

OPEN SESSION: There were several members of the public present (see attached notes).

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING, TOWN & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

Held on Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2005 at 2.15pm

PRESENT: Cllr B H Terry (Chairman)  
Cllr N J Chard  
Cllr Mrs B Charlton  
Cllr D R Cole

IN ATTENDANCE: Jo Stannard, Deputy Town Clerk

### **P/4213 ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr N Clarke, Cllr, D E Cracknell, Cllr M F J Daly and Cllr N C Wood.

### **P/4214 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

### **P/4215 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2005, having been circulated, were approved and signed as a correct record.

### **P/4216 PLANNING APPEAL**

Members noted that Ambassador Pools & Leisure Ltd had lodged an Appeal with the First Secretary of State against New Forest District Council's refusal to grant a Certificate of Lawfulness of existing use for use of the premises at 3-5 Wessex Road during the hours of 1300 hours to 1700 hours on Saturdays. It was noted that the Council had supported this planning application. However, if members wished to make further comments, these should be confined to matters of fact regarding use of the site.

**RESOLVED:** That, as there was no factual information available, the Town Council make no further comments on the Appeal by Ambassador Pools and Leisure Ltd.

### **P/4217 MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

Members considered the Draft Statement of Community Involvement, as part of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework, together with a response drafted by the Deputy Town Clerk (*Annex 'A'*).

**RESOLVED:** That the response to the Draft Statement of Community Involvement, as drafted by the Deputy Town Clerk, be approved.

**P/4218**

**TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

Members considered draft notes of an Informal Local Members' Liaison Meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2005 to discuss traffic management issues (*Annex 'B'*).

It was noted that the greatest cluster of accidents shown on the road casualty map was at the junction of West Street and the A31. Cllr Terry was concerned that, with the 2012 Olympic sailing events being held in the Weymouth area, this could result in the A31 becoming gridlocked. It was noted that, according to the local press, members of Dorset County Council had also highlighted this as a concern. Members therefore discussed the possibility of joining with other authorities to lobby for improvements to the A31 in preparation for the 2012 Olympics, in particular road widening, improving the west bound releases from Ringwood and re-introduction of the Ringwood distributor road between the A31 and Christchurch Road.

With regard to the Charter Market, Cllr Mrs Charlton reported that the Chamber of Trade & Commerce was talking to Mr Morant about the possibility of turning the stalls to face the pavement and about the traders' vehicles, which should not be parked beside the stalls. It was therefore agreed that any discussions with Mr Morant should involve a representative of the Chamber of Trade & Commerce. It was also noted that the Town Clerk was still trying to obtain a legal opinion from either the District or County Council on the validity of the Charter.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the decisions taken at the Informal Local Members' Liaison Meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> July be approved (*see Annex 'B'*).
- 2) That any meeting with Mr Morant about the Charter Market involve a representative of the Chamber of Trade & Commerce.
- 3) That investigations be undertaken as to the best way to lobby for improvements to the A31 in preparation for the 2012 Olympics.

**P/4219**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED**

Planning applications in respect of the weeks ending 21<sup>st</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> June and 5<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> July 2005 were considered.

**RESOLVED:** That the observations as shown in Annex 'C' be submitted.

**P/4220**

**URGENT BUSINESS**

The Deputy Town Clerk reported that the roof of the brick bus shelter in Southampton Road, Poulner had been set alight earlier in the week. She added that, as it was used as a meeting place by a group of youths, this shelter had been abused on a regular basis with tiles being damaged and walls covered in graffiti. In its current state, the bus shelter was in no condition to be used for its purpose and people had to stand beside the shelter to wait for buses.

The Deputy Town Clerk had spoken to the Acting Inspector at Ringwood Police Station who said that she would arrange for additional patrols in the area.

Members discussed options for the shelter and agreed to investigate the possibility of removing the existing tiled roof and replacing this with a concrete roof and to widen the windows to improve visibility into the shelter.

**RESOLVED:** That the Deputy Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee, be authorised to arrange for the tiled roof on the bus shelter in Southampton Road, Poulner to be replaced with a concrete roof and for the windows to be enlarged.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 4.05pm.

## **OPEN SESSION**

**PLANNING, TOWN & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE – FRIDAY 22<sup>ND</sup> JULY 2005  
AT 2.05PM**

### **PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER 85387 – THE OLD FORGE, LINFORD ROAD**

There were 16 members of the public present who wished to object to this planning application for proposed terrace of 3 houses, 2 semi detached houses and 1 block of 5 flats on the site of The Old Forge.

The following points were made:

Mr Peter Hutchinson of Cornerways Cottage, Gorley Road

- Not in keeping with the surroundings and out of character.
- Would affect wildlife.
- Damage to amenities of surrounding properties, particularly the mobile home park, with loss of light, noise, overlooking and additional traffic.
- The hedge is part of the character of Linford Road – the loss of this would destroy the entrance to the road and would affect wildlife.
- Flats out of character to the area.
- 10 parking spaces not sufficient.
- Linford Road is a very narrow and dangerous road – it is also a route to school.
- Current property has been underpinned twice.
- Does not object to development on this site, but development should enhance the area, not detract from it.

Mrs Doreen Wood of Horseshoes, Linford Road

- Very dangerous stretch of road between Horseshoes and the London Tavern – not wide enough for 2 cars to pass.

Mr Trevor Wood of Horseshoes, Linford Road

- The speed survey was carried out at a quiet time of day, between 2pm and 4pm on a Thursday – this is not representative of actual speeds, especially in the evenings.

Margaret Rood of Cunningham Close

- Her property backs on to the Old Forge – she would lose all privacy, as the proposed terrace of 3-storey houses would directly overlook her property.
- 3-storey properties would be out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Shirley-Ann Smith of Linford Road

- Over intensification of land usage.
- Linford Road is a route to school – her children have been nearly knocked over in the past.
- Out of keeping and character.
- No infrastructure to support additional homes and traffic.

# Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

## Draft Statement of Community Involvement



### Regulation 26 Consultation

**June 2005**

Hampshire's Draft Statement of Community Involvement describes how the County Council will involve the local community in preparing and reviewing minerals and waste planning documents, and in dealing with planning applications. We are now at the stage of asking for comments on our Draft Statement of Community Involvement, to find out if it needs to be improved and how. Please read the Draft Statement of Community Involvement and tell us what you think.

Our main emphasis is to make our final Statement of Community Involvement a reference document for the local community that is easy to understand and use. Please bear this in mind when you read and comment on this Draft version.

The Draft Statement of Community Involvement can be seen on our website:

[www.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste](http://www.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste).

You can also see printed copies at our Environment Department offices (Ashburton Court West, The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UD), at Hampshire County Council Information Centres, at libraries across Hampshire and at District Council offices.

**If you require more information, please contact Trevor Badley on 01962 845795, by e-mail at: [trevor.badley@hants.gov.uk](mailto:trevor.badley@hants.gov.uk) or by post to:**

**Trevor Badley, Minerals and Waste Planning, Environment Department, Hampshire County Council, The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UD**

**Please note that responses must be made in writing and received by 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday 27 July 2005 in order to have a right to be considered.**

## Your details:

**Organisation Name:**

Ringwood Town Council

**Organisation Address:**

"Greenways"  
71 Christchurch Road  
RINGWOOD  
BH24 1DH

**Contact Name:**

Mrs Jo Stannard, Deputy Town Clerk

**e-mail:**

jo.stannard@ringwood.gov.uk

**Telephone number:**

01425 473883

### Data Protection Statement

The information that you provide will be processed by Hampshire County Council in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, to contribute to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

Your comments may be made available for public inspection and you may be consulted at a later date.

Please contact us if you wish your details to be removed from our database.

Please answer the questions about each section of the Draft Statement of Community Involvement, as set out below.

There is an opportunity for any additional comments to be made at the end of this form.

As you read the Draft Statement of Community Involvement, you may wish to consider whether it meets the following criteria:

**Does the Draft Statement of Community Involvement:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Show that Hampshire County Council is meeting its legal requirements.</li><li>2. Set out the Council's strategy for community involvement and its links with other community involvement initiatives e.g. the Community Strategy.</li><li>3. Identify, in general terms, which local community groups and other bodies need to be consulted.</li><li>4. Show how local people, community groups and other bodies can be involved in a timely and accessible manner.</li></ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. Show that the methods to be used to involve people, community groups and other bodies are suitable for different stages in the preparation of the Council's Local Development Documents and for the particular communities.</li><li>6. Show that the Council can resource and manage the process effectively.</li><li>7. Show how the results of the community involvement are to be fed into the preparation of Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents.</li><li>8. Set out the mechanisms for reviewing the procedures in the Statement of Community Involvement.</li></ol> |
|--|--|

