

Application Number: 16/10754 Full Planning Permission

Site: BUS STATION, HIGH STREET, LYMINGTON SO41 9AF

Development: 17 sheltered apartments for the elderly; retail unit; communal facilities; access; underground car parking; bin store; landscaping; demolition of existing (AMENDED PLANS & DESCRIPTION)

Applicant: Renaissance Retirement Ltd & the Go Ahead Group PLC

Target Date: 05/09/2016

Extension Date: 16/12/2016

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Town Council view in part

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS

Lymington Conservation Area
Built up area
Primary Shopping Area
Town Centre

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
4. Economy
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)
CS5: Safe and healthy communities
CS7: Open spaces, sport and recreation
CS9: Settlement hierarchy
CS10: The spatial strategy
CS13: Housing types, sizes and tenure
CS14: Affordable housing provision

CS15: Affordable housing contribution requirements from developments
CS17: Employment and economic development
CS20: Town, district, village and local centres
CS24: Transport considerations
CS25: Developers contributions

Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document

NPPF1: National Planning Policy Framework – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM1: Heritage and Conservation
DM3: Mitigation of impacts on European nature conservation sites
DM4: Renewable and low carbon energy generation
DM5: Contaminated land
DM10: Residential accommodation for older people
DM14: Primary shopping frontages
LYM8: Lymington town centre opportunity sites

4 RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT ADVICE

Section 38 Development Plan
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
National Planning Policy Framework
Achieving Sustainable Development
NPPF Ch.2 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres
NPPF Ch. 4 - Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF Ch. 6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF Ch. 7 - Requiring good design
NPPF Ch. 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
Section 72 General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Section 66 General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions.
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

5 RELEVANT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE AND DOCUMENTS

SPD - Design of Waste Management Facilities in New Development
SPD - Housing Design, Density and Character
SPG - Lymington - A Conservation Area Appraisal
SPD - Lymington Local Distinctiveness
SPD - Mitigation Strategy for European Sites
SPD - Parking Standards

6 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant to the consideration of this proposal.

7 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Lymington and Pennington Town Council: recommend refusal: are surprised to be considering this application in light of the significant concerns of the Conservation Officer outlined in his report and the outstanding issues in relation to neighbour concerns all of which need to be addressed before this proposal merits further consideration. There are many unsold sheltered housing units in the town which seems to disprove the notion that the town is in need of this new development. There is nothing to support the notion that this site should be used for anything other than either a bus station or retail units as outlined in the current Development Plan.

8 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

None received

9 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

9.1 Conservation Officer: recommends refusal: the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Lymington Conservation Area, the character and appearance of that area and the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets in the form of a number of grade II listed buildings. In particular Nos 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37 High Street, Londesborough House and the Nat West Bank will have direct harm regarding their setting from the rear and in views across to and from those buildings. The impact on and proximity to Londesborough House is particularly noticeable. The scheme would also fail to respond to the local distinctiveness and defining attributes of the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is felt that the combined significance of the site and the setting of adjacent listed buildings is high, the harm identified must be given considerable importance and weight and gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. In addition the proposed development moves so far away from the prevailing character and context it is felt to have a significantly damaging effect on the local attributes.

9.2 Hampshire County Council Highway Engineer: no objection subject to conditions.

9.3 Hampshire County Council Flood and Water Management Team: require further information/clarification on the proposals.

9.4 Ecologist: no objection subject to a condition.

9.5 Archaeologist: Because the application involves underground car parking those areas involved will see all archaeological deposits being removed. There is increasing evidence, not available when the archaeological desk based assessment was undertaken by A C Archaeology, for archaeological deposits within the Lymington area that pre-date the creation of the present settlement. There is greater potential that archaeological material and evidence that pre-dates medieval Lymington could be recovered.

The latest Heritage Statement seemingly does not understand that multiple re-development of a site in the historic past adds potentially to the sites archaeological significance rather than detracting from its

significance. The Heritage Statement suggests that historic past development of the site will have significantly reduced the archaeological potential, whereas in reality some deposits may potentially have been truncated others will have been created.

The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that-

'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'

The sites archaeological potential and the significance of any surviving archaeological deposits are currently unknown. It is impossible at this stage to determine what the 'harm' to those deposits might be.

