

FORDINGBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

**Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 12th February 2014 at
7.30 pm. in the Town Hall**

Present:

Cllr Fulford – Chairman

Cllrs Adams, Anstey, Hale, Price, Lewendon, (A) Wilson & (G) Wilson

In attendance:

Miss D Vine, Assistant Clerk

Mr T Denne, Fordingbridge Society

9 Members of the Public

1. Apologies

There were apologies from Cllrs Buchanan, Paton & Connolly.

2. To receive any Declarations of Interest

Cllr Adams declared an interest in applications 13/11208 and 14/10052 as the applicants are customers. He would remain in the meeting but would not speak or vote on these applications.

3. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on the 15th January 2014 and report on any matters arising

It was proposed by Cllr (A) Wilson and seconded by Cllr Price and **RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the meeting held on 15th January 2014 be signed as a true record.

Matters Arising

There were no matter arising.

4. To receive any matters raised by members of the Public

None Raised.

5. To report any results on Planning Applications

13/11549 18-20 High St, Fordingbridge SP6 1AX

Mellors Property Holding Co

(NB: Subject to Legal Agreement)

Retention of 2 flats on first and second floors; 3 rooflights; entrance door

GRANTED subject to conditions

13/11479 19 Victoria Road, SP6 1DD

Mr & Mrs Ruark-Davis

Single storey front and side extension

GRANTED subject to conditions

Appeal Decision

APP/B1740/C/13/2202662 Highfield Farm, Midgham Road, SP6 3BX Mr R Wilson

Appeal ALLOWED and planning permission GRANTED

2 Members of the public entered the Meeting

6. To consider new Planning Applications

14/10017 5 – 7 Salisbury Street

Mr & Mrs Scriven

Create door & windows; 4 dormers; staircase; stud walls (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Cllr Fulford reported

This application has already been considered by Members and supported for planning consent at the meeting on the 15th January 2014. This listed building application proposes to use part of the upper floors as a two bedroom residential flat. Internal alterations are proposed. A new doorway would be installed on the front elevation, new windows on the first floor rear elevation and four dormer windows. The purpose of this application was to seek Listed Building Consent for internal alterations required to accommodate the dormer windows and new staircase which would affect the historic fabric of the building. All proposed alterations seek to preserve, enhance and ensure longevity of the building.

The Fordingbridge Society supported the application.

It was proposed by Cllr Hale and seconded by Cllr Lewendon and **RESOLVED:** that the application be supported under Option 3 as it will preserve and improve the listed building and the renovated building will add amenity value to the centre of Fordingbridge.

14/10026 Land to rear of 24 Church St

Mr I Lemon

Conversion & extension of outbuildings to create 1 dwelling; parking; access

Cllr Fulford reported

The site contains a detached two storey dwelling with rooms in the roof, and from the street the building appears to be an early 18C dwelling. The property has had some more recent additions including the single storey side extension, which are unsympathetic additions to the building and these have now been removed. The existing property is located on the road frontage and contains a relatively large rear garden area with many trees, vegetation and greenery, which contributes to its 'green setting' and provides a pleasant rear garden area in a high density location near the town centre. The existing garden possesses some detached brick outbuildings, which can be viewed from the road and neighbouring properties, although they are not in a good condition. No 24 Church Street is grade 11 listed and the site lies within the Conservation Area.

The context of the area is predominately residential with a mixture of property types and styles. This part of Church Street contains a plethora of older and more traditional residential properties in a historic context with some properties located close to the road frontage, with limited on street car parking spaces and front gardens. There has been some more modern development along Church Street, with some development opening up to the rear, however, this is rather limited. On the north side of Church Street, to the rear of the site, is a high density modern residential area, which does not contribute to the character of the area, but cannot be seen from Church Street. It would seem that the existing garden area of No 24 has several trees along the side and rear boundaries of the site, which screen that modern housing development.

In terms of the planning history of the site, planning permission and listed building consent has been granted to convert the existing dwelling into two residential units, together with the demolition of the existing single storey extensions, and two detached outbuildings and a new access driveway, parking and turning within part of the rear garden area under references 97751 and 97752. Whilst this has not been implemented, works are being carried out to implement the permission.

A separate planning application was also approved for a detached single storey one bedroom dwelling. The approved dwelling would be a single storey rectangular building accommodating one bedroom, and would be sited to the north eastern corner of the site broadly in the footprint of the existing detached outbuildings, which would be demolished. No works have commenced to implement that permission.

This current planning application is a slightly variation to that previously approved and proposes the conversion and extension to the existing detached outbuildings to create a one bedroom dwelling, together with car parking and access. In comparison to that previously approved, the main difference is that instead of demolishing the two existing outbuildings, it is proposed to convert and renovate the buildings. There are also changes in the design and appearance of the building, but the changes are not significant.

The resultant building would be an innovative proposal to reuse the existing buildings and would result in a low profile building using a variety of materials including timber boarding, glazing, green roofs, glazing, tiles and brick. Cllr Fulford congratulated Mr Lemon, who was present at the meeting, for his idea. Cllr Lewendon commented that it was nice to see old buildings being used and Fordingbridge needed more 1 bedroom properties.

The Fordingbridge Society supported the application adding that it was a creative use of existing buildings and innovative technology.

It was proposed by Cllr Lewendon and seconded by Cllr price and **RESOLVED:** that the application be supported under Option 3 as it made good use of existing buildings.

1 member of the public entered the meeting

14/10106 31 Salisbury Street, SP6 1AB

Mr E Simsson

Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 12/99321 to allow continued use for another 3 years.

Cllr Fulford reported.

The application is made for renewal of ref. 12/99321 to allow continued use of the premises as a personal health clinic/centre for weight loss and fitness purposes, involving one-to-one and one-to-two consultation/coaching sessions, with limited equipment including weights, a rowing machine and a static bike.

Condition no. 1 applied to ref. 12/99321 granted permission for the proposed use for a temporary period of one year. The condition was applied following concerns raised by the Environmental Protection Section, as the use entailed some physical training on the premises, which may have implications for amenity of the flat above in terms of noise transmission. At the time of reporting no problems in respect of noise had been recorded.

The proposed use does not involve any physical alterations to the building and the proposal would cause no harm to the heritage asset . Of 13 units fronting Salisbury Street within the frontage in the locality, ten are A1 (retail), two are A2 (financial and professional) and one is B1 (office). Introduction of a D1 use of the scale proposed, retains a commercial use within the frontage.

The Fordingbridge Society had no objections.

It was proposed by Cllr (A) Wilson and seconded by Cllr Lewendon and **RESOLVED:** that the application be supported under Option 3 as it is continued use of a successful business.

Cllr Perkins entered the meeting, gave apologies and advised that he was on flood duty at Fordingbridge Junior School.

14/10052 5 Langley Garden, SP6 1QL

Crownshade Ltd

Double garage

Cllr (G) Wilson reported.

Chairman

3

12.03.14

The property is a detached bungalow in an estate of similar properties. An integral garage is located within the property. The dwelling is set back from the road and whilst the front garden is open plan there are a number of high shrubs which screen the garden to the side of the property. The proposal is for a flat roofed garage which is positioned to the side of the property. Whilst a low height outbuilding would normally be Permitted Development, the original planning decision for the property contained a condition restricting Permitted Development rights. To retain the attractive screening along Salisbury Road no walls, fences or buildings are permitted without planning consent.

The proposed garage would have a low flat roof and whilst a pitched roof is normally preferred, in this location the low flat roof is considered beneficial as it would have less visual impact on the area. The low height of the proposed garage would mean that it would have limited impact on the street scenes within both Langley Gardens and Salisbury Road.

There would be a gap of approximately 1.5 metres from the side of the proposed garage and the shared boundary with number 7. This boundary consists of a fairly high picket fence and shrubs. Given the low height of the proposed garage the impact on this neighbour in terms of loss of light or visual intrusion would not appear unacceptable.

NFDC have indicated that wooden cladding would be preferable in the construction of the garage as this would blend in with the garden and fencing.

There is a tree adjacent to the rear boundary which is fairly attractive and therefore the Council's Arboricultural Officer will be consulted. This tree is not currently protected with any Tree Preservation Order.

Members queried the recommendation by NFDC for wooden cladding as the house is red brick and although in keeping with the fencing did not blend in with the house or other properties.

The Fordingbridge Society had no objections but welcomed consultation with the Arboricultural Officer concerning the birch tree.

It was proposed by Cllr Hale that the application be supported under Option 1 allowing the officers to determine the application under delegated powers. There was no seconder for this proposal.

Cllr Fulford asked for another proposal.

It was proposed by Cllr Anstey and seconded by Cllr (A) Wilson and **RESOLVED:** that the application be supported under Option 3, but with a query raised in respect of the use of wooden cladding.

Cllr Adams abstained.

2 members of the public entered the meeting

13/11208 Normandy, Whitsbury Rd, Tinkers Cross
Retention of shed to front of the property

Mr C Marshallsay

Cllr Hale reported

The property is a detached bungalow in a row of dwellings which are a mixture of styles and the area is designated as Countryside outside the New Forest. Opposite the site are fields with a small field shelter. The front boundary consists of high hedges with high gates forming the entrance to the front garden. The level of the land rises up from the road to the property. A large wooden

outbuilding has been erected within the front garden close to the boundary to the north. This shared boundary with the neighbouring property called Fieldens consists of a low fence, some planting has been added between the outbuilding and this fence.

The application seeks permission for the retention of the outbuilding within the front garden. The main issues to take into consideration when assessing this application is the impact on the street scene, the effect on the Countryside and neighbour amenity. The shed has a height of 2.56 metres, the length alongside the shared boundary is 9.5 metres and it has a width of 5.16 metres. The neighbour to the north, Fieldens, has a large front window on the ground floor of the elevation facing the highway. This window serves a lounge and the shed is clearly viewed from this room, further views of the shed are from the first floor windows and from the front garden. The excessive length and width of the shed along with the close proximity to the shared boundary mean that there is an impact on this neighbour in terms of visual intrusion.

