

Held at the Colbury Church Rooms, Deerleap Lane, on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2020 at 6.30pm.

**Present:** Cllr Caroline Hubbard (Chair), Cllr Sue Robinson, Cllr Mike Thomas, Cllr Andy Austin.  
**Clerk;** Helen Klaassen  
**Public;** 1

**AGENDA**

**PD/19/055 Apologies for Absence.**  
Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr White.

**PD/19/056 Declarations of Interest.**  
None.

**PD/19/057 Minutes of the Last Meeting.**  
The minutes were agreed and the Chair signed them.

**PD/19/058 Matters Arising from the Minutes.**  
It was noted that the Clerk would respond to the Habitat Mitigation Scheme (appendix 1).

**PD/19/059 Village Design Statement Review.**  
It was agreed to defer this item to the March meeting.

**PD/19/060 Planning Applications for the Committee’s Consideration;**

Case No	Address	Proposals
20/00014	21 Dene Road	Retention of outbuilding
<b>Recommend Option 4, Refusal.</b> The outbuilding affected neighbouring amenity (DP2) as it blocked the light to the neighbouring property’s kitchen and was against the requirements of DP37.		
20/00018	11 Whartons Close	Two storey extension; single storey extension; veranda; porch; alterations to fenestration
<b>Recommend Option 4, Refusal.</b> The proposals appear overbearing and inappropriately sized within the curtilage of the plot and from the street scene, which is characterised by houses set well apart in large plots. (DP2 e, SP17, DP18 a and e). The addition to the house is significant and is inappropriate to the existing dwelling in terms of scale, siting and layout (DP2 a).		
20/00019	Land Adjacent to 213 and 219 Lyndhurst Road	Change of use to car park; 2no. outbuildings to facilitate cycle hire and storage facilities; creation of vehicular and pedestrian accesses
<b>Recommend Option 4, Refusal.</b> The committee does not believe that the concerns raised from the previous application have been overcome. The site is located in an already busy area, that is accessed by visitors to the popular New Forest Hotel, the railway station and several dwellings in the area. The addition of 32 parking spaces and provision for bike hire will make this area considerably more congested and will have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity (DP2 e, f) as it provides a valuable green barrier between those properties and the railway line. Access to the site is from the main A35, and despite the up to date traffic assessment, it is disingenuous to suggest that the designation of the junction is safe, as visibility is poor for vehicles accessing the A35 from the car park and increased use may make it even less safe. It was highlighted that these proposals do not overcome previous concerns regarding safety and access.  Despite the applicant claiming otherwise, it is noted that the site is in close proximity to a designated SSSI and this development would put unnecessary pressure on that and would erode valuable habitat, as detailed in the Ecological Study (SP6).		

SP7; It is felt that the proposals do not contribute to conserving the landscape character, especially not meeting the requirement of SP7, c.

Additionally, it was noted that there were plans from Southern Rail to cut services stopping at Ashurst and therefore this may mean additional car parking is not required.

**PD/19/061 Tree Work Applications for the Committee's Consideration;**  
None.

**PD/19/062 Items for the Next Meeting.**

The meeting concluded at 19.29pm.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Appendix 1.**

It was noted that there was a disparity between the contributions for housing and visitor accommodation, in that a dwelling, regardless of size, required a total contribution of £3,512, the same being required per bedroom of visitor accommodation. It would be better that the contribution from dwellings should be on a per bedroom basis too. As a larger family property will contain more people who will have an impact than a small studio flat for example, with just one resident. This would relate more then, to the scale and kind of the development, rather than a blanket flat rate.

Mitigation schemes seem to be limited to education - encouraging behavioural change - and access management, through the employment of additional rangers. This relies on the goodwill of visitors to be considerate of the forest through their use of it, since restrictions cannot be enforced. The committee strongly felt that these measures did not go far enough. For example, consideration should be given to restoration programmes; where an increase in recreation had damaged an area that could not be rejuvenated through access management, this ought to be part of the mitigation scheme and the contribution adjusted accordingly to enable this.