- 9.6 Southern Gas: advise of the presence of gas mains in this area.
- 9.7 Southern Water: advise of the presence of a public sewer within the site.
- 9.8 Estates and Valuations: recognises the fact that commercial development on the main part of this site would be considered unlikely in view of the narrow access which results in the majority of the site being obscured from view and the fact that there is no through route resulting in no opportunity to create pedestrian flow as would be required for a retail/commercial arcade. It is also noted that the property has been marketed by a national commercial agent and that this has not resulted in commercial development propositions coming forward.
- 9.9 Environmental Health (Contaminated Land) no objection subject to conditions.

10 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

- 10.1 49 letters of objection have been received (including one on behalf of the Friends of Lymington Bus station) raising the following concerns: loss of the bus station and associated facilities which leads to congestion on the High Street, the Station should be designated as an Asset of Community Value, the buildings are too high, loss of light and outlook, overbearing, out of character, loss of privacy, highway danger/access problems, insufficient car parking provision, disturbance during construction, maintenance of alleyways, too many flats for the elderly in the area and need more first time buyer accommodation.
- 10.2 Two letters of support stating that the site is ideally located for elderly persons' accommodation and the proposals seem to fit this area.
- 10.3 Three letters commenting on the proposals - concerns about maintenance of alleyway, need more first time buyer accommodation and comments about accuracy of the plans.
- 10.4 The Lymington Society have written in raising concerns about the dilution of retail uses in the Town and that the site should be developed with a mix of retail and residential uses, the design of the retail unit is

completely out of character, the footprint of the buildings is too substantial leading to over substantial roofs which would be incompatible with the High Street and buildings to the rear.

11 CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

None

12 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

If this development is granted permission and the dwellings built, the Council will receive £20,736 in each of the following six years from the dwellings' completion, and as a result, a total of £124,416 in government grant under the New Homes Bonus will be received.

From 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 £185,864.31.

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 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, 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 advice was given prior to the submission of the application raising significant concerns about the proposals which have not been addressed and the applicant has indicated that further revisions to the scheme to overcome the concerns raised would not be forthcoming.

14 ASSESSMENT

- 14.1 This site is located on the south side of the High Street within the Lymington Conservation Area with listed buildings adjoining. To the sides and rear of the site are residential properties with their associated residential curtilages. The site contains a range of single/two storey functional buildings (all proposed to be demolished) and has a limited frontage to the High Street which is occupied by the access to the now disused bus station (although busses are stored at the site on occasion). The boundary of the site is currently formed by existing buildings and brick walls ranging in height from about 2 metres up to 4 metres. Development fronting the High Street is between two and three stories high with development to the rear being up to two stories and the scale of development generally reduces down from the properties fronting the High Street.
- 14.2 The proposal is to develop the site with 17 retirement apartments (16x2 bed and 1x3 bed) in buildings to be constructed around the site boundaries between one, two and three stories high. A retail unit is also proposed at ground floor level fronting the High Street. Underground parking is proposed for 17 cars which would be accessed by two car lifts. The application has been supported with the following documents: Planning Statement, Affordable Housing Statement, Contamination Statement, Drainage Impact Assessment, Heritage Statement, Historic Environment Statement, Transport Statement, Ecology Report and Design and Access Statement.
- 14.3 This site is subject to a site specific policy LYM8 which states that the site should be developed with retail/bus station uses. The bus station is now closed and a retail use is proposed on the High Street frontage which would go some way towards addressing this policy. The applicant has stated that the bus station use ceased in May 2015 and that replacement bus stops have been provided on the High Street. They also advise that the bus company no longer wish to retain this site and that there is no possibility of it being sold to another bus operator. In addition the property was marketed in 2013 and no formal offers were received for any commercial or retail uses. They feel that the provision of a retail unit on the High Street frontage would satisfy the policy aims for the site. On balance it is considered that this is a reasonable approach which is supported by the Estates and Valuation Officer, having regard to the narrow site entrance, lack of public access through the site and the lack of interest in the site for commercial development following the marketing exercise which has been carried out. In addition policy DM10 supports the provision of residential accommodation for older people on sites appropriate for residential development.