There is a field shelter in the field opposite but this is on lower ground and has a low height which along with the high hedges on the boundary means that this does not have a significant impact on the street scene.

There are no other outbuildings within the front gardens within this area and therefore the shed is out of keeping. The front gardens in this area provide a sense of space and openness. The neighbouring property at Fielden's has a low wall forming the front boundary and therefore the shed is clearly viewed from the road. The excessive length and width of the shed in this front garden location is visually intrusive on the street scene and is therefore detrimental to the Countryside and contrary to local policy. Furthermore, Policy CO-H2 only allows outbuildings within the Countryside if they are incidental to the main dwelling.

Members discussed the application and were shown photographs. Cllr Fulford queried why the application was for retention of the shed as it appeared that planning consent had not been applied for and therefore this should be a retrospective application.

Cllr Fulford asked for comments from members of the public who had indicated their wish to speak in objection of the application. Mr Hockey, owner of Fieldens, advised that the shed had been built in July 2013 and was being used as storage for a carpet business. He advised that the shed obstructed the view from his lounge and that the size was inappropriate. Mrs Plumridge, owner of Ambridge and neighbour of Mr Hockey also advised that the shed was visually intrusive. An objection to the application had been made to NFDC. Mr Dispain re-iterated the views of Mr Hockey and Mrs Plumridge.

The Fordingbridge Society objected to the application on the basis of visual intrusion on the neighbours, it is not in keeping with the area and also queried why the building was not subject to a retrospective planning application.

It was proposed by Cllr Anstey and seconded by Cllr Lewendon and **RESOLVED:** that the application be recommended for refusal, Option 4 as it is visually intrusive and contrary to local policy.

Cllr Adams abstained.

Mr Lemon left the meeting

14/10128 9 Downwood Close, SP6 1EA
First Floor front extension; porch

Mr & Mrs K Pelling

Cllr Anstey reported

The property comprises a detached house situated in a built up area of Fordingbridge comprising of mixed dwellings. The proposal is to build a first floor front extension and porch over the existing garage, cloakroom and front door. The principal elevation is set back so is well positioned to take the extension. The ridge height of the roof is lower than the existing roof. The extension is not considered intrusive and has no visual impact on neighbours.

The Fordingbridge Society had no objections.

It was proposed by Cllr Hale and seconded by Cllr Lewendon and **RESOLVED:** that the application be supported under Option 3 as it is a good use of existing space and has no visual impact on neighbouring properties.

14/10129 24 Dudley Avenue, SP6 1HF

Mr & Mrs L Jefferies

Single storey rear extension; new roof over existing garage; roof light

Cllr (A) Wilson reported

The property comprises a detached house situated in a built up area of Fordingbridge comprising a mixture of houses and bungalows. At present there is a small existing store room extending from the rear of the garage. The proposal is to remove this and extend from the garage to create a garden room and additional bedroom with a pitched roof over both the garage and extension. Cllr Fulford queried the projection distance from the existing rear wall as the plans are not clear in this respect but the overall opinion is that the extension is quite large and from measurements shown is extremely close to the boundary with No 22.fence and would have visual impact.

The Fordingbridge Society objected to the application on the basis that it is too large and the position will cast shadow into the neighbouring garden.

It was proposed by Cllr Lewendon and seconded by Cllr Anstey and **RESOLVED:** that the application be recommended for refusal, Option 4 as the extension is too large and will impact on neighbours.

Tree Works - Details can be viewed on the web site at : trees@newforestnpa.gov.uk

TPO/14/0091 81 Allenwater Drive, Fordingbridge, SP6 1RE

T1 & T2 Sycamore – Fell

Both in poor condition with pockets of decay

R14/15/14/0158 Bridge House, 15 Bridge Street, SP6 1AH

Fell 1 Willow and 1 Ash

For information only – no comments required

R14/15/14/0011 Mews Hill, Southampton Road, Fordingbridge, SP6 2JT

Fell Ash – Decay at base

Noted by members.

7. To consider any Licensing Act 2003 applications

TEN/4982/LICTE/14/00770 – PS

28/02/2014 19.00 TO 23.00

Fordingbridge Junior School, Pennys Lane, SP6 1HJ

Adult only Quiz Night – sale of alcohol and regulated entertainment 80 people

LICPR/14/00394 New Forest Water Park, Ringwood Road, SP6 2EY

Application for Grant of Premises Licence (S17)

Noted by Members.

8. HCC draft Statement of Community Involvement Consultation

Members had received details of the link to this document www.hants.gov.uk/county-planning
It was AGREED that Cllr Fulford would formulate a response on behalf of the Council.

9. To note any items of correspondence

Nothing to report

10. To receive a report from the Clerk or any other relevant planning business

Cllr Lewendon requested that members look at the effect on the town of the lack of efficient drainage once the current flooding situation had eased, especially with the proposed Whitsbury Road development. There will be a need for more new mains drainage as existing drains would be unable to cope and assurances would be required that would need to be included in any future planning application from the developer.

11. To note the date of the next meeting as 12th March 2014.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm.