

## Sway Parish Council Planning and Transport Committee

A meeting of the Planning and Transport Committee was held at the Jubilee Field Pavilion, Station Road, Sway on Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2014.

**Present:** Councillors Stephen Tarling (**Chair**), Kevin Cripps (**Vice Chair**), Peter Dance, Carole Gates, David Golby and Kevin Langford.

**In attendance:** Susan Brayley (Parish Clerk), John Warden (Transport Representative), Len Thomas (Community SpeedWatch Representative) and Sway News, together with 5 members of the public.

### **PT176/14 - Apologies**

None.

### **PT177/14 - Declarations of Interest**

None.

### **PT178/14 - Minutes of the Meeting held on the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014 and Matters Arising**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014 were approved with some minor adjustments and signed.

Matters Arising – Kings Lane Nursery - Chair advised that a NFDC Land Drainage Engineer was looking into the question of surface water disposal. in connection with the report submitted by the applicants and had sent his findings back to them.

### **PT179/14 - Outcome of Planning Applications Considered at Previous Meetings**

14/00503 - Forest Paradise, Silver Street, HORDLE - Temporary siting of a mobile home for an agricultural worker; barn. - Grant subject to conditions.

14/00777 - Broadley Brake, Middle Road, Tiptoe - First floor extension. – Refuse

14/00838 - Little Meadow, Manchester Road - Single storey extensions; roof alterations to facilitate first floor accommodation; alterations to conservatory; rooflights - Grant subject to conditions.

14/00850 - 8 Normandy Close - Addition of cladding to rear elevation – Grant

14/00818 - Waldon, Kings Lane - First floor rear extension - Grant subject to conditions.

### **PT180/14 - New Tree Preservation Orders - None**

### **PT181/14 – Applications for Tree Works / New Planning Applications**

#### **1) Applications for Tree Works**

#### **TPO/14/1300 – 25 Stanford Rise – 2 X Oak Trees – Remove.**

The Chair reported he had visited the site, but was unable to see anything from the road and there was little information on the file to assist Cllrs in making a decision. However had been assured by the Senior Tree Officer that either he or one of his staff will check carefully and refuse this if the trees are in good condition and of amenity value. The Chair also observed that the application came from a reputable fully trained local arboricultural specialist.

Cllr Golby observed that there were a number of mature trees in Stanford Rise, all of which were there before the houses.

Cllr Dance concurred with Cllr Golby, adding that he would like to see all the trees in Stanford Rise reviewed by the Tree Officers. He also agreed there was insufficient information to make

a decision as the application lacked an arboricultural report, plans or photographs, and it was agreed that that point should be made to the Tree Team.

## **2) New Planning Applications**

### **14/00909 – Green Croft, Manchester Road – Replacement dwelling and garage; demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings.**

Cllr Golby observed that this was one of the few remaining Cob dwellings left in the village and demolition of it would infringe policy DP10. In addition considered the proposed replacement building was oversized for the site and also breached the Sway VDS – recommended option 4 - Refuse.

Cllr Cripps agreed adding also infringes policy CP8.

The Chair observed also breached policies DP9; CP7 and DP1.

Cllr Cripps observed he considered the Officer's report was poor.

The Chair reported had been advised that morning the Planning Officer and Heritage Officer intended to visit the site soon, and invited a member of the public who was indicating an interest to speak.

The member of the public stated he was a close (side) neighbour to the property and was objecting strongly to the proposal for the following reasons:- it would be too close to the rear fence and would overlook his property; had been aligned with the back of the existing in order to get the garage in front of the property, but still looking for the biggest living area possible. Had no argument with the existing footprint, but the proposal had been pushed back to create as much parking space as possible. He advised that Planners had previously rejected windows overlooking neighbouring properties in neighbouring properties applications so why should they be permitted in this?

Cllr Cripps observed this had been rejected in Belvedere Cottage, Manchester Rd.

A member of the public asked if the existing was actually Cob.

Cllr Gates replied not all was Cob, was a rather tumbledown of Cob and other materials.

The Chair observed that was why the Heritage Officer was due to visit.

Cllr Gates stated she did not agree with the proposal.

Cllr Langford observed that someone had bought a property that was far too small for their family with the intent to develop as much as possible.

It was unanimously agreed to choose option 4 – Refuse, with following comments:-

This application contravenes policies DP1, CP7, CP8, DP9 and DP10 of the NFNPA. This would not maintain or enhance local vernacular character, the proposed dwelling is not appropriate in scale, form or layout, crowding the plot for its full width and being oppressive to the neighbours. This does not respect the spacious plots that characterise the area, and the garage at the front is clearly inappropriate to even the poorly defined building line.

