

ASHURST & COLBURY PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
TUESDAY 20TH JULY 2021 at 5:30pm

This meeting was held at Colbury Church Rooms.

Attending: Cllr Sue Robinson (Chair), Cllr Andy Austin (part), Cllr Adrian Eyre,
Cllr Caroline Hubbard (Vice Chair), Cllr Clive White
In Attendance: Mrs Karen Miles, (Clerk), 5 Members of the public

MINUTES

- PD21/022 APOLOGIES** – Cllr Thomas, Cllr Austin
(Cllr Austin arrived at 7.05pm to take part in the vote for 21/00587)
- PD21/023 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** - Cllr Hubbard and Cllr White on 21/00587 – 18 Ashdene Road. Councillors did not take part in the vote when this item was discussed.
- PD21/024 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** - members of the public are invited to ask questions or make statements on new applications only during this session. Comments made by the public were noted in respect of the applications below.
- PD21/025 Minutes of the Last Meeting.** To agree and sign the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15th June 2021. **Proposed** by Cllr Adrian Eyre and **Seconded** by Cllr Caroline Hubbard, the minutes were **Agreed** and the Clerk provided a copy for the Chair to sign.
- PD021/026 Matters Arising from the Minutes.**
21/009 - 128 Lyndhurst Road Car Wash – the owner had been given until 19th July to conform to planning conditions and officers would be visiting the site to ensure that enforcement takes place. Clerk to write to NFNPA for an update.
- PD021/027 Tree Work Applications for the Committee’s Consideration** **Decision**
TPO/21/0316 - 147 Lyndhurst Road, Ashurst - Prune 2 x Oak Trees **Accept Officers Decision (5)**
- PD021/028 Planning Applications for the Committee’s Consideration**
- 21/00521 – 171 Lyndhurst Road, Ashurst – Replacement Shopfront** **Permission (1) ***
Members **agreed unanimously** that they had no objections to this application however *they would like conditions imposed that any signs were not to be illuminated externally.
- 21/00587 – 18 Ashdene Road, Ashurst – Single Storey Extension** **Permission (1)****
Whilst it was noted this is a retrospective application, Members unanimously **agreed there was no overlooking caused and therefore had **no objections** to the application. **Objection (4) Addendum attached.**
- 21/00472 – Land adj 40 Whartons Lane, Ashurst – 62 no dwellings & parking.** A working party had been formed to meet and inspect all of the applicant’s documents on the NFNPA website, along with all of the comments made by the public, which had been taken into account in the Council’s considerations. All Members present **agreed** unanimously to **object** to this application for the many reasons set out in the attached addendum.
- PD021/029 Update about 40 New Road, Ashurst**
Councillor White advised that he had not heard anything more from the Enforcement Officer at NFNPA. Clerk chased via email 20.07.21
- PD021/030 Items for the Next Meeting**
21/00472 – Land adj 40 Whartons Lane, Ashurst – 62 no dwellings & parking
QU/21/0007 - 40 New Road, Ashurst

The meeting was closed for a refreshment break between 6.45pm and 7.05pm to wait for Cllr Austin to arrive. The meeting restarted at 7.07pm

Meeting closed at 7.15pm
21/00472 – Land adj 40 Whartons Lane, Ashurst – 62 no dwellings & parking

We believe that these proposed plans do not comply (or have not been demonstrated to comply) with the following Planning Policies:

- SP1 - Supporting sustainable development**
- DP2 - General Development principles**
- SP4 - Spatial Strategy**
- SP5 - Nature Conservation Sites of International Importance**
- SP6 - The natural environment**
- SP7 - Landscape character**
- SP 11 - Climate Change**
- DP12 - Flood risk**
- SP 15 - Tranquillity**
- SP17 - Local Distinctiveness**
- DP18 - Design Principles**
- SP 19 - New residential development in the National Park**
- SP27 - Affordable housing within the defined villages**
- DP34 - Residential Character of the Defined Villages**

The Parish Council see this as an opportunity to build a truly sustainable development, showcasing initiatives such as renewable energy, grey water management systems and electric vehicle charging points. A development of exemplary design which is fit for the New Forest National Park and the Green Halo Partnership.

The Parish Council is concerned that these proposals are underpinned by supporting data which is inaccurate, misleading, inconsistent, out of date and/or incomplete. For example, out of date vehicle ownership data, traffic survey performed during a completely unrepresentative period; we believe the submitted Flood Risk assessment is factually incorrect regarding the disposal of surface water from the site; the list of amenities available in Ashurst (which is a village, not a town as the developer has described us) is incorrect (no Post Office, no hospital, one convenience store).

There has been no attempt at public engagement. The Parish Council is disappointed not to have been invited to be involved in any of the apparently extensive pre-application discussions, despite the developer having been advised to engage with us, both in person and by email.

