

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF
BROCKENHURST PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON
TUESDAY 26th JUNE 2018 AT 7.00 PM
AT THE VILLAGE HALL**

Present: John Korbey Chairman
Mark Böckle Russell Horne
Henry Mellor Kevin Whittle
John Wingham

Mina Beckett Administration Assistant

In Attendance: Steve Avery (Executive Director, Strategy & Planning, NFNPA),
Pete Wales, Harry Oram and 20 members of the public.

Public Presentments:

The Architect spoke in support of Application No. 18/00411 (Forest Park Hotel, Rhinefield Road). He explained that this proposal seeks to address historic parking issues which are likely to recur once the Hotel is operating at full capacity following completion of extensive renovation works and regular weddings and functions take place . He advised that the proposed car park will be positioned some 48m from established properties in Forest Park Road and that existing trees, hedges and outbuildings will provide visual screening and minimise noise. He further advised that landscaping could be used to address any residual concerns in this regard. Finally, in response to residents' concerns that the Hotel's lawn would be further eroded by this proposal, he stated that the new owners intended to return the old swimming pool area (which is currently gravelled) to lawn.

Four local residents spoke in objection to the application. It is their view that there are errors in the application relating to the number of parking spaces to be created and the placement and treatment of existing trees. They are unconvinced of the need for additional car parking since large sections of the existing car park have been out of use during the refurbishment works yet this has not resulted in a shortage of spaces and consider that the option to extend existing provision opposite the hotel should be explored in the first instance. Furthermore, they are concerned that the proposed location of the car park and access track is unnecessarily close to neighbouring properties causing regular disturbance to residents. Additionally they feel that it is unacceptable to further reduce the amount of green space in the Hotel grounds and that this will have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area as well as compromising the amenity of the Hotel and safety of guests using the lawn.

Three local residents spoke in objection to Application No. 18/00372 (Inchcolm, North Road). This is the fifth application on the site and residents feel that bullying tactics are now being deployed by the developer to coerce them into supporting these plans. Although previous applications have been for four properties, the three that are now being proposed are larger in size and will overlook neighbouring properties the ground level of which is lower than the Inchcolm site. They are further concerned that the photographs and reports submitted in support of the application do not accurately reflect the site and that proposed access arrangements require removal of a hedgerow, the ownership of which is unclear and which will compromise the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties.

The Architect spoke in support of Application No. 18/00381 (Bramblings, Sway Road). The existing property sits further back from the road than its neighbours. Efforts have been made

to reduce the visual impact on the street scene, to ensure that the new dwelling is subservient to the original house and reduce overlooking.

The Architect spoke in support of Application No. 18/00266 (Salandine, Partridge Road). He noted that there are other similar developments in the local area including the adjoining property. It may result in some minor overshadowing of a neighbouring property but this has been kept to a minimum.

18/42 Apologies for Absence: Ian Holden

18/43 Declarations of Interest: None

18/44 Minutes of last meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd May 2018 were signed as a correct record.

18/45 Matters Arising

The Hall & Former Scout Hut Application was discussed (18/00221). Mr Horne and Mr Mellor have visited the site and measured the development. They concluded that the difference between the originally approved plans and the development as built is significant and does not therefore constitute a minor material amendment.

Steve Avery gave his view that in this specific case the terminology "Minor Material Amendment", whilst accurate in Planning terms, was not helpful in describing the decision to be made (ie. whether the development should be retained as built). In all cases the onus is on the applicant to construct their development in accordance with the approved plans, however, if it transpires that this is not the case, the role of the Planning Authority is to determine whether the development as built leads to significant Planning issues such as overshadowing, loss of light and/or privacy to neighbouring properties. If it cannot be demonstrated that these issues cause material harm in Planning terms then the Authority cannot take action against the developer.

Mr Avery further explained that his department has been subject to significant resource cuts in recent years which have included the loss of the Compliance Officer post. That said, he stressed that although reinstatement of this position would help with compliance monitoring, it would be impossible to check every development and would not of itself prevent unauthorised development. Discussions are underway within NFNPA to determine whether and how drawings which overlay the dimensions of a development as built against originally approved plans can be required of developers for ease of comparison and assessment when considering whether enforcement action should be taken.

The Meadens Garage site in Sway Road was discussed and concerns raised that recent developments have compromised the rural nature of the main road through the village. The Committee also expressed their disappointment that the agreed landscaping of the main garage site has not yet been put in place.

18/46 Planning Applications

Appl. No: 00221
Applicant: Mr Gouver
Proposal: Application to Vary Condition 2 of Appeal Reference APP/B9506/W/15/3139150 to Planning Permission 15/00342 to Allow Minor Material Amendment
Property: Hall & Former Scout Hut, Brookley Road
Comments: 4. We object to this application on the basis that the difference between the originally approved plans and the development as built is significant and this does not therefore constitute a minor material amendment.

