that are at lower risk of flooding. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The applicant's

Flood Risk Assessment does not consider the Sequential Test adequately. However, notwithstanding this, given that most parts of Hythe and the Waterside are in lower flood risk areas than the application site, it would be reasonable to conclude that there are alternative sites at lower risk of flooding where the component parts of the development could be provided. As such, the application would not satisfy the Sequential Test, and if local and national planning policies are adhered to, then the development is not one that should be permitted.

- 14.14 In this case, to refuse planning permission due to a failure to comply with the Sequential Test would effectively preclude the viable development of this site, and the site would therefore continue to remain as it is now, namely an empty piece of ground with a negative townscape impact. It is felt that if the townscape is to be improved in what is an important town centre location, then a decision that is contrary to Sequential Test requirements will have to be made. In this case, it is felt the significant visual and environmental benefits of developing an empty and unsightly town centre site would materially outweigh the harm that would arise from a failure to satisfy the Sequential Test. In reaching this conclusion, regard has been had to the fact that the more sensitive residential elements of the scheme are on upper floors that will not flood and which will provide a safe refuge during a flood risk event.
- 14.15 In line with Core Strategy Policy CS15, the proposed development is one that would be expected to secure contributions to affordable housing. The target contribution in this case would be £22,830. However, the applicants have submitted a viability appraisal to support their belief that any affordable housing contribution would make their scheme unviable. The Council's estates and valuation team have considered the applicant's viability assessment and accept its conclusions. Therefore, it is felt that there would be a reasonable justification to completely waive the affordable housing requirement in this instance.
- 14.16 In accordance with the Habitat Regulations 2010 an assessment has been carried out of the likely significant effects associated with the recreational impacts of additional residential development (as provided for in the Local Plan) on both the New Forest and the Solent European Nature Conservation Sites. It has been concluded that likely significant adverse effects cannot be ruled out without appropriate mitigation projects being secured. In the event that planning permission is granted for the proposed development, a condition is recommended that would prevent the development from proceeding until the applicant has secured appropriate mitigation, either by agreeing to fund the Council's Mitigation Projects or otherwise providing mitigation to an equivalent standard. In this case, if the applicants were to fund the Council's Mitigation Projects, they would need to secure a mitigation contribution of £7150 (part of which could potentially be met through CIL payments).
- 14.17 Overall, the proposed development would not be wholly consistent with the Council's Local Plan objectives and policies. Nor would the proposal be wholly consistent with National Planning Policy advice. This is because the development would not accord with policies on flood risk. However, this conflict with flood risk needs to be balanced against the economic and environmental benefits of redeveloping a derelict town centre site. In this case, it is felt the economic and environmental benefits arising from this scheme would materially outweigh the adverse impacts associated with the provision of a new building within a flood



zone 3 area. It is felt that the development would be of a sufficiently high design quality and one that would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the Hythe Conservation Area. The development could be provided without detriment to the amenities of neighbouring dwellings. As such, the application is recommended for permission.

- 14.18 In coming to this recommendation, consideration has been given to the rights set out in Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions) of the European Convention on Human Rights. Whilst it is recognised that there may be an interference with these rights and the rights of other third parties, such interference has to be balanced with the like rights of the applicant to develop the land in the way proposed. In this case it is considered that the protection of the rights and freedoms of the applicant outweigh any possible interference that may result to any third party.

### Section 106 Contributions Summary Table

<b>Proposal:</b>			
<b>Type of Contribution</b>	<b>NFDC Policy Requirement</b>	<b>Developer Proposed Provision</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Affordable Housing</b>			
No. of Affordable dwellings	0	0	0
Financial Contribution	£22,830	0	-£22,830
<b>Habitats Mitigation</b>			
Financial Contribution	£7150		

### CIL Summary Table

Description of Class	GIA New	GIA Existing	GIA Net Increase	CIL Liability
Dwelling houses	179.72	0	179.72	£14,377.60

## 15. RECOMMENDATION

### Grant Subject to Conditions

#### Proposed Conditions:

- The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the 'reserved matters' to be approved.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

3. Approval of the details of the access and the landscaping ("the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority before any of the development is commenced. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the details which have been approved.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4. The development hereby approved shall only be implemented and occupied in accordance with the Sanders Design Ltd Flood Risk Assessment dated March 2015 and the Sanders Design Services Ltd Flood Response Plan (submitted August 2015).

