

# EH&I Parish Council

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday 13 August 2019 at 7.00 pm  
Ellingham Church Hall, Ellingham BH24 3PJ

<b>Attendance:</b>	<b>Apologies received:</b>
Cllr Burtenshaw (Chairman) (LB) Cllr Errington (Vice Chairman) (RE) Cllr Loader (RL) Cllr Stainton-Burrell (S-B) Cllr Webster (PW)	Cllr Blake (EB) Cllr Coutts (RC) Cllr Sampson (BS) Cllr Taylor (GT) Cllr Wilson (AL)
<b>Clerk:</b> Melissa Edmunds Members of the public: 21	

ITEM	Ref No.		Action
		Cllr Burtenshaw opened the meeting and welcomed the members of the public	
<b>1.</b>		<b>Apologies</b>	
	<b>19/08/98P</b>	None	
<b>2.</b>		<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
	<b>19/08/99P</b>	Cllr Webster – non pecuniary - NFDC CONS 19/0441 - Ibsley House.	
<b>3.</b>		<b>To confirm minutes of the Planning Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2019</b>	
	<b>19/08/100P</b>	Due to further discussions and amendments it was proposed to postpone confirmation of the minutes until the September Planning Committee. <b>Proposed by Cllr Burtenshaw, seconded by Cllr Taylor - (9) in favour, (1) abstention</b>	
<b>4.</b>		<b>Chairman's Report on Matters Arising from 9 July 2019 (not on the agenda)</b>	
		None	
<b>5.</b>		<b>Public Forum</b>	
		None	
<b>6.</b>		<b>To consider responses for Development Control and TPO applications</b>	
	<b>19/08/101P</b>	<p><b>NFDC 18/11606</b> Land Off Snails Lane, Blashford, BH24 3PG : Outline application for demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of up to 143 dwellings (incl. 50% affordable housing); public open space; recreation mitigation land; landscaping; sustainable drainage systems (SUDS); vehicular access points from Snails Lane and Salisbury Road. (Environmental Impact Application Development and affects a Public Right of Way). All matters reserved except for means of access.</p> <p>Cllr Burtenshaw advised that Gladman Developments Ltd (GD) had declined to attend the meeting, offering a closed one for councillors instead. This is not how the Council conducts its business. Cllr Burtenshaw reported that the Planning Committee meeting of 9 July had debated the suitability and appropriateness of the site for housing development as proposed in the NFDC emerging Local Plan. Areas</p>	

of concern that emerged included: density of housing; conservation / environmental impact; surface and foul drainage; access and transport; impact on local infrastructure / services. Comments had been sent to NFDC.

Cllr Errington summarised the proposal:-

- (Up to) 143 dwellings on two sites (10 / 133) of which 50% affordable, with adjoining SANG for recreation.
- Some 20 ecological, services and other reports had now been submitted, including an Environmental Statement. In terms of the impact of development, these claimed that there would either no risk or it could be mitigated.
- NFDC has received approx. 550 public comments to date: some 85% from Ringwood and local area; 95% overall not in favour; 3% lukewarm.

Key issues raised by the Snail Lane Residents action group:

- Ecological importance of the 'Blashford Wet Meadows', which far outweighs the small contribution it would make to NFDC's housing quota requirement.
- Issues with Water saturation at the site.
- Proximity of SSSI, SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites.
- The site is used by many species - resting, breeding, feeding and transitioning – and provides valuable additional off-site habitat for the adjacent Blashford Lakes Reserve (H10WWT).
- The site should be offered as a mitigation area to offset the ecological impact of other proposed developments in the New Forest district.

Other questions / comments:

- Cramming most of the homes on to one site would look like a ghetto, while allowing the possibility of future infill development
- The site was not well restored after its mineral use ceased leaving boggy, poor quality agricultural land. It should be used as wetland habitat.
- What is GD's definition of 'affordable housing'? Given the low average local wage, clarification is needed
- Once sites have gained planning permission, developer(s) will often submit their schemes for 'viability assessments' due to unanticipated costs, resulting in either reduction or loss of any affordable housing and/or other Section 106 provisions
- What would be the impact of developing the site on surface, ground water and local fluvial systems?
- Proposed foul and surface water drainage systems are not suitable. The EA does not think GD's proposal is proven adequate for 100+ homes.