Going forward we would like to see a change to NFNPA compliance arrangements to allow confirmation that developments are constructed in accordance with agreed plans. We also strongly recommend that guidance is issued to applicants to encourage them to annotate key dimensions on submitted plans for universal ease of reference.

Appl. No: 00266
Applicant: Mr Batten
Proposal: Two Storey and Single Storey Rear Extensions
Property: Salandine, Partridge Road
Comments: 1. We support this application but would be happy to accept the Officer's decision.

Appl. No: 00372
Applicant: Mr Tizzard
Proposal: 3 No. New Dwellings; Alterations to Existing Access; Demolition of Existing Dwelling
Property: Inchcolm, North Road
Comments: 4. We object to this application. We are concerned that this proposal does not adequately address the reasons for the previous application's refusal. In particular it is our view that it will result in over-development of the site and overlooking and loss of amenity to neighbouring properties and the Conservation Area. Proposed access arrangements are also unsatisfactory.

Appl. No: 00381
Applicant: Mr Malkin
Proposal: 1 No. New Dwelling; Carport; Bin Store; Carport and Creation of New Access and Entrance Gates for Bramblings; 1.8m High Boundary Fence; 1.8m High Brick Wall and Entrance Gates; Hardstanding; Associated Landscaping
Property: Bramblings, Sway Road
Comments: 4. We object to this application. We accept that this is a unique site with scope for development, however, it is our view that the height, character and proximity to the boundary of the development is not in-keeping with other properties in Sway Road, there being no other two-storey properties within 1.9m of the boundary (at its closest point) in this location. We consider that the changes proposed to the access gate are positive, however, we are concerned that the proposed boundary fence will result in loss of rural character along the road. Finally, we would welcome detailed clarification from the Tree Officer with regard to the impact of the proposed development.

Appl. No: 00383
Applicant: Gates Engineering Ltd
Proposal: Continued Temporary Use of Land for the Parking of Cars and Vehicles; 1.8m High Fence
Property: Land Opposite Gates of Brockenhurst, Sway Road
Comments: 4. We object to this application. Given the extension of the car park on the main garage site we question the need for ongoing temporary use of this land for car parking. We are further concerned that its continued further use for this purpose compromises the local street scene and is out of character for a rural village. In particular we strongly object to the erection of a high close boarded fence which will be of significant visual detriment to the character and appearance of the area. Finally, it is our view that there is a cumulative impact on road safety with vehicle movements on both sides of the road.

Appl. No: 00398
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Rush
Proposal: Single Storey Rear Extension; Porch; Replacement Dormers; Alterations to Fenestration; Cladding; Re-Roofing of Existing Roof
Property: Dovecote House, Sway Road
Comments: 3. We support this application.

Appl. No: 00411
Applicant: Mr Perry
Proposal: Creation of Overflow Car Park
Property: Forest Park Hotel, Rhinefield Road
Comments: 4. We object to this application. We appreciate that sufficient car parking is needed to support business need, however, it is our view that the need for additional parking has not been adequately demonstrated at this time since renovation works have only recently been completed. We therefore consider that time should be allowed to assess the need for overflow parking once the Hotel has returned to operating at full capacity for a reasonable period of time. Finally, it is our view that the design and location of proposal is not in-keeping with the character of the Conservation Area and we have concerns as to the validity of the tree report associated with this application (which is two years old and shows trees which have been felled since it was produced).

Appl. No: 00414
Applicant: Mr McKee & Ms Mathews
Proposal: Porch
Property: 22 Careys Cottages
Comments: 3. We support this application.

Appl. No: 00423
Applicant: Mr Mincher
Proposal: Single Storey Extensions; 2 No. New Dormer Window; Porch; 1 No. New Rooflight
Property: The Folly, North Weirs
Comments: 2. We object to this application on the basis that the lantern roof will cause light pollution in close proximity to the open forest but would be happy to accept the Officer's decision.

Appl. No: 00432
Applicant: Mrs Jago
Proposal: Single Storey Rear Extension; Demolition of Conservatory
Property: Little Cot, Waters Green
Comments: 3. We support this application.

18/47 Correspondence:

The following items of correspondence were noted:

- a) Enforcement Parish List and Enforcement Schedule; Minerals and Waste List; Agricultural Occupancy List; and Tree Works Applications and Tree Preservation Orders lists for May 2018.
- b) Letters of objection from local residents to Application Nos. 18/00372 (Inchcolm, North Road), 18/00383 (Land Opposite Gates of Brockenhurst, Sway Road) and 18/00411 (Forest Park Hotel, Rhinefield Road).

18/48 Any Other Business None

18/49 Date of Next Meeting Tuesday 31st July 2018 at 7.00 pm.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm.