

Application Number: 17/10359 Full Planning Permission

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

Development: 17 sheltered apartments for the elderly; retail unit; communal facilities; access; underground carparking; bin store; landscaping; demolition of existing

Applicant: Renaissance Retirement Ltd & the Go Ahead Group PLC

Target Date: 10/07/2017

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

- 6.1 16/10754 17 sheltered apartments for the elderly; retail unit; communal facilities; access; underground car parking; bin store; landscaping; demolition of existing refused 15-12-16 appeal lodged.
- 6.2 17/10608 remediation works to party wall (Application for Listed Building Consent) current application.

7 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Lymington and Pennington Town Council: recommend refusal: This Council remains opposed to any development of this nature at the bus station which remains designated as such within the District Development Plan. We have considered the future use of the site within our Neighbourhood Plan and believe there is a strong argument to support the notion that it would be beneficial to this town for its use to be for retail / residential should the site not continue to be used as a bus station.

8 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

None received

9 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

- 9.1 Conservation Officer: recommends refusal: while acknowledging the changes that have been made since the refusal of planning permission last year and recognising that the site would benefit from some form of redevelopment the proposal would not be appropriate in this sensitive location. The scheme moves so far away from the prevailing character and context it is felt to have a significantly damaging effect on 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 condition.
- 9.5 Archaeologist: no objection subject to condition.
- 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 16 letters of objection have been received (including one on behalf of the Friends of Lymington Bus station and one on behalf of the Lymington Society) raising the following concerns: the objections to the previous

scheme have not been overcome, loss of the bus station and associated facilities which leads to congestion on the High Street, the loss of the bus station as a vital community asset, the buildings are too high, loss of light and outlook, disturbance during construction, impact on existing businesses during construction, too many flats for the elderly in the area and need more affordable homes.

- 10.2 Two letters of support stating that the proposal is the perfect answer for aged persons accommodation.
- 10.3 One letter raising concerns about the condition of alleyway to the side and rear of the site.

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 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 £176,616.

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 no pre application advice was sought prior to the submission of this application and the concerns raised in relation to the previous application have not been adequately addressed as a result there is no scope to further amend the proposals within the timescales for determination of this application.

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 bus station. 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 application follows the refusal of a similar scheme last year (see paragraph 6.1 above). The previous application was refused for four reasons relating to its adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings as a result of the developments excessive size, the harm to the setting of a number of Grade II Listed Buildings, no mechanism to secure the required affordable housing contribution and the failure to establish the archaeological potential of the site and the significance of any surviving archaeological deposits on the site.

- 14.4 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. This reflects the stance that was taken in respect of the previous application in relation to this issue.
- 14.5 The main changes between this scheme and that previously refused are in relation to the height of the buildings. The application has been supported by a plan that illustrates the difference between the two schemes. This shows that the height of some parts of the buildings have been reduced in terms of ridge and eaves heights, particularly towards the rear of the site. Other parts of the development remain of the same height as was considered previously. The footprint of the buildings and layout of the site remains essentially as considered previously although there has been a modest reduction in the footprint of Block C at the north-west corner of the building and an area of soft landscaping would be replaced with a paved area. In addition some elevations have been adjusted and more vertically proportioned windows have been introduced. While these changes are acknowledged it is considered that they do not go far enough to overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the proposed development would result in a built form that would be inappropriate in this sensitive context for the reasons set out below which are essentially the same concerns that were raised in respect of the previous scheme.
- 14.6 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 continued to raise concerns about the scale of this revised scheme 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.

- 14.7 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.
- 14.8 The attachment of the development to listed buildings adjoining 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.
- 14.9 The proposal 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 would be acceptable (no concerns were raised in respect of the previous application in relation to this element of the scheme). 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 of this block moving back into the site should step down and become more subservient to the frontage element of the building and this aspect still dominates and has not been altered. The front elevation of the retail unit has become a more positive addition which represents a better quality building which closes this gap in the High Street frontage.
- 14.10 While the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings, that is not the same as a less than substantial objection. In accordance with the advice of paragraph 132 of the NPPF, great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. In assessing this issue, consideration has been given to the benefits of the scheme which

include the provision of housing which is of significance given the lack of 5 years supply of housing land (paragraph 14 of NPPF), providing specialist housing which would contribute to an acknowledged need and the proposals would bring forward the development of a site which does not contribute positively to the area.

- 14.11 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 more suburban location. 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. No concerns were raised in respect of neighbour impacts in relation to the previous scheme and this proposal similarly gives rise to no adverse impacts as set out below.
- 14.12 Gleivins 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 Gleivins 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.
- 14.13 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 overshadowing impact as it would be to the north of this property.
- 14.14 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 which would have privacy screens that would protect this neighbour's privacy. A first floor lounge window would face this property at a distance of 5.5 metres from the boundary (14 metres from the rear elevation of Gladwins). This distance would be within acceptable limits in this town centre location.
- 14.15 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 overshadowing impact would result.

- 14.16 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.
- 14.17 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 in its own right, although this negative impact weighs against the scheme to a modest degree.
- 14.18 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.
- 14.19 In terms of archaeological issues the Archaeologist has raised no objection to this application following the submission of further documentation which assesses the likely archaeological potential of the site which overcomes reason for refusal No. 4 of the previous application. Conditions would be necessary to ensure that the archaeological significance of this site is recorded/retrieved prior to commencement of works.
- 14.20 The Ecologist has raised no objection to the proposals and states that that further details could be secured by condition.
- 14.21 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 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.

- 14.22 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 and was also accepted in relation to the previous application. The required contribution would be £256,589.30. This figure takes into account the vacant building credit which has included a discount of 16.4% 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.
- 14.23 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. The applicant has agreed to fund the Council's Mitigation Projects which would require a contribution of £53,050.
- 14.24 In conclusion, in balancing the issues, the social benefits of providing specialist housing for the elderly and the economic benefits of the re-use of this brownfield site, and the provision of retail floorspace are not considered to outweigh the harm that would be caused in respect of the very sensitive context of this 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.
- 14.25 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			
Financial Contribution	£256,589.30	£256,589.30	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	2394	387	2007	2007	£80/sqm	£176,616.00 *
------------------------	------	-----	------	------	---------	---------------

Subtotal:	£176,616.00
Relief:	£0.00
Total Payable:	£176,616.00

* 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)

Where:

A = the net area of floor space chargeable in square metres after deducting any existing floor space and any demolitions, where appropriate.

R = the levy rate as set in the Charging Schedule

I = All-in tender price index of construction costs in the year planning permission was granted, divided by the All-in tender price index for the year the Charging Schedule took effect. For 2017 this value is 1.1

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 in this area which would not respect 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 and fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. 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. 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. Notwithstanding the applicants commitment to make the required affordable housing contribution, in the absence of a mechanism to ensure the agreed contribution is paid, 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.

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 no pre application advice was sought prior to the submission of this application and the concerns raised in relation to the previous application have not been adequately addressed as a result there is no scope to further amend the proposals within the timescales for determination of this application.

Further Information:

Major Team

Telephone: 023 8028 5345 (Option 1)



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
June 2017

Item No: 3h
Bus Station
High Street
Lymington
17/10359
SZ3295

Scale 1:1250

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