*These are the criteria that the Government has set out to determine whether the SCI is 'sound', i.e. is able to fulfil its purpose and really help the local community get involved in planning.*

*Should the Draft Statement of Community Involvement go to an Inquiry before a Planning Inspector, he or she will assess the Draft Statement of Community Involvement against these criteria.*

*Source: Planning Policy Statement 12, Local Development Frameworks, ODPM, 2004.*

<p><b>Section 1: Statement of Community Involvement – Summary</b></p> <p><i>Paragraphs: 1.1 - 6.2</i></p>	<p><i>Question:</i> Is the summary clear, and easily understandable?</p>		
<p>Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?</p>	<p>Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

<p><b>Section 2: The New Planning System</b></p> <p><i>Paragraphs: 7.1 – 8.4</i></p>	<p><i>Question:</i> Is the new planning system clearly explained and understandable?</p>		
<p>Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?</p> <p>8.4 may be better presented in diagrammatic form.</p>	<p>Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
	<p><i>Question:</i> Are the stages of preparation that the Draft Statement of Community Involvement is going through clearly explained?</p>		

**Section 3: Who needs to be involved in the planning process?**

*Paragraphs: 9.1 – 9.9*

*Question:* Is this section clear and easily understood?

Yes:



No:



*Question:* Have we missed out any other 'hard to reach' groups? (If you think we have, please add them below)

Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?

Yes:



No:



Table 2 needs to be simplified.

**Section 4: Links to Community Planning**

*Paragraphs: 10.1 – 11.6*

*Question:* Is this section clearly explained and understandable?

Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?

Yes:



No:



**Section 5: Preparing for community involvement**

*Paragraphs: 12.1 – 13.1*

*Question:* Is this section clearly explained and understandable?

Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?

Yes:



No:



**Section 6: The Minerals and Waste Development Framework.**

*Paragraphs: 14.1 – 21.3*

*Question:* Is this section clear and easily understood?

Yes:



No:



*Question:* Are there any techniques of or approaches to community involvement that we have not included?

Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?

Yes:



No:



A flow chart could be used to clarify the process explained in Section 15.

**Section 7: Planning Applications**

*Paragraphs: 22.1 – 28.2*

*Question:* Is this section clear and easily understood?

Yes:

No:

*Question:* Are there any other approaches to community involvement in determining planning applications that you feel should be included?

Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?

Yes:

No:

**Section 8: Management**

*Paragraphs: 29.1 – 30.1*

*Question:* Is this section clearly explained and understandable?

Yes:

No:

Any suggestions for improvement? Comments?

<b>Appendix 1: Consultees</b>	<i>Question:</i> Is this Appendix clear and easily understandable?			
Are any changes needed? Are there any other <u>groups</u> of consultees who should be included? Comments?	Yes:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No:	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Forest National Park Authority				

<b>Appendix 2: Options for community involvement</b>	<i>Question:</i> Is this Table clear and easily understandable?			
Are any changes needed? Comments?	Yes:	<input type="checkbox"/>	No:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The table needs to be better laid out and simplified – there is too much text and it is not easy to read.				

If you wish to make any further, or any additional, comments, please use the space below.

Please write the paragraph number(s) to which your support/objection refers:

It would be helpful to see a flowchart of the process, including timescales and points at which the community will have the opportunity to be involved.

**Thank you for your contribution to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework.**

**Ringwood Traffic Management Issues  
Informal Local Members' Liaison Meeting**

***Draft notes by JS – awaiting official minutes from NFDC***

Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2005, 9.30am at Greenways

Present:

Allan Ellis	Transportation Group, NFDC
Peter Savidge	Cycle Policy & Strategy, RTC
Martin Wiltshire	Principal Engineer, HCC
Steve Willoughby	Transport Policy, HCC
Jo Stannard	Deputy Town Clerk, RTC
Cllr N R G Clarke	Town & County Councillor (Chairman)
Cllr L C Ford	Town & District Councillor
Cllr J D Heron	District Councillor
Cllr B Terry	Town Councillor
Cllr C Treleaven	District Councillor
Cllr N Wood	Town Councillor

Apologies:

P C Dave Taylor      Traffic Management, Hampshire Police

**1. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes were approved as a correct record.

**2. Road Casualty Map**

The group viewed a road casualty map produced by the County Council from Police records, showing a 3-year picture up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005.