- 14.4 This site is in a very sensitive location within the Conservation Area and in very close proximity to a number of important Listed Buildings. There is clearly scope to provide a significant enhancement on this site having regard to the poor quality of the existing buildings, however, in this context, it is important that any development proposal has regard to its sensitive setting. The Conservation Officer has raised concerns about the scale of the proposed development and how it relates to the listed buildings and the conservation area. This location is of high heritage value and, as such, development of the highest contextually responsive urban design and architectural quality would be expected. This area is characterised by a strong linear burgage plot character and building to space ratio which the submitted layout fails to respond to. While this site has lost some of this character through clearance the prevailing character of the surrounding area still retains this contextual linear pattern. The proposed overly large roof profiles, the dominance of built form, the uniform height, overly wide gables and the lack of meaningful green space all contribute to a scheme that is seeking a degree of built form which fails to respond to its context. The dominance and footprint of the scheme creates harm to the heritage assets and as a result is far in excess of what the site can reasonably accommodate. In this location the scheme would be expected to present a more responsive broken up linear built form that reduces in height, mass and width as it moves back from the High Street. In general, rear developments are around two storey with the occasional smaller element at three. There should be a more varied contextual roofscape to provide reference to the plots around it and create visual interest. The proposed large roofs with very similar pitches, width and height do not pick up on or respond to locally distinctive forms of development within the designated conservation area. In addition the wide footprints to each building result in creating awkward flat roofed elements within the scheme which are another feature which detracts from the varied and much lower and slimmer roof forms to the rear of the High Street. The failure in the analysis accompanying the application to recognise the importance of green spaces around the site, gaps between buildings and views through the site, all of which are common in this part of the conservation area, has resulted in a scheme which delivers none of these contextual attributes.
- 14.5 The proposed development would appear almost like a series of long dock or commercial style buildings possibly more akin to an edge of waterfront location. The elevations lack the more intimate nature and design of Lymington courtyard developments. The dimensions, details and articulation of the buildings proposed make little reference to the locally distinctive elements of Lymington, be that in traditional or modern interpretation. The lack of interest, variation and detailing in the scheme all indicate a standard approach rather than a site specific one. The elevations still look like they respond to the internal plan form requirements of the buildings rather than the elevational architecture of Lymington High Street and the designated conservation area.
- 14.6 The attachment of the development to listed buildings within the site is not covered in any great detail and neither is the loss of more historic boundary walls around the site which also gives cause for concern.
- 14.7 The proposal also includes the provision of a retail unit on the High Street frontage and the principle of this is seen as a positive element of the scheme. The architecture of the frontage building has now been clarified and would be acceptable. The punched vertical arrangement of

windows evident on the High Street is now picked up on and referenced to bays on adjacent buildings both in scale and arrangement. The height moving back into the site should step down and become more subservient to the frontage building and this aspect still dominates and has not been altered. This front elevation has become a more positive addition which represents a better quality building which closes this gap.

- 14.8 There are also serious concerns about how the proposal would impact on the setting of the grade II listed buildings at nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 36 and 37 High Street, Londesborough House and the Nat West Bank High Street. The development would result in direct harm to the setting of these listed buildings from the rear and in views across to and from those buildings. It is considered that the combined significance of the site and the setting of the listed buildings is high, in the light of the fact that harm to the setting of these listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area has been identified this must be given considerable importance and weight which leads to the recommendation to refuse the application. While the judgement under the National Planning Policy Framework is a finding of less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings and conservation area this gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption against planning permission is a statutory one and the authority must be conscious of the of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation.
- 14.9 In terms of neighbour implications, it is important to recognise the fact that the level of residential amenity in a densely developed town centre location such as this is not as high as in a less densely developed area. However, the residential properties to the rear and sides of the site do have a relatively high level of privacy as there are no windows presently overlooking these properties from this site.
- 14.10 Glevins to the west of the site is a substantial detached dwelling with a large garden, to the front and rear, there is a substantial wall (up to about 4 metres high) along the common boundary of the site. The proposed development would result in buildings (Block B) very close to this boundary at a similar height to the wall with roofs sloping away from the boundary, as such the bulk of the buildings would be likely to have an acceptable impact on this property. Windows facing Glevins would be such that no unacceptable overlooking would result having regard to the height of the wall, the location of the windows and the fact that they do not serve habitable rooms, apart from some rooflights.
- 14.11 With regard to residential properties to the rear, there are three dwellings known as Maitlands, Gladwins and La Colleta. Maitlands immediately abuts the rear boundary of the site and is a two storey dwelling with a private rear garden. The rear elevation of Block B would be two storeys on the boundary with no windows facing Maitlands. As such no overlooking would result. However a balcony is proposed at first floor level which would allow views to the south over the rear garden of this neighbour. A privacy screen is proposed that would reduce any possibility of overlooking. The bulk of the building would not result in an overbearing impact as it would be to the north of this property.

- 14.12 Gladwins is centrally located on the rear boundary of the site with an alley between. The proposals are such that there would be no building directly on the boundary (apart from a small part of Block C). As such no overbearing impact would arise. Balconies are proposed at first floor level in Block C would have privacy screens that would protect this neighbours privacy. No windows are proposed that would directly overlook this property.
- 14.13 La Colleta is also a two storey dwelling located to the rear of the site with an alley between. Block C would abut the rear boundary at a height of two storeys. There would be no windows in the south elevation and as a result no overlooking would result. Other windows further from the boundary would result in an acceptable impact, having regard to this town centre location. In addition, as the proposed development would be to the north of this property, no overbearing impact would result.
- 14.14 To the east of the site is the garden of La Colleta and a garden associated with a residential property at Solent Mews. Block C would be located close to this boundary at a height of two storeys with roofs sloping away from this boundary. The vertical walls of this block would be at a very similar height to the existing structures on this boundary and as a result no significant increased overbearing impact would result. Windows in this east elevation would serve non-habitable rooms that could be glazed with obscure glass. There would be windows close to the side boundary serving bedrooms facing north and south, however, these would offer oblique views which would be acceptable in this location. Properties in Solent Mews have windows at first and second floor level facing south into the site. The proposed development would have some impact on the outlook from these windows, however, there is already a two storey building on this part of the site and the change in outlook would not be so significant as to justify a refusal of planning permission.
- 14.15 Londesborough House is a three storey listed building in office use immediately to the north of Block C, this property does have significant windows facing south into the site which would be affected by the proposed development, the outlook from these windows would be reduced as a result of the development. However, outlook from commercial property is not given such a high level of protection as residential property and it is not considered that this impact is of such significance to justify a refusal of planning permission.
- 14.16 In terms of highway matters, the Highway Engineer has commented that the level of parking proposed would meet our guidelines of 1 space per unit, 17 spaces are proposed in the underground car park. The applicants have demonstrated that the level of trip generation of the proposed development (196 trips per day) would be lower than that generated by the previous bus station use (220 trips per day) and as such no objection is raised to the level of traffic generation proposed. The width of the access would be acceptable and turning space would be provided on site to enable all vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear.
- 14.17 In terms of archaeological issues the Archaeologist has recommended refusal of the application on the grounds that the sites' archaeological potential and the significance of any surviving archaeological deposits

are currently unknown. It is impossible, at this stage to determine what harm to those deposits might be. In the light of this uncertainty, refusal of permission is justified.

- 14.18 The Ecologist has raised no objection to the proposals and states that the submitted ecological survey is acceptable and that further details could be secured by condition.
- 14.19 Other matters raised by interested parties which are not referred to in the assessment above include concerns that the bus station should be designated as an Asset of Community Value. This has now been considered formally by this Council and the decision has been made that this site is not worthy of this designation. The matter of the loss of the bus station is beyond the control of any decision on this application as it has already been closed by the Bus Company who have made alternative arrangements for the service. Disturbance during construction of new development, while understandably of concern to local residents, is not a determining factor in the assessment of this application. Similarly, maintenance of the alleys is an ownership issue which is not relevant to the consideration of the application. Comments have also been made that there are too many flats for the elderly in this area and that the site should be developed for first time buyers. However, planning policies encourage development for both of these forms of housing and a refusal of planning permission on this basis could not be justified.
- 14.20 This proposal generates the need to make a contribution toward affordable housing in accordance with policy CS15 of the Core Strategy. In this case the requirement would normally be 50% of the number of units to be provided on site. However, having regard to the difficulties associated with managing a mixed flats development an off site contribution is appropriate in this case and this is the established approach adopted in respect of sheltered housing developments elsewhere in the District. The required contribution would be £245,437.50. This figure takes into account the vacant building credit which has included a discount of 17.36% based on the proposed floorspace with the existing floorspace discounted. While the applicant has agreed to this level of contribution, in the absence of a completed Section 106 Agreement this needs to form a further reason for refusal of permission.
- 14.21 In accordance with the Habitat Regulations 2010 an assessment has been carried out of the likely significant effects associated with the recreational impacts of the residential development 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.
- 14.22 In conclusion, while the benefits of providing sheltered accommodation for the elderly is recognised, this proposal would not have regard to the very sensitive context of the site in the Conservation Area close to listed