**It was proposed and seconded to recommend refusal under option 4 to NFDC with the following comments:**

- The environmental and other costs associated with this proposed high density development significantly outweigh the benefits of providing an additional 143 dwellings.
- A significantly smaller scale development might be more acceptable.
- This site is of exceptional environmental importance and should be offered as a mitigation area of other sites being developed in the district. With appropriate funding for long-term management it could be kept for posterity and environmental benefit.
- Please also refer to EH&IPC submission to NFDC of 15/07/19.

**In favour - (8), abstention - (2)**

		<p><b><u>NFNPA 19/00512</u> &amp; <u>NFNPA 19/00618</u></b> - Linford Park Nursing Home</p> <p>Ian Donohue the planning agent for the two retrospective applications was invited to outline them. He explained that there is a problem with drainage at the site and that they are not allowed to drain into stream. It is the intention to look for a longer term solution and to drain into the main drains in the road, and they will possibly be applying in approximately 3 months for this. In the interim they using the bunds that drain into the interceptor, which is currently emptied every 6 weeks. At the moment the top bund is not connected and not in use, the second bund is emptied once a week and is estimated to be in situ for about 3 years, until longer term solution is finalised. The application for the access track is to resurface with grass track and that if the drainage works in the long term then the track might not be used.</p> <p>Following a detailed discussion, in summary, these 2 applications (and previous applications from this applicant) all amount to a lack of proactivity and accuracy in submitting planning applications, a lack of engagement and prior consultation with NFNPA and EHIPC, multiple policy infringement and neglect in terms of public safety, environmental health, conservation of the environment and character of the National Park.</p>	
<p><b>19/08/102P</b></p>		<p><b><u>NFNPA 19/00512</u></b> - Linford Park Nursing Home, Linford Road, Linford, BH24 3HX: Retention of 2 no. bunds/bladders for drainage purposes; 1.2 m high post and rail fencing.</p> <p><b>It was proposed to recommend refusal under option 4 to NFNPA for the reasons listed below:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bund materials &amp; construction are inadequate for the 3 year life implied in the application. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The pond liner in the bund is not protected. Pond liners are intended to be at the bottom of ponds and covered</li> <li>- By water, soils, turf etc. - not left exposed to the elements and UV.</li> <li>- The liners are already under significant tension, which will lead to premature failure.</li> <li>- The 'fence' surrounding the bund is plastic garden netting, not post &amp; rails</li> <li>- The bund walls are made of loosely piled up soil with no vegetation or other means to ensure stability, and will likely erode in heavy rain or bund overflow.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lack of suitability and security of the bladders and bunds (and sewage treatment plant) to ensure that the quality of the natural environment is not compromised, especially given the proximity to the water course and multiple SSSIs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The pond liner creates a pond. Without provision for draining, the bund will provide no 'spare' capacity once filled with rainwater should the bladder rupture/leak. The bladder will also float around when empty and may heavy enough to breach the flimsy fencing.</li> <li>- Bladder B2 - the open-ended green discharge pipe from the bladder, only controlled by a quarter-turn ballofix valve at the far end of the bladder with no lock, so anyone could open.</li> <li>- Missing, wrongly sized, or unsecured manhole covers &amp; lids of sewage treatment plant and main storage tank. Tank is 6'-7' deep, half filled with sewage and no ladder / means of escape.</li> <li>- Loose access cover(s) to main storage tank. A submersible negative head</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

pump lifts the sewage from the tank and discharges it through the (blue) collapsible hose to bladder B2. This type of hose is not appropriate for carrying sewage, let alone it being unprotected on the surface.