It was noted that the greatest cluster was at the junction of West Street and the A31.

**AGREED:**

- 1) That the Town Council should write to the Highways Agency Route Planner asking what was planned for this location, in light of the road casualty statistics.
- 2) That AE would ask if a copy of the road casualty map could be produced for the Town Council.

**3. New Forest Highway and Transport Advisory Panel – 05/06 Traffic Management Programmes**

It was noted that the following schemes were included in this year's programme:

- Waiting restrictions for Hightown Road (including Cemetery area).
- Traffic Orders for Quomp (trial closures).
- Pedestrian Signing – this had now been put on hold at the request of the Town Council as there was no funding available and it would be considered as part of the Town Plan.

- B3081 Ringwood to Verwood road – proposals to reduce the speed limit from Bakers Hanging to Verwood to 50mph were out for preliminary consultation, together with a short extension of the 30mph limit at the entrance to Verwood.

It was noted that, due to the amount of work involved in decriminalisation of on-street parking which included the need to review all traffic orders throughout the district, some items in the programme had been delayed.

#### **4. Traffic Management Issues**

##### **4.1 Market Place**

It was noted that a Prohibition of Driving Order (POD) had previously been proposed for the High Street and Market Place but had not been progressed. As part of this scheme, it had also been proposed to put in some waiting restrictions near Lloyds Bank in order to create a passing point to ease congestion in the High Street.

The biggest problem in the Market Place on Wednesdays was that the market had crept further into the highway over the years, making it dangerous for pedestrians who were forced into the path of vehicles.

From a traffic management point of view, it was felt that the market Charter could not be overruled by a parking order, therefore, the market traders' vehicles could not be moved on. However, it was noted that the Town Council had asked for a legal opinion from the District and County Councils as to whether the Charter could be challenged.

JH suggested that, rather than try and challenge the Charter, it may be possible to tackle the problem on the grounds of health and safety. He said that the market was not exempt from health and safety regulations or from causing obstruction to the footpath. He said that pressure could be brought by Hampshire Highways to ensure that the footpath was not used or blocked on market day and the District Council could get involved from a health and safety point of view, forcing the market owner to define a safe width and stop, or even reverse, the creep.

#### **AGREED:**

- 1) That an experimental Prohibition of Driving Order be implemented as soon as possible for the High Street and Market Place on Wednesdays.
- 2) That waiting restrictions be implemented on both sides of the road near Lloyds Bank as part of the above scheme.
- 3) That an informal meeting be arranged with Mr Morant, the owner of the market, to inform him of the steps that would be taken by the relevant councils if he failed to cooperate by tidying up the market and attempting to reduce the creep into the highway.

##### **4.2 Bickerley Road**

It was noted that the white line scheme, designed to provide passing places and safer movement at junctions, had now been implemented. However, it appeared that some drivers were ignoring the lines and others were parking on the opposite side of the road. It was therefore suggested that double yellow lines be painted along the length of Bickerley Road adjacent to the Village Green.

It was hoped that, under decriminalisation of on-street parking, the District Council would look at a residents parking scheme in this area.

A problem had also been identified in the area of Bickerley Gardens, with traffic exiting from Greyfriars and the Library sometimes having to mount the pavement. The District Council had therefore suggested some additional longitudinal white 'access' markings to protect the junction/bend and to provide a passing place in the narrow section of road.

There had also been problems with parking in the area of Deweys Lane with residents being unable to access their properties. It was noted that the Town Council was in the process of purchasing the area of Village Green adjacent to the road and, as part of an improvement scheme, would move the dragon's teeth back towards the road and replace the missing gate. The District Council had also suggested implementing a Prohibition of Driving Order along the end of Bickerley Road, from its junction with Lynes Lane.

Cllr Clarke asked about the s106 monies that had been collected as a contribution towards a footpath on this end of the Village Green and AE agreed to ask Tim Lawton about any developments on this.

**AGREED:**

- 1) That the District Council be requested to implement double yellow lines along the length of Bickerley Road adjacent to the Village Green
- 2) That the white lining scheme for Bickerley Gardens be agreed.
- 3) That the District Council be requested to implement a Prohibition of Driving Order in Bickerley Road, from its junction with Lynes Lane to the cul-de-sac by Deweys Lane.