- The plans show dwellings which are out of character with the surrounding Village houses, which are detached bungalows or houses, set back from the road with generous front gardens and on-site parking. The density and layout of the site is urban and out of character for this semi-rural area on the edge of a Village, with many dwellings fronting directly onto the street, with no front gardens or verges. We acknowledge that the density will not be the same as in Whartons Lane, however this density is significantly higher.
- The designs are generic, urban and lack local distinctiveness; they do not reflect the guidelines in the Ashurst and Colbury Village Design Statement. “The scale, form and mass of any new development should be in keeping with surrounding buildings and be sympathetic to the character, appearance and rural outlook of the village.” We object to the amount of hard-standing and close boarding proposed, as it will look harsh and suburban. Boundaries should be softened with low hedges to reflect the character of the existing Village, and to provide some screening, particularly to Whartons Close, as detailed in the Village Design Statement
- We are concerned about the visual impact of some dwellings which will be on a higher level than others on the site; also about possible overlooking of neighbouring properties, in particular 40 Whartons Lane and 2,4 and 6 Whartons Close, through the gap in the trees in the northern boundary (“Distance view line”). There is a lack of detail in the planning application about what could be a considerable uplift in levels (Section C.C)
- We believe that these plans demonstrate overdevelopment, as evidenced by the lack of front gardens, use of tandem parking and close grouping of dwellings. This is presumably driven by the site specific

constraints, such as parts of the site falling within surface water flood risk, and the need to include SUDS attenuation ponds.

- Local residents have repeatedly experienced flooding in gardens and roads when it rains. The drainage strategy suggests surface water will be discharged into headwall outfalls which then flows into a ditch - we believe this is incorrect, and that the outfalls flow into a pipe which runs under the Park. Any increase in surface water runoff may overload this pipe - the Park is also affected by flooding, being the site of a previous lake.
- We are concerned that the submitted surveys of drainage are incomplete or misleading; any assessment of potential impact upon local flooding cannot be reliable until the underpinning data is robust.
- There are already significant problems with traffic and parking in Whartons Lane, which will be worsened by this development. The availability of local amenities and convenient public transport in Ashurst has been significantly overstated by the developer; most residents will use cars to access employment and other amenities.
- Car parking provision is not well integrated into the design. Parking which is not adjacent to the dwelling will cause difficulties for the elderly, infirm or wheelchair users. This will lead to on street parking if deliveries are made or items need to be unloaded from vehicles; this could impede emergency access to the site.
- The size of the parking spaces and use of surrounding fencing will make it very difficult for residents to park (works) vans or motorhomes in them, or for wheelchair users to be able to access their vehicles.
- Four visitor parking spaces is inadequate for 62 dwellings, this will lead to overspill parking on Whartons Lane, or on street parking on the site.
- The flats do not have private green space; this will result in significantly increased use of the Queen Elizabeth Field opposite, as the open space provided in the development will not be adequate for this number of residents. There are safety concerns regarding people crossing the road; it can be very busy at peak times, and visibility can be obscured by parked cars.
- The documentation on the Planning Portal do not make clear who will bear responsibility for maintenance (in perpetuity) of the attenuation ponds, green spaces and any new planting. Clarity is needed from the developer with regard to who will be responsible for the costs of ongoing maintenance.
- Residents have seen a wide variety of wildlife in the field, including Deer, Buzzards, Foxes, Pine Martens, Bats, Owls and Sparrow Hawks. Following the development, wildlife currently inhabiting the fields will move to the woodland at Foxhills. The Queen Elizabeth 2 Park opposite is not a suitable alternative habitat for wildlife, being used by children and dog walkers.
- We have concerns about light pollution in an area which is currently very dark at night. In particular, the bollard lighting on the perimeter path will impact the woodland and wildlife at Foxhills. This is contrary to the NFNPA Dark Skies policy, as there would be a continuous glow which will impact upon wildlife. We would ask that there be no lighting on the perimeter path, to avoid overspill.
- The proposed lighting of the central spine road, cul-de-sacs, and along the Whartons Lane frontage is suburban, and is excessive for this semi-rural area. It proposes a significantly greater density of 5m street lighting columns than the existing street lighting in the surrounding roads, which would be out of keeping with the local area. We have grave concerns regarding the level of street lighting that Hampshire County Council may require, which could cause significant light pollution.
- We note the Ecologist and Landscape Officer objection to these proposals, and that the Building Design & Conservation Area Officer is unable to support these proposals. Natural England commented that further information is required, "as submitted, the application could have potential significant effects on the NF SSI, NF SPA, NF Ramsar site, NF SAC"; additionally other sites also.
- The proposals do not include any sustainable design features beyond those required to meet the minimum requirements of the Building Act.

- Why is there no mention of, for example, Solar panels, ground source heat pumps, or provision for electric vehicle charging? The developers have stated that “photovoltaics will provide renewable energy”, but do not give any details of where this will be utilised.
- There are no one or two bedroom flats available for private sale. This does not meet the needs of local residents, some of whom wish to downsize and stay in Ashurst. The Local Plan (7.11) states that “the population of the National Park aged 60 and over has increased by 24% over the 2002 - 2012 period with most age groups up to the age of 59 having decreased over the same period. This trend is predicted to continue over the Plan period”. During the consultation on the Local Plan, Ashurst and Colbury Parish Council noted that “A projected 28% growth in the 65+ age bracket from 2011-2021 suggests that at least 28% of open market dwellings should be for older people.” and requested that “No less than 25% to comprise small bungalows allowing for elderly residents”.
- The developers have commented that “private flats for sale were uncharacteristic of the area” - surely this also applies to the proposed affordable housing/shared ownership flats. It would be possible to allocate some of these flats for private sale, and more of the larger houses as affordable housing; the NFDC Housing Strategy report commented that it is “disappointing that ...scheme...not included rented homes providing 4 bedrooms for larger families, especially given the strategic evidence base as well as the evidence of need on the District Council’s Housing Register”
- The developers commented that the Ashurst & Colbury Parish Questionnaire 2018 “showed a strong desire for family housing” - in fact, 208 people wanted retirement/downsizing dwellings, and 183 wanted family housing