The Sway Village Design Statement (which is a Supplementary Planning Document) includes Guidelines which are defined as “express specific design criteria that will influence planning decisions.” And this application is not in line with the following Guidelines:

- Proposals should protect, maintain or enhance buildings considered to be of local historic and vernacular importance, wherever possible retaining original features such as roof coverings, windows, doors, chimneys.
- Any new developments should consider the need to maintain generous plot sizes.
- Extensions to existing properties should maintain space between existing properties to avoid overcrowding.
- New developments or extensions within the defined village should consider the development in its immediate area and blend its style, design and materials with the local properties in that area.
- The design of new development within the defined village roughly between Manchester Road, Brighton/Station Road and Church Lane and especially those houses which presently have large gardens should respect the spacious character of the locality and not lead to inappropriate high density development.
- Garages, outbuildings or carports should not be positioned in front of the house.

Additional guidelines on Boundaries do not encourage 1.8m close-boarded fencing.

**14/00948 – Arnewood Court Farm House, Barrows Lane – Two storey extension; roof alterations to facilitate additional second floor accommodation; 3 no. roof lights; detached garage; (demolition of single storey side and rear extensions and garage).**

The Chair observed was a continuation of 14/00253 (amended) and that for that previous application the applicant came to our committee meeting to assure us that every care for this conservation area would be taken and as much preserved as possible. However this had not happened and he was therefore now far more wary. There were at the time of the earlier application curved walls forming an elegant entrance which match the style of this conservation area – and may well be considered part of the listed walls. The plans say “Existing walls to be retained”. Condition 2 of the decision says that “Development shall only be carried out in accordance with drawings...” The view of the front as seen now is above right – those elegant curved brick walls have disappeared. The Chair also reminded Cllrs of the assurances given that the conditions previously set regarding the location within the Conservation Area, preservation of the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings and protection of trees and neighbouring amenities would be met, advising that then there seemed to have been a disregard for the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings and the removal of all trees. Reporting that the Officers briefing (issued on the 10/12/2014) observed “*The main issues were to consider are whether the proposal would therefore comprise an extension in excess of the 30% and whether it would add to the bulk and visual impact of the property.*” It was reported that section 14.02 of the accompanying Design and Access Statement confesses that it does exceed the 30% rule and should be refused with an option 4, with that as the reason; as this has been the consistent approach by Sway to the implementation of DP11 for fear of setting a precedent and opening the floodgates.

This view was supported by the other Cllrs and it was unanimously agreed to give following response:-

4: We recommend REFUSAL, for the reasons listed below.

Application exceeds the 30% limit of DP11 and Sway have consistently recommended refusal of any such applications, due to the precedent this would set.

The letter and spirit of the previous application 14/00253 (amended) and the conditions thereof have not been followed.

If the application were to be amended to fall within the 30% limit (or so close as to be truly de minimus) then Sway Parish Council would want to be consulted on the amendments (whatever they might be) and would insist that a condition be added to ensure a landscaping plan is first agreed and that it is sympathetic to the Conservation Area and the adjacent Listed Buildings; and includes the rebuilding of the curved walls to match the original demolished ones to the satisfaction of the NFNPA, and includes a suitable planting and maintenance of trees.

**14/00905 – Meadow Way, Mill Lane - Single storey extension; 1no. Rooflight**

It was observed that this was a modest extension, with a flat roof that would normally be regarded as in breach of the Sway VDS, however as there is no obvious alternative construction and the roof was not visible from the road, this should not be an issue. The following response was unanimously agreed:-

1: We recommend PERMISSION, for the reasons listed below, but would accept the decision reached by the National Park Authority's Officers under their delegated powers.

This is a modest extension and although it has a flat roof which is not in line with the Sway Village Design Statement this would not be visible from the road and there are no obvious alternatives. We would also want to ensure that the views of the neighbours at Casabrana are considered.

**Action:** The Clerk to convey the above responses to the Planners of the New Forest National Park Authority.

#### **PT182/14 Update on Planning Enforcement**

The Chair reported that the month had started with eight investigations, three have been resolved and closed (as reported last month):- The Paddock, Middle Road, Tiptoe, (listed due to an NFNPA error); Cago Cottage, Crabbswood Lane, (have agreed to cease using the dwelling as a commercial wedding venue); and Land adj High Forest, Manchester Road (investigated and found to be accordance with approved plans). One investigation has been added: The Estate Office, Station Road SO41 6AB Unauthorised development - extension. Making six investigations going forward – the lowest for some time.

**PT183/14 Planning Inspectorate and Enforcement Appeals –** As reported last month formal notice of the appeal against decision 14/00722 - Moorlands, Middle Road, has been received from the NFNPA. Chair stated his surprise that the letter informing us of this appeal says Sway Parish Council are not given an opportunity to comment on this appeal. Clerk advised this was the usual case. That being the case the committee will consider reiterating their support for the NFNPA position to the planning officer in due course.

#### **PT184/14 NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee –**

Chair advised two applications affecting Sway were due to be heard at the meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> December - 14/00817 land at Limolands Farm, Vaggs Lane SO41 0FP - Construction of a 14 hectare solar farm, to include solar panels to generate electricity, associated plant buildings; perimeter fencing; cctv cameras; landscaping and associated works. Was before the committee as an “Application of Local Significance”. The officer’s report recommends refusal. And 14/00862 Part parcel OS 0054 & 7740, Great Break Field, North Common Lane SO41 8LL Application to vary condition 1 of planning permission reference 13/98434 to allow permanent siting of 3 storage units. Comes before the committee because the officer recommends granting permission.

Cllr Golby reiterated that he was against the storage units having permanent status as were temporary structures.

Reporting that the Clerk had already registered the Council’s interest, the Chair stated he would attend on Council’s behalf and would circulate draft comments for agreement prior to the meeting. This was unanimously agreed.

#### **PT185/14 Other Planning Issues –**

Cllr Cripps reported that two properties in Manchester Road had had large expanses of tarmac laid apparently without permission. Clerk to refer to Planning Enforcement. **Action Clerk**

**PT186/14 Reviewing New or Amended Policies from External Bodies such as the NFNPA, NFDC, DCLG – None**

#### **PT187/14 To Agree Sway’s Response to the Initial Draft of the New Forest National Park Authority Management Plan 2015 – 2020.**

The Chair thanked Cllr Golby for his feedback and recommended using the previously circulated draft as the response to the NFNPA. Agreed unanimously.

#### **PT188/14 Report by the Parish Council’s Transport Representative**

John Warden reported that the figures remained the 50’s, however more new users had enrolled.

#### **PT189/14 Roads, Hedges and Ditches**

Cllr Golby reported being alerted by residents who had received letters from HCC contractor advising that two of the lights on the dark northern corner of Manchester Road would not be

replaced due to concerns of the safety of operatives installing them and that the existing would be switched off. The Clerk took a copy of the letter in order to contact the HCC Officer concerned. Cllr Langford reiterated his comments previously concerning problems with the new lighting, including a new lamp post obstructing wheelchair and pushchair access. Chair asked Cllr Langford to report the problems as advised in the previous month's meeting.

**PT190/14 Community Speedwatch**

Len Thomas circulated the CSW report up to 6<sup>th</sup> December 2014 (attached). The teams had set up in different locations this time, including Manchester Road where no speeding had been recorded, but the same could not be said of the Pitmore Lane area. There were still problems with the Police follow up, or lack of it to be more precise. Cllr Cripps asked if the official SID could be utilised to raise awareness, it was agreed this should be sighted on Durnstown entering Sway close to the Hare & Hounds. Clerk to contact NFDC Transport Department to arrange set up.

Len also reported attending a meeting by invitation at Hampshire Police HQ at Netley, had been introduced to the Police CSW contacts (amongst others) and had come away with a number of concerns following this. Was agreed to investigate further in the New Year.

**PT191/14 Correspondence and Any Other Business**

The Chair advised receiving the "Rights of Way Vegetation Priority Cutting Lists" for 2015, from the Clerk, response required by 1<sup>st</sup> February (latest) Cllr Dance offered assistance with checking the paths and responding.

Had also received the "Waste of Space" request for mapping brownfield sites as part of the CPRE countryside protection scheme and had added one site.

Finally the Chair was pleased to report the "Our Past, Our Future" initiative had got past the first stage of its application to the Lottery Heritage Fund. As most applications achieving this went on to receive funding this was looking hopeful. Sway could have a good chance of being part of this as was being centred on sites just outside the Crown Lands.

**PT192/14 Dates of Future Meetings**

The following dates were noted:-

Thursday	22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2015	Jubilee Field Pavilion
Thursday	19 <sup>th</sup> February 2015	Jubilee Field Pavilion
Thursday	19 <sup>th</sup> March 2015	Jubilee Field Pavilion

There being no further business, the Chair welcomed a new "face" to Sway and then closed the meeting at 8.45pm.