Reason: To ensure that the development is safe from flooding, and to ensure the flood risk associated with the development is acceptable, in accordance with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National Park.

5. Before development commences, samples and exact details of the facing and roofing materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable appearance of the development in accordance with policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.

6. Before development commences, the following details shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- a) Detailed drawings to a scale of at least 1:10 showing the treatment and external finishes of the shopfronts (including shop fascias), external doors, windows and porch;
- b) Detailed drawings to show the treatment and external finish of the string course, cills, lintels and parapet walls;
- c) Detailed drawings (notwithstanding the submitted details) to show the colour, dimensions and detailing of the rooflights that are to be installed on both sloping and flat roofs.

Development shall only take place in accordance with those details which have been approved.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the area, including the Hythe Conservation Area in accordance with policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National Park and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan for the New Forest District outside the National Park. (Part 2: Sites and Development Management).

7. The first floor landing window and the glass balcony railings on the east elevation of the approved building shall at all times be glazed with obscure glass.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbouring properties in accordance with policy CS2 of the Local Plan for the New Forest District outside the National Park (Core Strategy).

8. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the approved areas for the parking of cycles on site have been provided and these areas shall subsequently be kept available for their intended purposes at all times.

Reason: To promote sustainable travel and to comply with Policies CS1, CS2 and CS24 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.

9. No development shall be carried out until proposals for the mitigation of the impact of the development on the New Forest and Solent Coast European Nature Conservation Sites have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the local planning authority has confirmed in writing that the provision of the proposed mitigation has been secured. Such proposals must:

- (a) Provide for mitigation in accordance with the New Forest District Council Mitigation Strategy for European Sites SPD, adopted in June 2014 (or any amendment to or replacement for this document in force at the time), or for mitigation to at least an equivalent effect;
- (b) Provide details of the manner in which the proposed mitigation is to be secured. Details to be submitted shall include arrangements for the ongoing maintenance and monitoring of any Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces which form part of the proposed mitigation measures together with arrangements for permanent public access thereto.
- (c) The development shall be carried out in accordance with and subject to the approved proposals.

Reason: The impacts of the proposed development must be mitigated before any development is carried out in order to ensure that there will be no adverse impacts on the New Forest and Solent Coast Nature Conservation Sites in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Local Plan Part 2 and the New Forest District Council Mitigation Strategy for European Sites Supplementary Planning Document.

10. The development permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, sol sht 4 rev B, sol sht 2 rev B, sol sht 1 rev C, sol sht 3 rev C, sol sht 5 rev D, sol sht 6 rev B.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of the development.

### **Notes for inclusion on certificate:**

1. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, New Forest District Council takes a positive and proactive approach, seeking solutions to any problems arising in the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome by giving clear advice to applicants.

In this case there have been discussions and negotiations with the applicants to secure an acceptable and viable design solution. Amended plans have been submitted during the course of the application to address initial design concerns.

2. In discharging condition No. 10 above the Applicant is advised that appropriate mitigation is required before the development is commenced, either by agreeing to fund the Council's Mitigation Projects or otherwise providing mitigation to an equivalent standard. Further information about how this can be achieved can be found here:-  
<http://www.newforest.gov.uk/article/16478/Contributions-for-Habitats-Mitigation-and-the-Relationship-with-Community-Infrastructure-Levy-Payments>

### **Further Information:**

Major Team

Telephone: 023 8028 5345 (Option 1)



# New Forest DISTRICT COUNCIL

Tel: 023 8028 5000  
www.newforest.gov.uk

Chris Elliott  
Head of Planning & Transportation  
New Forest District Council  
Appletree Court  
Lynchurst  
SO43 7PA

**Planning Development  
Control Committee  
September 2015**

**Item No: 3a**  
50  
Pylewell Road  
Hythe  
15/10177  
SU4207

Scale 1:1250  
N.B. If printing this plan from  
the internet, it will not be to  
scale.