**4.3 Quomp**

It was noted that the closure point was due to be changed on 16<sup>th</sup> August, and that there would be no period when the road was open to 2-way traffic. Very few comments had been received relating to the first closure point – a summary of these was circulated. It was agreed that feedback from residents was vital in order to make the best decision at the end of the second trial closure.

The traffic counts to identify the impact of the first closure had been carried out on 19<sup>th</sup> July and would now be analysed.

**AGREED:** That Walking & Cycling Working Group would consider the best way to get feedback from residents at its next meeting in October.

**4.4 Hightown Road**

It was noted that the proposals for waiting restrictions in Hightown Road would be progressed to public advertisement as soon as possible. This work was currently being held up by work on decriminalisation of on-street parking. However, it was hoped that it would be completed in the 2005/06 financial year.

## **5. Any Other Business**

### **5.1 Kings Arms Lane**

It had been previously agreed to include a proposal for King's Arms Lane to be made one-way in a future programme of works. It was noted that the Local Plan policy may have to be revisited as it stated that "favourable consideration would be given to measures to restrict traffic movements to southbound only on the upper section of King's Arms Lane.", as there was some concern that this would push additional unwanted traffic onto Bickerley Road.

### **5.2 Junction of Parsonage Barn Lane and Southampton Road**

Cllr Terry said that he had seen two coaches mount the kerb when turning left into Parsonage Barn Lane from Southampton Road. PS said that this junction had been re-assessed by engineers in the light of previous comments and had in fact been altered. However, he would pass this information on to the engineers.

### **5.3 Pedestrian Crossing – Christchurch Road**

MW reported that another survey of pedestrian and vehicle movement had been undertaken on the length of Christchurch Road between "Greenways" and the Greyfriars roundabout. The result of 0.42pv<sup>2</sup> did not justify a new crossing (normally, anything over 1 would be considered, although special cases could be justified over 0.5). In addition, it was noted that it would be almost physically impossible to locate a crossing on this section of road. However, it may be possible to put in a refuge island and improve the crossing near the roundabout and/or to put in a drop kerb and tactile paving just north of the public offices.

**AGREED:** That the District Council be requested to investigate the feasibility of an uncontrolled crossing facility in Christchurch Road between "Greenways" and the Greyfriars roundabout.

The meeting closed at 11.10am.

## Ringwood Town Council - Planning Observations - 22nd July 2005

Number	Site Address	Proposal	Observation	Comments
2005/298	Within the garden of Broomhill, Crow Hill, Crow, RINGWOOD	Fell ash and prune 3 oaks	Permission (1)	
84737	St Elmo's Residential Home, Gorley Road, RINGWOOD	Two-storey and single-storey extensions; conservatory; porch; vertical flue to extractor fan (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)	Permission (1)	
85086	131a Southampton Road, RINGWOOD	Raise height of front wall; front entrance gates	Permission (1)	
85087	131 Southampton Road, RINGWOOD	First floor extension; alterations to form 2 houses	Permission (1)	
85120	Crow Crest, Crow Hill, Crow, RINGWOOD	First floor rear extension	Permission (1)	
85123	Land adjacent to 14 & 16 Brooks Close, RINGWOOD	Block of 2 flats; new access	Refusal (4)	This area becomes very congested with parked vehicles and is difficult to maneuver around - concern re. hazard to road users and access for emergency vehicles. We also feel that the proposal constitutes overdevelopment.

1 - Recommend Permission, but would accept NFDC officer's decision 2 - Recommend Refusal but would accept NFDC officer's decision 3 - Recommend Permission  
 4 - Recommend Refusal 5 - Will accept NFDC officer's decision

<b>Number</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
85141	4 Kingfisher House, Waterside Close, RINGWOOD	Block of 8 flats; demolition of existing house	Permission (1)	
85160	Lochend, Hurst Corner, RINGWOOD	Replacement fence	Permission (1)	Subject to a condition requiring the close board fencing to be removed after 2 years.
85209	Beechwood House, 11 Gravel Lane, RINGWOOD	Conservatory	Permission (1)	
85232	Castle View Farm, Long Lane, Upper Kingston, RINGWOOD	Rear conservatory	Permission (1)	
85235	Crowfield, Long Lane, Upper Kingston, RINGWOOD	Single-storey rear extension	Permission (1)	
85239	Rear of 41 Christchurch Road, RINGWOOD	Demolition of single-storey workshop (Application for Conservation Consent to Demolish)	Permission (1)	
85259	Forest Side, Forest Lane, Hightown Hill, RINGWOOD	Two-storey extension	Permission (1)	
85261	42 Broadshard Lane, RINGWOOD	Roof alterations to form rooms in roof	Permission (1)	
85274	Picket Croft, Picket Hill, Hightown, RINGWOOD	Continued temporary siting of caravan (Renewal of planning permission 78375)	Officer's Decision (5)	

1 - Recommend Permission, but would accept NFDC officer's decision 2 - Recommend Refusal but would accept NFDC officer's decision 3 - Recommend Permission  
4 - Recommend Refusal 5 - Will accept NFDC officer's decision

<b>Number</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
85281	Land of 33 The Mount, RINGWOOD	Dwelling (Outline application with details only of means of access)	Refusal (4)	Overdevelopment of site. Proposed access will be hazardous to pedestrians and other road users in an already congested area. Also, an area of landscaping has been enclosed within the boundary fence.
85298	21 East View Road, RINGWOOD	Roof alterations, including 2 front dormers and 2 velux windows, in association with new first floor	Permission (1)	
85299	14 Forestlake Avenue, RINGWOOD	Two-storey side extension; single-storey side & rear extension; front porch	Permission (1)	
85310	Oak Cottage, Gorley Road, Poulner, RINGWOOD	Single & two-storey side and rear extension; rear conservatory	Permission (1)	
85328	Old Bridge Cottage, The Bridges, RINGWOOD	Two-storey side and rear extensions; rear balcony; pitched roof over existing dormer	Officer's Decision (5)	
85329	9a Parsonage Barn Lane, RINGWOOD	Single-storey side extensions; roof alterations to form rooms in roof; rear conservatory; raise height of wall by 900mm with close boarded timber fence.	Permission (1)	

1 - Recommend Permission, but would accept NFDC officer's decision 2 - Recommend Refusal but would accept NFDC officer's decision 3 - Recommend Permission  
4 - Recommend Refusal 5 - Will accept NFDC officer's decision

22 July 2005

Page 3 of 5

<b>Number</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
85331	29 North Poulner Road, RINGWOOD	Single-storey rear extension	Permission (1)	
85333	Land adjacent to 5 Coniston Road, RINGWOOD	House (Outline Application with details only of means of access)	Permission (1)	
85351	Letcher & Son, 24 Market Place, RINGWOOD	Display illuminated sign	Refusal (4)	Proposed sign has already been installed and illumination is neon blue. This is out of keeping with the character of the conservation area.
85356	150 Hightown Road, RINGWOOD	Attached garage; demolition of existing detached garage	Permission (1)	
85357	13 Highfield Avenue, RINGWOOD	Two-storey rear extension; roof alterations in association with new first floor	Permission (1)	
85360	6 Joyce Dickson Close, RINGWOOD	Single-storey side extension; access to alterations	Permission (1)	
85369	Rear of 41 Christchurch Road, RINGWOOD	Two & three storey blocks of 6 flats & offices; parking (Outline Application with details only of siting and means of access)	Refusal (4)	Proximity of proposed buildings would have a detrimental impact on the adjoining property (Close Court) with loss of light to most parts of the property for most of the day.
85383	15 Hampton Drive, RINGWOOD	Roof alterations; dormers	Permission (1)	

1 - Recommend Permission, but would accept NFDC officer's decision 2 - Recommend Refusal but would accept NFDC officer's decision 3 - Recommend Permission  
4 - Recommend Refusal 5 - Will accept NFDC officer's decision

<b>Number</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Observation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
85385	2 Lin Brook Drive, RINGWOOD	Two-storey side extension	Permission (1)	
85387	The Old Forge, Linford Road, RINGWOOD	Terrace of 3 houses; 2 semi detached houses; 1 block of 5 flats; access and parking; demolition of existing house (Outline Application with details only of siting and means of access)	Refusal (4)	Out of character, over development, detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties, unsuitable access onto a dangerous narrow road (which is a route to local schools) and concern re. additional traffic movement, concern re. protected trees and loss of hedge along Linford Road which is an important part of the character of the road.

1 - Recommend Permission, but would accept NFDC officer's decision 2 - Recommend Refusal but would accept NFDC officer's decision 3 - Recommend Permission  
4 - Recommend Refusal 5 - Will accept NFDC officer's decision