



# *Sway Parish Council*

## Planning and Transport Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Sway Planning and Transport Committee held at Jubilee Field Pavilion, Station Road, Sway on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017

### Present

Councillor name	
Stephen Tarling (Chair)	P
Hugh Marchant (Vice Chair)	P
Peter Dance	P
Ted Fleat	NP
Alex Pepper	P
Melanie Seacombe	NP
John Warden	P

P=Present NP=Not present

**Also in attendance:** Sway News, and 21 members of the public.

### PT17/134 Apologies

There were apologies from Councillor Seacombe, Councillor Fleat, and the Parish Clerk, David Edwards.

### PT17/135 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Marchant declared his membership of the New Forest Association (NFA) Planning Committee. The Chair and Councillor Warden declared their membership of the Friends of the New Forest (formerly the New Forest Association).

### PT17/136 Minutes of the Meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017 and Matters Arising

Following one minor correction under PT17/132 to change "19:30 pm" to read "19:30"; the Minutes of the Meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2017 were approved as a correct record of the Meeting and signed by the Chairman.

**Matters Arising:** In reference to PT17/118 Cllr. Marchant reported:

- a) **Marathon:** A number of Sway residents acted as marshals for the New Forest Marathon, and we hope that Sway Village Hall will benefit from the New Forest Marathon Community Fund. The poor track by Wootton Coppice Inclosure had been improved.
- b) **Wiggle:** A transcript of the Q&A session when UK Cycling Events (UKCE) came to the Parish Council meeting is now available on the Sway Parish Council website. UKCE will post a marshal at the Brighton Road end of Mead End Lane, but will only trial rear numbers on the Saturday (not the Sunday). It is unfortunate that UKCE are the only

cycle event organisers that do not follow the New Forest Cycle Event Organisers' Charter.

- c) **Disabled access around Sway:** comments from another resident concerning the poor state of pavements along Church Lane are to be forwarded to HCC by Cllr. Marchant (with the permission of the resident concerned).

### **PT17/137 Parish Clerk's update on any matters of relevance to the Committee**

The Chair advised the meeting that the Parish Clerk had not provided details of any updates.

### **PT17/138 Outcome of Planning Applications considered at Previous Meetings (including those applications referred to the NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee) and related matters.**

These are summarised in Appendix 1. It was noted that no decisions had yet been made on the site of the Turkey Farm applications.

### **PT17/139 New Tree Preservation Orders and Tree Work Applications**

Cllr. Seacombe had circulated a report and that is Appendix 2. Councillors expressed their thanks to Cllr. Seacombe for an appropriately responsive and comprehensive report.

### **PT/17/140 New Planning Applications**

<a href="#">17/00659</a>	Fyre Stycken, Mount Pleasant Lane, Lymington, Sway SO41 8LS	Residential kennels; associated parking Two agricultural buildings	05/09/17 (extension to 20 <sup>th</sup> September obtained)
--------------------------	---	--	--

The Committee listened carefully to a long prepared statement from the agent, and to a number of local residents who all objected to this proposal. At the time of our meeting the independent acoustic report commissioned by neighbours was not yet online, but the Committee heard details from an appropriately qualified neighbour on that subject. The Committee further discussed this at length after which all but one member present voted for a firm refusal with a 4 (and the one other member suggested making our points but leaving the decision to the officer with a 5). So Sway Parish Councils comments to be forwarded to the NFNPA are:

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

Sway Parish Council emphasise that we would like to see this site redeveloped and we do support local employment opportunities. However on balance we feel the current application is neither complete nor appropriate. The advantages of employment & a tidier site are not sufficient to overcome the objections & issues. We note more than 30 letters of objection from neighbours reinforcing our concerns. Sway's main concerns are:

- a) The application and plans are incomplete or contradictory – for instance in respect of matters such as the management plan, proposals for dog-walking, surface water disposal (there is a “Danger Deep Water” sign on the edge of the plot), foul water and dog waste disposal, traffic movements, levels and roofline heights, building standards, soft landscaping, extent and permeability of hard standing, the acoustic report (which contradicts the plans), ventilation etc.

- b) The application does not cover the entire site – as required by DP16b) – there is intensive activity at the south-west end of the site with 5 buildings (according to the plans). A number of caravans can clearly be seen, and cars and vans are also often parked there. This activity, when added to that proposed in this application, should surely be considered in respect of local amenity, access, traffic, disturbance etc.
- c) There would be an adverse impact on the two rights of way footpaths that form part of the boundary. Other dogs being walked along those footpaths may well set off barking in the kennels; and the buildings are too close to the footpaths.
- d) CP14 supports employment development outside of defined villages where that helps the well-being of local communities, supports the cultural heritage of the National Park and does not have an adverse impact on the special qualities of the National Park. Sway fear that these criteria are not met, particularly in respect of items such as noise, odour, increased traffic etc. and would have a harmful impact on the rural character of the surrounding area.
- e) As distinct from the extent of any licence – the most recent one of which was for just 10 dogs; the previous use is reported to have been very modest, and it is generally agreed that the current application would lead to a more intensive use.
- f) The site is generally towards the top of a hill so any noise will carry further, possibly exacerbated by the courtyard design funnelling sound in one direction.
- g) The 'Management Plan' seems to be poorly thought through and lacks detail. Shorter but numerous individual lead walks along inappropriate local footpaths (narrow, with ponies, electric fence, barbed wire etc.) or along local lanes without footways would be inappropriate.
- h) Road safety and parking are serious concerns. The kennels would generate significant increased traffic in an area of enclosed lanes with poor visibility splays – which are beyond the control of the applicant. The proposed parking arrangements are inadequate for a proposed venture of this size.
- i) Number of dogs. We cannot see how the total number of dogs can be regulated, and given the size of the kennels and lack of detail, local residents are concerned that the number of dogs could increase even further than this application suggests.

<a href="#">17/00706</a>	Fuschias, Station Road, Sway, SO41 6AA	Rear extension (Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission 17/00362).	Not applicable
--------------------------	---	--	----------------

This application was for information only – no comments are invited or permitted.

<a href="#">17/00701</a>	Thornhill, Middle Road, Sway, SO41 6BB	First floor extension; 1 No. rooflight.	29/09/2017
--------------------------	---	---	------------

The committee noted that this is inside the defined village, is not a small dwelling, the previous similar permission, which Sway supported, has now lapsed; and the proposal is modest, within the guidelines of the Sway Village Design Statement and would have no significant adverse impact on the neighbours on the street scene. All but one of the committee members voted for a 1 (and the one other member voted for a 5). Sway's response will therefore be:

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 within the Guidelines of the Sway Village Design Statement and would have no significant adverse impact on the neighbours or the street scene.

<a href="#">17/00604</a>	Restaurant The Silver Hind, Station Road, Sway, Lymington, SO41 6BA	2 No. semi-detached dwellings; 1 no. detached dwelling; creation of access and associated landscaping; 1.8m high fence and brick wall; demolition of existing public house.	25/09/17
--------------------------	---	--	----------

Neither applicant, nor agent, nor anyone in favour of this application spoke. Neighbours and residents objecting spoke at length and focussed on two main issues: the loss of a community asset and the grossly over-crowded proposed development.

Many paid tribute to the community asset provided by the current owners and their support for local events. An application to register the Silver Hind as an asset of community value was suggested, but the experience with the Old School left the committee reluctant, but it would be considered at the next meeting. It is most disappointing that an alternative use is being sought for this site.

Objectors suggested that if this were to be a change of use, then fewer, smaller dwellings would be more appropriate; and noted that the proposal does not comply with the Sway Village Design Statement guidelines. Objectors added that the plot is already overdeveloped; the proposal lacked sufficient parking at a critical position in the centre of the village and in fact would remove parking spaces along Station Road, the plot falls away to the rear and this proposal would cause serious overlooking and loss of light to neighbours, and there is an adjacent impressive oak tree of amenity value.

The committee agreed with these issues and after further discussion unanimously agreed that Sway's submission would be:

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

Sway would like to emphasise the value of the Silver Hind Restaurant as a community asset provided by the generosity of the current owners, and their support for many local events.