- Unlocked electrical services cupboard, which can't be kept shut due to electrical supply cable to submersible pump.
  - Bladder B1 - discharge pipe from bladder for coupling to a tanker is as found, and readily accessible to anyone coming into site. Bladder B1 - discharge pipe from bladder is only shut off using a quarter-turn ballcock valve (as
  - Bladder B1), and again with no lock.
  - Bladder B1 - rocks / bricks are already being thrown onto / at the bladder, which has no protection and minimal deterrent to accessing it for someone with worse mischief in mind.
- No options have been proposed for a permanent solution that the applicant will work towards over the next 3 years.
    - In addition, there is a concern that the Klargester waste treatment plant that has been recently installed may not be of sufficient specification to remove not only the biological effluent (faecal & other organic waste), but also the medical specific effluent (cleaning fluids and pharmaceutical or chemical products) if the long term proposal is to discharge to surface or ground water?
    - The agent for the applicant was not able to confirm to EHIPC planning committee if the current output of the waste treatment plant into the bladders is fully treated, clean water. The smell from the open storage tank indicates that it is not.
    - The application is not transparent as it states it is for drainage purposes which implies surface or rain water, yet it is actually for disposal of foul water from the sewage treatment plant.
    - The applicant has not declared within the application or covering letter the actions already taken by the Environment Agent to prohibit the discharge of effluent from the sewage treatment plant
  - Bund B1 nearest the track is not appropriately situated to become a longer term water storage for access by fire service (as mentioned in parish briefing note).
    - Situation of the bund and bladder near to the nursing home. e.g. in the area of the old mortuary, that is now available as the consultant's accommodation application has been withdrawn.
  - Continued encroachment of use of main building on agricultural land
    - Bunds and bladders could have been constructed elsewhere within the currently C2 designated area (see previous point).
  - The application is inaccurate in a number of areas:
    - In section 12 Biodiversity & Geological conservation misses the fact that there are SSSIs / New Forest Special Protection Areas on land adjacent to the proposed development.
    - In section 13 Foul Sewage disposal method of disposal is indicated as 'unknown' - is this not the purpose of the 5-6 tanker visits / day?
    - In section 14 it Waste Storage states that the plans do not incorporate areas to store and aid the collection of waste - then what is the function of the bunds and bladders?

# EH&I Parish Council

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In section 15 Trade Effluent it states that the proposal does not involve the need to dispose of trade effluent or trade waste. Given that the sewage is coming from commercial premises it would appear that at least some of this would be classified as trade effluent, particularly when the nursing home is up to full capacity: (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/domestic-sewage-discharges-to-surface-water-and-groundwater/domestic-sewage-discharges-to-surface-water-and-groundwater">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/domestic-sewage-discharges-to-surface-water-and-groundwater/domestic-sewage-discharges-to-surface-water-and-groundwater</a>)</li> <li>- It states that the use of bunds &amp; bladders do not rely upon the access track. However, the East bladder &amp; bund is not currently connected to the West bladder and bund.</li> </ul> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	
	<p><b>19/08/103P</b></p>	<p><b>NFNPA 19/00618</b> - Linford Park Nursing Home, Linford Road, Linford, BH24 3HX: Retention of access track.</p> <p>Cllr Taylor explained the location of the tracks, and the following was discussed and noted:</p> <p><b>It was proposed to recommend refusal under option 4 to NFNPA for the reasons listed below:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant states the purpose of the track is to provide access to the sewage treatment plant (not to the bunds / bladders). Access could be achieved directly from the Nursing home grounds to the North, as there is now a gate in the fence, several trees have been removed, the ground has been levelled and vehicles have already been taking this route. Note that the satellite photograph in the application is from early 2019, before the track was constructed and multiple trees felled along the route of the track and around the sewage treatment plant.</li> <li>• The location plan includes a spur to Bund/ Bladder B2, which is not required and there also is a turning / parking space near the sewage treatment plan &amp; holding tank. Section 9. of the application inaccurately states vehicle parking is not relevant to this proposal</li> <li>• Section 10. of the application says there are hedges and trees on the proposed development site and adjacent to the proposed site that may be important as part of the local landscape character. A full tree survey has not been provided, yet several trees have already been felled and hedging removed.</li> <li>• The application is based on the assumption that previous refusal (case 19/00058) was based mainly on the visual impact of the track. The Officer's Report Assessment sections 11.1-11.9 indicate there are multiple reasons for refusal. These have not been adequately addressed in the current application.</li> <li>• The current material laid as the track is crushed building waste (containing plastics, metal, rubber and other detritus), not 150mm crushed concrete as intended for the base layer of the new track design. In addition the depth will need to be substantially reduced for the additional planned layers to be laid if the grass road is to be flush with the surrounding surface as indicated in the plans.</li> <li>• It is still seeking to reclassify a large area of agricultural land which is specifically restricted to agricultural land use only, for C2 use in support of a nursing home.</li> <li>• It has even less merit than the original application which was previously refused as it has been established that the treatment tank this application</li> </ul>	