.....  
Chair of Committee

Sway Community Speed Watch details  
up to Saturday 6 December 2014

- 1 - Since we started speed watch in April this year we have
- performed 123.5 hours of speed watch sessions
  - each session covered by at least 3 volunteers
  - each hour of session requiring another hour or more to complete the paperwork along with planning and analysis etc, this equates to well over 580 person hours

- 2 - In this time we have recorded 1919 vehicle details of speeders
- 93 have been recorded speeding twice
  - 13 have been recorded three times
  - 2 have been recorded four times!
- Sadly, not all this data has been acted upon as 638 records have been lost (see overleaf).

- 3 - We only take details of vehicles that are exceeding the speed limit by 10% + 2 mph (ie 35 mph or more in a 30 mph speed limit) as per ACPO guidelines. Even then we are often unable to note everybody who speeds. Since July, we have collected data that is recorded in the Speed Indicator Device itself. This shows:
- We have missed 834 offenders (tailgaters or those who avoid passing us!)
  - 45% of all motorists exceed the 30 mph speed limit
  - 16% exceed it going at 35 mph or more
  - There continues to be a slight downward trend in the percentage of vehicles just exceeding 30 mph (31-34mph) but trends for the higher speeds are unchanged.

Specific data for this last week (1 December to 6 December)

Number of sessions = 5 (totalling 8 hours)	
person hours at road side	= 25
person hours completing forms	= 8 (approx)
person hours creating and analysing stats	= 2 (approx)
person hours initial planning	= 2 (approx)
person hours tracking data loss and other errors	= 5 (approx)
person hours attending function at Netley	= 8
Total for this last week	= 50 person hours

Sessions:	hours	vehicles reported
1/12/14 am Pitmore Mid	2	42 vehicles
2/12/14 am Pitmore North	1	8 vehicles
3/12/14 am Arnewood Bridge rd	2	75 vehicles
4/12/14 am Manchester Rd	1	0 vehicles
5/12/14 am Pitmore South	2	55 vehicles
6/12/14 am Durnstown	0	cancelled
Total	8	180 vehicles

Previous totals per week of SID use in Sway  
(These are revised figures following in depth analysis of data losses)

April 28-May 2 (24 hrs) = 290 resulting in 0 letters, so 290 lost  
 June 2 – June 6 (18 hrs) = 244 resulting in 180 letters, 44 failed PNC, 20 lost  
 June 30 – July 4 (12 hrs) = 232 resulting in 166 letters, 13 failed PNC, 53 lost  
 July 21 – July 25 (20 hrs) = 260 resulting in 115 letters, 10 failed PNC, 135 lost  
 Sept 8 – Sept 12 (18 hrs) = 363 resulting in 211 letters, 20 failed PNC, 132 lost  
 Oct 6 - Oct 11 (18 hrs) = 286 resulting in 255 letters, 23 failed PNC, 8 lost

Nov 4 – Nov 8 (5.5 hrs) = 64 resulting in 64 letters, 0 fail, 0 lost  
Total (115.5 hrs) = 1739 resulting in 991 letters, 110 failed PNC, and 638 lost

So 748 records (43% of our data) have been discounted for some reason or another. 110 of these failed PNC checking which could be for many reasons such as the vehicle details not matching the registration, or the vehicle changing hands and the new owner registration not yet processed by DVLA. A very few others were discounted as having insufficient detail. But the loss of the bulk of those 638 records (37% of our data) may never be explained.

The situation has improved vastly in the past 2 months with the police now dedicating resources to data entry and PNC checking. This is mainly in response to the many questions we have raised through monitoring the process. We will continue to watch it very closely. Last month none of our data was discounted or lost, but it should also be noted that we submitted less than a quarter of our usual tally. This is because we had to cancel most of our sessions due to bad weather. This month the numbers are much higher.

Another problem has now come to light. Whereas any person recorded speeding for the first or second time will be sent a letter, that does not happen for those recorded three or more times. This may result in a visit from the police, but we have recently discovered there is no process in place for ensuring that this happens. We have raised an issue with the people responsible for SpeedWatch at Netley. The situation is even worse if the vehicle is registered to someone in another county (eg Dorset). It seems unlikely there will ever be any process for ensuring they get a visit. And of course they are not even sent a letter! This issue needs to be raised at the highest level if SpeedWatch is to be taken seriously.