

UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE

Items 3(a) and 3(b) - Finn M'Couls, 25 Market Place, Ringwood (Applications 15/11018 and 15/11019)

Ringwood Town Council have commented further and now recommend permission stating that concerns previously raised had been largely addressed, however the Committee felt that the access onto Strides Lane was an issue, but couldn't sustain an objection on those grounds, as the Highways Officer was satisfied. There was a question over provision for smokers after 10:30pm, as they would not be able to utilise the rear external areas for this purpose.

Item 3(c) - 2 West Street, Ringwood (Application 15/11067)

Paragraph 14.2 of the report makes reference to the receipt of lighting details for the gable sign. This has been the subject of further consultation with the Conservation Officer who has no objection to the strip lighting proposed.

Item 3(d) – Devonway, 11 Lime Kiln Lane & land rear of 201-209 Long Lane, Holbury, Fawley (Application 15/11072)

The Highway Engineer has commented further in respect of additional concerns being raised by a local resident (which have been sent directly to Members) and states that the level of car parking provision proposed would be in accordance with the Car Parking Guidelines and that the proposed access for refuse and fire appliance vehicles would be acceptable even when cars are parked in Lime Kiln Lane. He has also requested a further condition to require the developer to submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan. However, this is not considered to be reasonable on a development of this scale, particularly given the fact that no highway danger has been identified and that a level of inconvenience to local residents is to be expected as part of a development of this nature.

The same resident also raised concerns about the presence of Stag Beetles on the sit. The Ecologist has commented further that the application does not appear to have significant larval habitat (dead/decaying wood such as tree stumps) and that the condition recommended (No. 7) would ensure suitable enhancement for the species.

Condition No. 11 needs to be revised to refer to the correct plan numbers by deleting reference to plan nos. 5015.001 and 5105.001Rev B and adding 5105.001 Rev C.

Item 3 (f) – 19 Long Lane Holbury, Fawley (Application 15/11352)

Reason for refusal 2 to be reworded to make it clear that the loss of protected trees results in the loss of amenity to the area.

**Item 3(g) - Land of Compton House & Sarum House, Blackwater Drive, Totton
(Application 15/11647)**

Councillor Britton writes in support of the application. He notes that he took a while to come to a notable decision as the proposal pits the desperate housing needs against the views of the majority of local resident, with the loss of green space the main issue. Support is given because this Council has such an acute shortage of 1 & 2 bedroom properties, which this application would help to address. Regarding the main reason for the opposition (loss of green space), around half of that existing would be lost, however there would still be enough space for the local residents to enjoy and the existing space would be enhanced. The local area will be able to cope with the extra residents and it is good to see that extra car parking is proposed. Another concern raised by the proposal is crime and anti-social behaviour but it is understood that the age range of the likely occupants would be such that some fears should be allayed. The proposed development is suitable for the area and so badly required that the application is supported.

Councillor Penman writes in support of the application. While the loss of open space is not favourable there will still be enough green space available to be enjoyed by the local residents. Not all the open space will be used and he hopes that what is left will be enhanced by the developers. This new housing stock will be much welcomed by people on the long Council list and locals need to be aware that only residents over 45 will be allowed to live in these flats which should dispel some fears that there could be an increase in antisocial behaviour. While the fears of residents regarding this development, particularly with the loss of some of the open space, the urgent need for council housing makes this housing so badly needed that the application is supported.

Condition No. 2 needs to be revised to take account of an amended plan – number 2587-GAD-1000003 Revision B to be replaced with Revision D.

The Highways Engineer has commented further in respect of additional concerns being raised by local residents and states that the level of car parking provision proposed would be in accordance with the Car Parking Guidelines and that adequate turning facilities would be provided. In addition, he has confirmed that the local highway network is able to accommodate the increased vehicle movements associated with the proposed development. He has also requested a further condition to require the developer to submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan. However, this is not considered to be reasonable on a development of this scale, particularly given the fact that no highway danger has been identified and that a level of inconvenience to local residents is to be expected as part of a development of this nature.

The Environment Agency have not yet responded to their consultation – as a result the recommendation is changed to Head of Planning and Transportation be **AUTHORISED TO GRANT PERMISSION** subject to such further conditions that he may be deem appropriate and to address any issues that may be raised by the Environment Agency.

Item 3(h) – 55 High Street, Lyminster (Application 15/11415)

The Relevant Planning History – Section 6 – needs to be amended as follows:

15/11413 – Withdrawn by applicant on 22nd December 2015. Delete “Current application (See Item item 3g)”

15/11671 – This is a current application awaiting determination. Delete “however does not need consent and has been withdrawn by the applicant”

Item 3(n) - Autumn Tints, Spring Road, Lymington (Application 15/11533)

Condition No. 2 needs to be amended to reflect the correct plan numbers as follows:
P1508:03 rev ? needs to be replaced with P1508:03 rev 0 and P1508:09 rev 0 needs to be added.

Item 3(o) - 120 Commercial Road, Totton (Application 15/11545)

Two further letters of objection have been received raising concerns already referred to in paragraph 10 of the report.

Two further petitions have been received objecting to the application, with a total of 28 signatures.

Item 3(p) – 32 Chiltern Drive, Barton-on-Sea, New Milton (Application 15/11547)

Members' attention is drawn to a letter and photographs that have been circulated by the applicant separately as they cannot attend meeting.

Para 14.6 line 4 needs to be amended by the addition of the word "not" after "to"

Item 3(t) – Beach Front, Hurst Road, Milford on Sea (Application 15/11599)

(i) Comments circulated to some Committee members (but not all) by Mr and Mrs Gibbons (beach hut 65)

- Reduced clear views of the sea and island due to inhabited roof
- Lack of rear elevation plan looking from bowling club from existing promenade
- Wire balustrading - where coincide with the access ramps there would be 2 or 3 wires cutting across the skyline. Mass of wire balustrading to look through.
- Compromises privacy of beach hut owners.
- Request that balustrading/handrail is set back as far as possible from eastward edge to avoid overlooking and likelihood of anything being dropped.
- Narrower beach huts and thinner party walls due to removal of eastern terrace.
- Amended size of doors to be same as original - 915mm as this will allow better wheelchair access and more light in deeper huts
- NFDC should not get involved in colour of beach hut doors.

(ii) Additional representation letter from 34 Vitre Gardens, Lymington. (beach hut owner)

- Consider application with care and compassion towards users of beach front and its old fashioned charm
- Beachfront already upgraded with new railing, surfacing, seating and lighting.

- Eastern end not being redeveloped which leaves an area for redevelopment
- New huts are not in the same location and smaller in size.
- If storm not occurred slab would have needed renewing within a few years,
- Beach huts should be demolished and rebuilt at no cost to owners.
- Do not want beach huts crammed into smaller space or roof used by public as it is our property - is this legal?
- if new huts more robust why not constructed at eastern end too.

Previous storms stronger at Western end with complete destruction of some huts near White House when sea wall collapsed