There are more than 70 objections online and no support. The applicants have not sought any pre-application advice. There are objections from both HCC Highways and the Tree Officer. The main concerns are:

- a) The change of use and concomitant loss of employment would be a tragic loss to the village and community of Sway. This is currently a village community asset and also has permission to provide serviced visitor accommodation; CP10 and CP15 apply.
- b) This plan is grossly over-developed and pays no respect at all to the Sway Village Design Statement SPD. Guidelines on page 18 include: *"Any new development should consider the need to maintain generous plot sizes"*; and new development *"should respect the spacious character of the locality and not lead to inappropriate high density development"*.
- c) The NFNPA Design Guide SPD under "Avoiding suburbanisation" on page 11 shows a similar development to the one proposed here and indicates that it is not appropriate. There is far too little off-street parking for such an extensive development of a small plot and if this were permitted parking on Station Road would be lost. The plot is already too crowded, over-developed and lacking in parking spaces; and should absolutely not be more intensively developed.

- d) The current Core Strategy Development Management Policies DPD seeks to maintain the retail and commercial frontage in Sway and this would detract from that intent, although CP7 refers mainly to retail outlets.
- e) This plan is clearly contrary to NFNPA policies: DP1a) because it is inappropriate scale, form and siting (far too close to neighbours and to the roadway unless it is retail); DP1 b) and d) – not respecting the local built environment, adverse impact, visual intrusion etc.; CP9 in not supporting local employment or community facilities; DP9 in compromising the character of the local area which is characterized by spacious residential plots; and CP8 in contributing to the gradual suburbanizing effect within the National Park.
- f) The plot falls away to the rear, and this application would bring serious issues with overlooking, visual intrusion and loss of light.
- g) There is a prominent oak tree of amenity value towards the back of the plot which will dominate plot 3 and its amenity value and root spread would need to be considered, in the unlikely event that this application is taken further than a refusal.

### **PT17/141 Update on Planning Enforcement**

The month started with 12 investigations, 3 have been resolved and two added: Operation outside of permitted hours at Arnewood Manor Farm, and unauthorised living accommodation added on land off North Common Lane. The Committee were particularly disappointed that it had been considered non-expedient to pursue a fence adjacent to highway in excess of 1m on Westbeams Road, especially given recent successful efforts to prevent similar further urbanisation.

### **PT17/142 Planning Inspectorate and Enforcement Appeals**

<a href="#">Appeal 3178291</a>	Land to the rear of 37 & 38 Set Thorns Road SO41 6AG	New dwelling with terrace; detached outbuilding. [Appeal against the refusal of application <a href="#">17/00192</a> ]
<a href="#">Appeal 3177830</a>	Land to the rear of 37 & 38 Set Thorns Road SO41 6AG	New dwelling with terrace; detached outbuilding. [Appeal against the refusal of application <a href="#">16/00886</a> ]

Sway Parish Council recommended refusal of both applications. The deadline for receipt of comments is 20 September 2017 and in this case Sway are invited to respond. Cllr. Marchant had kindly transcribed the appropriate sections of the meetings where the Committee's original decisions were discussed. The Committee were disappointed to find that NFNPA Planning were not going to make any submission in addition to their officers' reports (but had merely sent in suggested conditions should the appeals be sustained). Sway's original comments were short and so the Committee decided that Sway should send in further comments based on the original decisions and the Chair would circulate drafts.

### **PT17/143 NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee.**

One Sway item appears on the agenda of the NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee meeting of 19<sup>th</sup> September 2017:

<p><a href="#">17/00403</a> <b><u>AMENDED</u></b></p>	<p>Hatch Motors of Sway, Station Road SO41 6BA</p>	<p>Three storey building to include convenience store (Use Class A1), 6 No. flats; associated refuse, plant area and parking areas; 4 No. three storey dwellings with associated parking; demolition of existing garage and associated outbuildings.</p>
---	--	--

The NFNPA's Planning Officer recommends granting permission and Sway recommend refusal. Sway replied in full to the amended application but unfortunately that full reply was not posted online by NFNPA Planning. The chair reported that he had therefore circulated Sway's full reply to members of the NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee. There were some further items in the paper files which were either not accurately represented in the Officer's report and/or not available online on the NFNPA planning website. For the record Sway's full response is added here as Appendix 3. It was agreed that the Chair would speak at the Planning Development Control Committee and use Sway's full response as a basis. Comments on the congestion chaos caused at both the Stopples Lane, Hordle Co-op and the Milford-on-Sea Co-op by multiple large delivery vehicles were noted. Early morning deliveries and the comments of the NFNPA Planning Officer on the applicants' 'Review of Development Viability Assessment' were further noted. The current owner planned to move to another site within Sway but the Committee believe that the intended new location is no longer available, so there will be a further loss of employment. The absence of any plans for the ex-NFU building was clearly a concern and against policy.