# EH&I Parish Council

		<p>seeks to service has been located in a place that the Environment Agency have deemed unsuitable to warrant a consent to discharge into ground or surface water. In the applicant's application for retention of bunds/bladders (19/00512) the applicant states that the use of the bunds/bladders is not reliant on the access track. This further erodes the argument that the track is necessary.</p> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	
<p><b>19/08/104P</b></p>		<p><b>NFNPA 19/00576</b> - Blackheath Farm, Toms Lane, Linwood, BH24 3QX: Single storey extensions; porch; 4 no. rooflights; alterations to fenestration.</p> <p>Cllr Loader explained the location, showing photos of the house, gardens, driveway that leads onto the access road and common beyond and the proposed plan. The following was discussed and noted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parish council are inclined to agree with the NPA in their Briefing Note that the proposed increase in floor space (at 61%) would fail to comply with policy DP11. Accordingly we feel unable to comment on a matter of policy. However subject to the increase in habitable space being deemed as acceptable it is considered that the proposed design would be acceptable and there would be little impact on the surrounding area.</li> <li>• The existing property is not in close proximity to other properties, and has fruit trees on the curtilage and a field beyond</li> <li>• It is tired looking with decrepit out buildings in two locations, and to start a past application previous owners had put a slab of concrete down.</li> <li>• The proposed elevation of the roof line will stay the same, and the property will be constructed of timber cladding and slate roof.</li> <li>• It was noted that the previous application and permitted development had not been acted on, and were within the banked amounts.</li> <li>• The applicant confirmed they are looking to build a symmetrical, better insulated house using a heat source and heat pump, and are trying to make it a more sympathetic and comfortable family home, and that they will use one of the out buildings as an open car port.</li> </ul> <p><b>Subject to a decision by the Authority of the application of policy DP11, it was proposed to recommend permission under option 1 with delegated powers to NFNPA for the reasons listed below: -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parish Council believes the proposal will result in an improvement to the appearance of the existing building.</li> <li>• Being mindful of the rural location, the applicant should be encouraged to take steps to mitigate all unnecessary light pollution with outside lighting to have Passive InfraRed sensors (PIRs) and all windows/rooflights to have window coverings or integrated blinds.</li> </ul> <p><b>Seconded, (10) in favour</b></p>	
<p><b>19/08/105P</b></p>		<p><b>NFDC 19/10894</b> - Lindens, Bleak Hill, Harbridge, BH24 3PX: - Conservatory. Cllr Sampson explained the location, showing photos of the house, gardens, and proposed plan. It was noted that: -the conservatory will be constructed over the existing patio area and will not be overlooked or detrimental to the property.</p> <p><b>It was proposed to recommend permission under option 3 to NFDC for the reasons listed below:</b></p>	

# EH&I Parish Council

		<p>The proposed conservatory would be subservient to the existing bungalow, and would be a relatively modest extension. By reason of its design and siting, it should be an appropriate addition that would not interfere with the prevailing form of the dwelling. The extension would be confined to the area of the built form already on site, and would not project into the wider garden area.</p> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	
<b>19/08/106P</b>	<b>NFDC 19/10879</b>	<p>- Sunset, Ivy Lane, Blashford, BH24 3LY: 3 no. outbuildings; 2 no. solar panels; pergola (Retrospective). Cllr Burtenshaw explained the location, showing photos of the house, plot and structures erected. The following was discussed and noted: this is a retrospective application. The garden building had previously been granted a lawful development certificate, but the building should not exceed 2.5 meters, with the addition of the two solar panels erected on triangles they are higher than 2.5 metres and create a detrimental aspect, especially when viewed from the public footpath which runs alongside.</p> <p><b>It was proposed to recommend refusal under option 4 to NFDC with the following comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the shed structures is within 6ft of the front boundary which it is believed is not permitted. Also, it has resulted in part of the hedging (being a condition of a previous application) being removed which impacts on the character of the area.</li> <li>• The addition of solar panels to the garden building would result in a building exceeding 2.5 metres in height which is contrary to the previously approved LDC and similarly impacts on the area especially when viewed from the public footpath</li> </ul> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	
<b>19/08/107P</b>	<b>NFDC 19/10919</b>	<p>- Somerley Household Waste Recycling Centre, Verwood Road, Somerley, BH24 3QE: Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 09/94567 for an extension of time for a further 10 years until 31 December 2029.</p> <p><b>It was proposed to raise no objections to the NFDC.</b></p> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	
<b>19/08/108P</b>	<b>NFDC CONS 19/0441</b>	<p>Ibsley House, Mockbeggar Lane, Ibsley, BH24 3PR: Fell: 1 x Eucalyptus; 1 x Douglas Fir. Cllr Sampson confirmed the Tree Officer had recommended removal.</p> <p><b>It was proposed to raise no objections to the NFNPA Tree Team</b></p> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	
<b>19/08/109P</b>		<p>Cllr Burtenshaw proposed to suspend standing orders</p> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	
<b>19/08/110P</b>	<b>NFNPA CONS 19/0461</b>	<p>Rockford Farm Cottage, Rockford loop Road, Rockford, BH24 3NB: Fell: 1 x Eucalyptus; 1 x Leyland Cypress; 1 x Silver Maple; 1 x Silver Birch. Prune: 1 x Common Ash; 1 x Weeping Willow. Cllr Errington confirmed there would be no adverse effect and removal would give other trees a better chance.</p> <p><b>It was proposed to raise no objections to the NFNPA Tree Team</b></p> <p><b>Seconded, all in favour (10).</b></p>	

# EH&I Parish Council

	<b>19/08/111P</b>	<b>Future tree Applications</b> - Cllr Burtenshaw recommended that future tree applications should be viewed as a cursory glance, unless a major scheme is proposed. <b>All in favour (10)</b>	
<b>7.</b>		<b>Decisions received from NFDC &amp; NFNPA (Circulated prior to Agenda)</b>	
	<b>19/08/112P</b>	NFNPA 19/00345 - Moyles Court School, Moyles Court, Rockford - <b>Granted (temporary permission)</b> NFNPA CONS 19/0410 Highwood Copse, Highwood Lane, Highwood - <b>Raise No Objection</b> NFDC 19/10282 Forest View, Harbridge Green, Harbridge, BH24 3PT - <b>Granted (subject to conditions)</b> NFNPA QU 18/0074 Edgemoor Farm, Toms Lane, Linwood, Ringwood- <b>Close Current File</b> NFDC APP B1740/W/18/3210647 Lake House, Woolmer Lane, Blashford - <b>Appeal dismissed</b>	
<b>8.</b>		<b>To consider responses for Planning Authority Committee meetings, Appeals and Enforcements</b>	
		None	
<b>9.</b>		<b>Correspondence</b>	
	<b>19/08/113P</b>	Email received from NFDC clarifying that since an appeal in 1992 Budgens does have the necessary permissions to trade 24 hours,	
	<b>19/08/114P</b>	Email received from resident close to Budgens outlining their concerns regarding the noise and light disturbance caused by late night trading at Budgens. Cllr Burtenshaw recommended dialogue with Planning Enforcement to identify different route to support resident.	
		<b>Write to Planning Enforcement</b>	<b>Clerk</b>

The meeting closed at 9.40pm

Dates of 2019 EH&I meetings at Ellingham Church Hall, 7.30 pm:

**Planning Committee**  
(Tuesdays)

10 September  
08 October  
12 November  
10 December

**Parish Council**  
(Tuesdays)

**August** - no meeting  
24 September  
29 October  
26 November  
**December** - no meeting