

OPEN SESSION: There were several members of the public present who gave notice they wished to speak on specific planning applications to be considered by the Committee.

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

Held on Friday 20th July 2007 at 2.05pm

Apologies

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Town Clerk reported that apologies for absence had been received from Cllr M Daly and Cllr M A Steele.

Declarations of Interest

Cllr Clarke indicated that he would be declaring a personal and prejudicial interest in the item on the Village 30 project and would leave the meeting during discussions on that matter.

PRESENT: Cllr N R G Clarke (Chairman)
Cllr N J Chard
Cllr D R Cole
Cllr D E Cracknell
Cllr B H Terry
Cllr Mrs J A M Terry

IN ATTENDANCE: Terry Simpson, Town Clerk
Cllr Mrs C Ford

P/4476

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22nd June 2007, having been circulated, be approved and signed as a correct record.

With the agreement of the Committee, item 7 relating to planning applications was considered next for the benefit of the members of public present.

P/4477

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Planning applications in respect of periods ending 20th & 27th June and 4th & 11th July 2007 were considered.

APPLICATION 07/90412

Mr Thorne explained that he had lived opposite this site for 37 years. There had been at least 10 cases in this area where vehicles have left the road and had come to rest in exactly the place where it was proposed to install the pole and cabinets. Any accidents would be much more serious once those structures were in place. He therefore objected to the application on road safety grounds. Cllr Mrs Ford referred to a specific instance where a personal friend had been involved in an accident through no fault of her own at this inherently dangerous junction. Other members of the public supported the views expressed and referred particularly to the numerous accidents in the area and also to the fact that children going to and from school would pass this structure and could therefore be in danger of radiation emissions.

The Committee considered the application and the representations received and for the reasons set out in the Annex, agreed that the application should be recommended for refusal.

APPLICATION 07/90370

Mr M Willis, an adjoining property owner supported by Mr Donaldson and Cllr Mrs Ford explained that he was speaking not only on his own behalf but on behalf of other residents in the area on this application. Two previous applications had been refused on this site for single dwellings for several reasons including

highway implications, out of character and impact on residential amenity. The current proposal for commercial use as a veterinary surgery would probably bring about over 100 vehicle movements per day at a dangerous junction. This would be considerably more than previously proposed for a residential development. In addition the car park would back onto residential properties gardens and inevitably the car park would need to be floodlit which might in itself encourage unacceptable behaviour by young people in the area through the night. Whilst accepting that it might be appropriate to erect bungalows on the site, the present proposal was unacceptable on highway and over development grounds.

The Committee considered the views expressed and agreed for the reasons set out in the Annex that the current application should be recommended for refusal.

APPLICATION NUMBER 07/89994

Mr Watkinson of 1 Broadshard Court supported by Cllr Mrs Ford noted that the Committee had previously recommended refusal of an application submitted earlier this year. Despite some changes having been made to the application it was still fundamentally flawed in particular with regard to the visibility splays. By reference to the highways manual he explained how the current proposals were also unacceptable notwithstanding the revised views of the highway authority. He did not believe that the current application overcame the problem with regard to the highways guidance manual or that the visibility splays were adequate.

Having considered the revised application, the Committee saw no reason to change their previous view and reaffirmed that the application should be recommended for refusal for the reasons outlined in the Annex.

APPLICATION NUMBER 07/90372

Mr Collier on behalf of the applicants explained to Members the history of the site and the reasons why the existing property was not capable of renovation. He understood the reasons why a previous application on the site had been refused and why the decision had been upheld on appeal. This new application which had been discussed with the Planning Officer, sought to overcome previous objections.

Members noted that the Planning Officer's report on the current application indicated that the proposals would not appear out of context with the street scene and as there would be no adverse impact on the adjoining neighbours, it appeared to overcome the concerns raised in the Inspector's decision notice. Members therefore were minded to recommend approval of the revised application for the reasons set out in the annex.

RESOLVED: That the observations shown in *Annex A* be submitted to the District Council.