buildings because of the size and layout of the development as described above. For these reasons the recommendation is to refuse the application. The impact of the development on neighbours, highway issues and other matters referred to above would be acceptable.

- 14.23 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 this recommendation, if agreed, may interfere with the rights and freedoms of the applicant to develop the land in the way proposed, the objections to the planning application are serious ones and cannot be overcome by the imposition of conditions. The public interest and the rights and freedoms of neighbouring property owners can only be safeguarded by the refusal of permission.

Section 106 Contributions Summary Table

Proposal:			
Type of Contribution	NFDC Policy Requirement	Developer Proposed Provision	Difference
Affordable Housing			
No. of Affordable dwellings			
Financial Contribution	£245,437.50	£245,437.50	0
Habitats Mitigation			
Financial Contribution	£53,050	£53,050	0

CIL Summary Table

Type	Proposed Floorspace (sq/m)	Existing Floorspace (sq/m)	Net Floorspace (sq/m)	Chargeable Floorspace (sq/m)	Rate	Total
------	----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	------	-------

Dwelling houses	2616	387	2229	2229	£80/sqm	£185,864.31 *
Non-Residential Institutions	31	0	31	31	No charge	£0.00 *

Subtotal:	£185,864.31
Relief:	£0.00
Total Payable:	£185,864.31

* The formula used to calculate the amount of CIL payable allows for changes in building costs over time and is Index Linked using the All-in Tender Index Price published by the Build Cost Information Service (BICS) and is:

Net additional new build floor space (A) x CIL Rate (R) x Inflation Index (I)

15. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would result in a combination of buildings that would be of an excessive size by virtue of their height, width, depth, overly large roof profiles, close proximity to the site boundaries and lack of meaningful green space of this area which in this area which would not respect the local distinctiveness. The site lies within the Lymington Conservation Area close to many listed buildings and the proposals would fail to recognise this sensitive context. As a result the proposals would fail to comply with policies CS1, 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 DPD), Lymington Local Distinctiveness SPD, Lymington Conservation Area Appraisal and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the setting of adjacent heritage assets in the form of a number of grade II listed buildings, in particular buildings at nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 36 and 37 High Street, Londesborough House and the Nat West Bank High Street. These buildings would suffer direct harm to their setting from the rear and in views across to and from these buildings. The proposals also fail to fully assess the significance of the Heritage Asset under paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As a result the development would fail to comply with policy 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 DPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed development would fail to make any contribution toward addressing the substantial need for affordable housing in the District. The proposal would therefore conflict with an objective of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park 2009 and with the terms of Policies CS15 and CS25 of the Core Strategy.
4. The proposed development fails to establish the archaeological potential and the significance of any surviving archaeological deposits contrary to Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 advice was given prior to the submission of the application raising significant concerns about the proposals which have not been addressed and the applicant has indicated that further revisions to the scheme to overcome the concerns raised would not be forthcoming.

Further Information:

Major Team

Telephone: 023 8028 5345 (Option 1)



New Forest
DISTRICT COUNCIL

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

David Groom
Service Manager
Planning and Building Control
New Forest District Council
Appletree Court
Lyndhurst
SO43 7PA

**Planning Development
Control Committee
December 2016**

Item No: 3b
Bus Station
High Street
Lymington
16/10754
SZ3295

Scale 1:1250

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



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 1000262220