The chair would speak to this item at the Planning Development Control Committee along the lines detailed in our response to the application.

**PT17/144 Report by the Parish Council's Transport Representative.**

Both the recent smaller numbers using the Cango and the longer term prospects given County Council cuts are not good news, but Sway News intend a large spread in the October edition.

**PT17/145 Roads, Hedges and Ditches**

**a) Hampshire County Council National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey.**

The Clerk had forwarded a paper but unfortunately this was merely the "eContract Scorelink User Guide" which is not applicable to a Parish Council.

**b) To decide whether to request that £10,000 of Parish Council reserves be earmarked for flashing Speed Limit Reminder equipment deployed in Sway.**

This was discussed at length. The suggestion was not for a speed indicating device – but for the sort of device that just reminds drivers of the speed limit and perhaps shows an outline of a speed camera. Sway Community SpeedWatch only cover a few hours every four weeks, so a more permanent solution should be sought. Alternatives of fixed locations, moveable cameras, deployment, questions of locations and power sources were discussed. Many other villages use these devices, but with Sway Parish Council's modest precept and other contingencies and our reserves, perhaps £10,000 was beyond immediate budgeting. In the end the Committee suggested by a majority that the full Parish Council be asked to earmark £5,000 for one moveable SLR and three or so sites to cover the capital equipment costs and expenses for at least one year.

**c) Ditches:** A local resident asked about the responsibility for ditches in verges adjacent to properties and was furnished with appropriate HCC leaflets after the meeting, including

<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/flood-water-management/HCCFloodRiskManagement-Landowners.pdf>

### **PT17/146 Community SpeedWatch Report**

Last month was blighted by poor weather and lack of volunteers, but the statistics are still poor, the full report is on the [Sway Parish Council website](#). Insurance of the equipment will need to be followed up.

### **PT17/147 Correspondence and any agenda items for the next meeting**

- a) Cllr. Dance noted a number of hedges need trimming and he agreed to assemble a list of the locations, for either the Parish Clerk and or Hampshire Highways as appropriate (and available).
- b) Issues were raised over Sway Right of Way footpath 2 – where although it has been cleared there are concerns over the width and adjacent electric fencing, and poor state of stiles; and also over Sway Right of Way footpath 11 – which is very overgrown with brambles and one precarious section of fence (at the Northover Lane end) looks to be a possible danger. Cllr. Dance would inspect these two and take up the items with the Hampshire Rights of Way team.
- c) Following a reminder from a local resident the Parish Clerk will be asked to ensure the cattle grid at Durnstown is closed for the Remembrance Day service.
- d) A report has gone in concerning a dangerous deep rut on Shirley Holms towards the Pitmore Lane end – until it is repaired drivers are advised to take extra care there.

### **PT17/148 Any other business**

- a) Following articles in both the Lymington Times and Sway News, local residents asked about suggestions that land on the corner of Arnewood Bridge Road and South Sway Lane be earmarked for development. The Chair outlined the recent details: this plot was not submitted to the 'Call for Sites', is not on the list of possible sites and it is understood that there was correspondence between the owner and NFNPA planning. There is nothing further to report at this time.
- b) The external lights of the Sway Jubilee Pavilion are not all coming on at night as necessary. The Parish Clerk and/or Caretaker will be asked to investigate. The new padlock for the gate is awaited and should improve security.

### **PT17/149 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held at 19:30 on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2017 in the Jubilee Field Pavilion.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 21:29.

.....  
Chair of Committee

.....  
Date

## Sway Planning and Transport Committee meeting 14 September 2017 Minutes Appendix 1

### Outcome of planning applications considered at previous meetings

Number	Address	Title	Sway No.	Sway Notes	NFNPA Outcome	NFNPA notes
<a href="#">17/00549</a>	Little Hollies, Station Road SO41 6BA	Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a proposed single storey rear extension.	N/A	N/A	Permitted development	The proposed development would be fully compliant with Class A of Part 1 of the General Permitted Development Order and it is recommended that the Certificate of Lawfulness (proposed) should be granted.
<a href="#">17/00492</a>	Half Day House, South Sway Lane SO41 6BL	Retention of 1.95 metre high fencing.	4	The fence is too high and falls foul of both the national rules and Sway Village Design guidelines.	PDCC Refuse	Out of keeping with rural character, creeping urbanisation. Contrary to Policies DP1 and CP8 of the NFNPA, the adopted Sway Village Design Statement and Sections 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework which all seek to protect the New Forest from harmful and inappropriate development.
<a href="#">17/00526</a>	Merrifield, Flexford Lane SO41 6DN	Two agricultural buildings.	N/A	Application is not complete - suggest withdrawing and resubmitting	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
<a href="#">17/00542</a>	Lepe House, Flexford Lane SO41 6DN	Manege; fencing.	4	The proposal was too large. The Committee did, however, feel that they would be more sympathetic if an application were made for a smaller manege (800sq m) which was located away from Sway Tower. They would also want to see the drainage issues addressed, and conditions limiting use to personal use and prohibiting the installation of lighting.	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
<a href="#">17/00521</a>	Forest Way, St. James Road SO41 6AN	Single storey rear extension.	1	The size of the proposed extension was such that it was unlikely to have any impact on neighbourly amenity.	Grant Subject to Conditions	Conditions including: development in accordance with the plans and matching external facing materials.



<a href="#">17/00535</a>	Wooden Chalet, Hollowood Farm, Barrows Lane SO41 6DE	Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for existing use of building as Independent dwelling.	5	The Committee were not aware of any evidence which cast doubt on the Applicants' assertion that the property has been used as an independent residential dwelling since 2007.	Lawful	It is recommended that a Certificate of Lawfulness of the Existing Use of the wooden chalet at Hollowood Farm as a single independent dwelling be granted.
<a href="#">17/00631</a>	Claywood House, Arnewood Bridge Road SO41 6DA	Two storey side extension; single storey side and rear extensions; replacement windows (demolition of existing single storey extension) (Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission reference 16/00879)	N/A	N/A	Raise no objection	Still within DP11 30% and "the proposed changes would be sufficiently minor so as to enable them to be construed as a non-material amendment. A further planning application would therefore not be required."
<a href="#">17/00548</a>	Fair Holme, Mill Lane SO41 8LN	Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a proposed single storey rear extension; roof alterations to facilitate additional habitable accommodation; 3 No. rooflights; new front porch; flue	N/A	N/A	Lawful	All parts fall within the appropriate sections of the Town and Country General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, C, D and G.
<a href="#">17/00584</a>	Merrifield, Flexford Lane SO41 6DN	Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a proposed single storey rear extension; roof alterations to existing single storey rear extension; alterations to fenestration.	N/A	N/A	Planning Permission Required	The total enlargement (including previous extensions) exceeds that allowed in the GPDO.

<a href="#">17/00575</a>	Rufus Cottage, Station Road SO41 6BA	Single storey extension; roof alterations.	5	If permission is granted, the Committee would recommend that an appropriate condition be imposed regarding surface water disposal. The Committee would also recommend that appropriate matching roofing materials are used, only downward facing lights are used and further permitted development rights are removed. The Committee also recommended a condition requiring obscured, non-opening fenestration on any windows overlooking the immediate neighbours.	Grant Subject to Conditions	Conditions including: development in accordance with the plans; and matching external facing materials and windows in the north elevation to be obscurely glazed at all times.
<a href="#">17/00605</a>	The Foxes, Manchester Road SO41 6AS	Variation of condition 1 of planning permission reference 12/97417 to allow amended landscaping planting plan.	4 or 5	(4) Conflict with aims of Core Strategy policies seek to prevent erosion of Park's local character or gradual suburbanisation. (5) If surface is permeable, recommendation is to leave it to NPA officers.	Refuse	Too urban, contrary to NFNPA policies DP1 and CP8; the NFNPA Design Guide SPD page 68 and the Sway Village Design Statement SPD page 21
<a href="#">Appeal 3176443</a>	Boundway Gate, Boundway Hill SO41 6EN	Replacement summerhouse	4	See application <a href="#">17/00187</a> No further comments from a Parish Council were allowed.	Appeal sustained with conditions	There is a dilapidated shed there so it can be replaced by a summerhouse. Conditions include: development in accordance with drawings, incidental use only, and protection of trees and hedges to be agreed and remain in situ.

**Sway Planning and Transport Committee meeting 14 September 2017**

**Minutes Appendix 2**

**Tree Report September 2017**

**Application No: TPO/17/0667**

**Address: SITE OF BOUNDWAY GATE, BOUNDWAY HILL, SWAY, SO41 6EN**

Prune 2 Oak trees

T3 Thinning by 20%, selective removal of branches to open up crown. Retain natural shape.

T4 Removal of dead wood, crown lifting to provide a height clearance of 5 metres.

**SPC Tree representatives comments**



These trees are of amenity value as they front on to the applicants property. However the application does not seem unreasonable and would probably aid the health and improve the shape of the existing trees.

**SPC's Comments to NFNPA**

SPC offer no objections

**Application No: TPO/17/0726**

**Address: QUARR HOUSE MANCHESTER RD SWAY SO42 6AS**

Prune 3 Beech and 3 Oak

Thin out new oak and beech to avoid over crowding.

All trees to be crown lifted by 4.5 metres to clear driveway.

**SPC Tree representatives comments**

The application does not seem unreasonable and would probably aid the health and improve the shape of the existing trees.

**SPC's Comments to NFNPA**

SPC offer no objections

**Application No: TPO/17/0713**

**Address: 18 HERON CLOSE, SWAY, SO41 6ET**

Prune 3 Oak Trees: Crown lift 3.5 metres to clear verge and drive.



### **SPC Tree representatives comments**

Two of the three trees are part of a line of mature trees that form a boundary between the private drive way to 18 Heron Close and farmland to the west. Whilst not immediately in view from the main part of Heron Close they could be considered to have value as they provide a wildlife corridor and barrier between open farmland and a housing estate.

Whilst they do not appear to be hanging over the driveway, SPC is not against minimal pruning to ensure they are not damaged by high sided vehicular movements.

It was not obvious where the third oak tree was sited.

### **SPC's Comments to NFNPA**

SPC consider that the oak trees that are part of the boundary between adjacent farmland and the housing estate have amenity and wildlife value. Whilst they do not appear to be hanging over the driveway, SPC is not against minimal pruning to ensure they are not damaged by high sided vehicular movements.

**Application No: TPO/17/0672**

**Address: Highbury Brighton Road Sway SO41 6ET**

Prune 1 Lime Tree: Crown lift up to 5 metres, crown clean and thin 20%. Reasons given to give more light to flower bed and lawn.

## SPC Tree representatives comments



This tree has a HIGH amenity value and can clearly be seen from Brighton Road as it sits prominently in the middle of the front lawn just in front of the recent newly built garage.

It would seem a shame to alter its shape by raising the crown 5 metres.

The reasons given are to give light to lawn and flower beds. It does not seem unreasonable to change the type of planting that can accommodate dry shade rather than alter the shape of this lovely tree.

## SPC's Comments to NFNPA

Partial Objection. This tree has a HIGH amenity value and can clearly be seen from Brighton Road as it sits prominently in the middle of the front lawn.

It would seem a shame to alter its shape by raising the crown 5 metres.

The reasons given are to give light to the lawn and flower beds. It does not seem unreasonable to change the type of planting that can accommodate dry shade rather than alter the shape of this lovely tree. We would therefore prefer only to see minimal crown lifting although have no objections to sympathetic crown clearing as long as the shape is maintained.

*This application is not on the agenda however was assessed and comments submitted to NFNPA*

## Application No: TPO/17/0742

### Pine Cottage, Mead End Road, Sway SO41 6EE

Prune 3 Beech tree, Fell 1 Beech Tree, Prune 1 Oak Tree, Prune 2 Horse Chestnut Trees

## SPC Tree representatives comments

T1 – T6 are the only trees visible from the road and consist of 1 Beech in the front lawn and 3 Beeches 1 Oak and 1 Horse Chestnut on the front boundary and therefore the comments only relate to these trees.



The beech tree in the front lawn looked to be of a good shape and to reduce the height by 5 metres seems extreme.

The trees in the front boundary although of high amenity value are overcrowded and badly need some remedial work to maintain them. The work therefore doesn't seem unreasonable.

### **SPC's Comments to NFNPA**

No Objection. The beech tree in the front lawn looked to be of a good shape and to reduce the height by 5 metres seems extreme, however SPC are happy to go with the tree officer's recommendations.

The trees in the front boundary although of HIGH amenity value as they can clearly be seen from the road are overcrowded and SPC are happy to see remedial work undertaken to ensure their health and longevity. The work therefore doesn't seem unreasonable and we are happy to go with the tree officers recommendations.

The remaining trees could not be evaluated from the road and therefore we accept the tree officer's recommendations.

## **Sway Planning and Transport Committee meeting 14 September 2017**

### **Minutes Appendix 3**

#### **Sway Parish Council's response to amended application 17/00403 Hatch Motors of Sway**

In respect of the amended proposals (published 02 Aug 2017) Sway select: 4. We recommend REFUSAL, for the reasons listed below; and we wish the following comments to be added to our previous comments:

Sway support the idea of redeveloping this site, particularly with affordable housing or smaller and hence less unaffordable market price housing, particularly dwellings of less than 100m<sup>2</sup>. Sway appreciate the small changes made in these amended plans in an effort to abrogate some of the issues previously highlighted. However this current amended application is still too overcrowded, has too many parking and manoeuvring dangers, the main building with the retail ground floor is still too large and overbearing, this would still create more noise and light pollution than appropriate for a New Forest defined village, there would be insufficient soft landscaping and screening, the old NFU building which is part of the curtilage is not considered, and the design and height of the town houses is not appropriate.

Many residents have serious concerns over road safety, parking, manoeuvring of delivery lorries, noise pollution etc. Many of these issues are reflected in the objection of HCC Highways which Sway would highlight and support.

Parking provision is clearly insufficient. Firstly at least three spaces (for instance those numbered 1, 2 and 3) have been taken from the ex-NFU building which previously housed 3 offices and a flat above, so those parking spaces should revert to use for the ex-NFU building. Secondly the 5 spaces at the front (numbered 9 to 13) are on the turning circle of delivery lorries – and the swept path shows these would barely miss two adjacent walls, and three adjacent trees. Experience from other sites in Sway Defined Village indicate that if you want to ensure that nobody parks on either side of station road from early morning and then commutes from Sway station, one needs to put out parking cones by 06:30am – so essentially parking spaces 9-13 will be lost. Of the other parking spaces numbered 4 to 8 one is for disabled parking leaving just 4 generally useable spaces for the shop. Presumably some of the shop employees might want to park there?

There are 10 parking spaces for the apartments – which have a total of 11 bedrooms – this is clearly insufficient given that with such poor local transport 11 bedrooms would usually bring some 22 cars plus deliveries, artisans, tradespeople, visitors etc. Three parking spaces might otherwise comprise a small garden for the flat of the ex-NFU building so then there would only be 8 spaces!

There are eight parking spaces for the 12 bedrooms of the town houses when in all likelihood 20 would be a minimum requirement to avoid further parking on Station Road.

The turning circle traces of the lorries appear ridiculously tight – it seems that a lorry has to touch the front of Town House 2 and drive to the very edge of two parking spaces in order to reverse into the rear bay – and when it does so it would effectively block 6 of the 8 parking spaces!

There is some confusion over delivery times. 10am to 1pm is mentioned plus bread and milk and newspapers (6am on a Sunday). In Sway's experience the NFNPA is totally incapable of policing any such conditions and no delivery service pays any attention whatsoever to such planning conditions – even if they were ever to know about them. So honestly large delivery lorries (or a greater number of smaller ones) will come and go as they see fit, at times of great congestion or intrusion, and blocking access to the parking spaces.

The size, massing, overbearing nature, visual impact and scale of the main building (shop and apartments) and the height of the 'Town Houses' are of particular concern to the residents of Sway. The current Hatch Motors main building is far more modest and of an appropriate scale for the setting. The NFNPA Design Guide SPD has some fine examples of how to avoid suburbanisation on page 11 and one of the examples of inappropriate design is uncannily similar to this application (although it does lack the more imposing main building proposed here). The Design Guide section on Commercial building types has much to show how this application could be improved.

NFNPA Policy DP1 is clearly contravened: this amended application detracts from local character and distinctiveness: this is overcrowded, overbearing, generally too high, and of poor layout in contravention of DP1a); it does not respect the local low level built environment with generous gardens and soft landscaping and make insufficient provision for replacement new appropriate planting in contravention of DP1b); the local amenity will be damaged particularly with the impact, overlooking and/or visual intrusion on the houses in Westbeams Road, the adjacent Youth Centre and Churchyard, the remaining ex-NFU building and the pharmacy – in contravention of DP1c); and surely nobody could pretend that this will not have an adverse impact on parking, road safety or noise and light pollution – and it would thus contravene DP1d).

Policy CP6 encourages the reduction of noise, visual intrusion, nuisance and other unacceptable environmental impacts on the National Park and its special qualities. Clearly this proposal would drastically increase such pollutions.

Policy CP7 requires enhancement of the built environment and designed landscapes and Policy CP8 indicates that development which would result in a gradual suburbanising effect within the National Park will not be permitted. This proposal is at the heart of a defined New Forest village in the National Park and even the use of the phrase 'Town House' indicates a suburbanising influence – these off-the-shelf 'Town Houses' would suit an urban townscape where such density and tall houses might be appropriate; but these are not suitable in the New Forest, or any other, National Park.

Policy DP6a) requires the enhancement of the built heritage of the New Forest – Sway see little that is indicative of a New Forest vernacular; DP6c) ensures new development is accessible where appropriate – and not only are vertically stacked 'Town Houses' and apartments less accessible but with such squeezed parking with deliveries taking part of the space we fear that emergency vehicles may not have access and motorised wheelchairs and similar could also not have full access.

Policy DP9 seeks to maintain the '*spacious residential plots set within mature landscapes*' which characterise the defined villages and hence enhance the built heritage, whereas this application seeks to squeeze in more dwellings and retail space as could sensibly be accommodated in this plot. Sway are pleased to see a suggestion of smaller dwellings, but disappointed to see so many crammed into such a small space with little thought for parking, landscaping, local amenity, overlooking etc.

Policy DP16 rightly encourages the redevelopment of existing employment sites. However DP16 a) would permit this where "*there would be environmental benefits such as a reduction in the visual impact of the site in the landscape, an improvement to the amenities of nearby properties, or a reduction in traffic or other disturbances from the site*" Clearly this proposal does the exact opposite: it has greater visual impact in the landscape, detracts from local amenity and obviously increases traffic and disturbance. Furthermore DP16b) requires that "*the redevelopment scheme deals comprehensively with the full extent of the site*" whereas this application strangely sequesters parking spaces from the ex-NFU building and completely ignores the ex-NFU building leaving a large building that was previously used as three offices and a flat above with just one parking space!

Policy CP9 supports small scale development within defined villages but only "*provided that the proposals conform with other policies in the Core Strategy*" Unfortunately this proposal fails to



comply with DP1, DP6, DP7, CP6, CP7 and CP8; and thus fails to meet the proviso of CP9. Policy CP12 b), c) and d) are not met; CP12 e) could be met if 50% of the housing were to be affordable housing and Sway would encourage that; and the only other section, CP12a) is only met if CP9) is met – which it clearly is not. So unless half of all the housing is affordable housing this application fails to meet CP12.

Sway are surprised and disappointed that the developers feel any affordable housing contribution is inappropriate.

National Planning Policy Framework Section 7, particularly paragraphs 58, 59 and 66; and Section 11, particularly paragraphs 115, 117, 120 and 123 support the refusal of this application.

The Sway Village Design Statement (an SPD adopted by the Authority), in guidelines requires (page 18): *“Any new developments should consider the need to maintain generous plot sizes.”* And encourage the avoidance of overcrowding, and respect for the spacious character of the locality. On page 21 boundaries of native hedging are encouraged and on page 22 indicate that *“Driveways should have sufficient space to accommodate off street parking”*. On page 23 it says *“Illuminated commercial signs should be resisted wherever possible”* and indicates that external lighting should be kept to a minimum.

So in summary this application is contrary to national policy, contrary to a raft of NFNPA policies, contrary to both the Sway Village Design Statement SPD and the NFNPA Design Guide SPD and opposed by every local resident who has commented, and should be refused.