MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ASHURST AND COLBURY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

Held at the Church Rooms, Colbury Church on 15th January 2019 at 6.30pm.

Present: Cllr Caroline Hubbard, Cllr Clive White, Cllr Mike Thomas.
Clerk; Helen Klaassen
Also in attendance; Cllr Andy Austin

PD/231 Apologies for Absence.
None.

PD/232 Declarations of Interest.
None.

PD/233 Minutes of the Last Meeting.
The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting and were signed by the Chair.

PD/234 Matters Arising from the Minutes.
It was noted that 7 Wingrove Road and 4 Beech Road had permission granted.

PD/235 Planning Applications for the Committee’s Consideration;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case no.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/00961</td>
<td>18 Woodlands Road</td>
<td>Replacement dwelling; creation of raised patio area; 2-metre-high fencing; demolition of existing dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Option 4 Recommend REFUSAL.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed ‘regency’ style design of the new property is deemed to be vastly inappropriate to the character of the immediate and wider area, as it is a marked contrast to the properties surrounding it and with the wider New Forest vernacular, going against both policies CP8 and DP6 (NPPF S12 and S15). Whilst it was noted that Woodlands Road is home to variety of architectural styles they tend to be within a similar realm to each other. The proposed design is unacceptable in this location, fronting onto New Forest SSSI and is not compliant with policy DP1 A, B, and C. There was concern that to allow a property of this design would set an undesirable precedent which may have a negative impact on the character of the area. The committee had no objection to the replacement of the current property within the confines of policy DP10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/00947</td>
<td>30 Chestnut Drive</td>
<td>Single storey side extension with pitched roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommend Option 5; We are happy to accept the decision reached by the National Park Authority’s Officers under their delegated powers.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It was noted that the proposed extension was not visible from the street and therefore presented no impact on the street scene. The committee felt that the design was in keeping with the property and did not present any adverse impacts on neighbouring properties, thus meeting the requirements of DP1 and DP11. The committee did however, note and concur with the tree officer’s comments regarding the trees near to the property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PD/236 Tree Work Applications for the Committee’s Consideration.
None.
**PD/237  Any Other Business.**

The response from David Illsley was mentioned, but it was decided to leave discussion for the impending full council meeting where it was an agenda item.

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 7.26pm.

Signed: __________________________

Date: __________________________