P/4478

PLANNING FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE - WHITE PAPER

A copy of the Government Consultation Paper on this topic had been circulated with the Agenda. The Chairman also explained that the County Council were looking at these issues and referred to a Paper prepared by that authority. Following consideration of the issues it was

RESOLVED: (i) That the general principles contained within the White Paper be supported;

(ii) That in order to overcome the uncertainty caused by delays, it is necessary to speed up decision making and therefore the guidelines for consultation and the timescales for responses should be light and testing; and

(iii) That account should be taken of flood defence works or requirements in the consultation processes.

P/4479

CHANGES TO PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT – CONSULTATION PAPER

Members considered proposals made by the Government in their consultation Paper about changes in relation to householder permitted development. Members supported the general principles being developed by the Government but were concerned as to whether the proposals in themselves were sufficient and

- RESOLVED:** (i) That the Government proposals be supported in principle but that it appeared that there would still be too many constraints and as such the proposals provided too little relaxation in the current rules; and
- (ii) That for ease of householder use, the final documentation should incorporate a series of diagrams which would provide a greater clarity and understanding for the average householder.

P/4480

VILLAGE 30 PROJECT

Cllr Nigel Clarke declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item since he is involved in determination of these matters as a County Councillor. After explaining the issues, and in line with the Council's adopted Code of Conduct and new Standing Orders he left the meeting and took no part in the debate or voting on the matter.

Cllr Clarke explained that as a County Councillor he had looked at the suggestions put forward by the Town Council. Whilst the reasons for the applications were understood, Ringwood's proposals could not be supported on highway, traffic or accident grounds.

After his statement County Cllr Clarke left the meeting. Cllr Neville Chard in the Chair.

The Town Clerk reported that it was clear that Ringwood had not been selected for the first tranche of the Village 30 Project as the areas put forward by the Town Council for extension of the 30mph speed limit in Christchurch Road, Crow Lane and Hightown Road had not been identified as urgent. However, the County Council's Cabinet had made a commitment that all villages wishing to participate in the scheme would be able to do so in due course. There was now an opportunity to provide further community evidence to support the Town Council's bid prior to consideration for the next tranche.

Members expressed their disappointment at the news, but understood that if the criteria could not be matched, it would be difficult for any scheme within the town to proceed without that supporting evidence.

RESOLVED: That no further action be taken at this stage to identify a Village 30 project within Ringwood.

County Cllr Nigel Clarke returned to the meeting and took the Chair.

P/4481

SCRUTINY OF TRANSPORT IN THE COMMUNITY

Members were pleased to note that the County Council was undertaking a scrutiny review of the effectiveness of passenger transport services in meeting community needs in the County. The Town Council had been invited to submit its views as part of that exercise. Cllr Clarke explained that he sat on the County's Review Group dealing with this matter. Ringwood was not the typical average market/small town since unlike others it did not have a railway station but was a hub town well served by the National Express service. The town also had the benefit of community transport provided through Greyfriars and Community First.

Views were expressed on the possibility of linkages with both of the organisations providing community transport and also investigations into the possibility of using a smaller vehicle which would increase

flexibility. It was felt that public transport in the late evenings was poor and that some of the procedural issues had an adverse effect on community transport provision.

RESOLVED: That the County Council's Environment and Transportation Policy Review Committee be requested to include in it's review the following issues:-

- (i) Improvement of linkages with voluntary and charitable community transport schemes;
- (ii) Introducing greater flexibility by the use of smaller vehicles;
- (iii) The introduction of transport facilities in the late evenings particularly for young people who travel to nearby towns for entertainment; and
- (iv) Investigate the administrative, procedural and regularity hurdles which operators and volunteers meet when trying to offer community and public transport facilities.

P/4482

BICKERLEY ROAD – TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

The Town Clerk advised Members that a resident of Bickerley Road had requested that New Forest District Council carry out an immediate review of the recently implemented parking restrictions in the road. Members noted that this Order had been introduced following a long period of consultation during which time there had been full opportunities for the receipt and consideration of representations. The Order had only just been implemented and it was important to see how well the arrangement worked before making any further changes. Members therefore believed that it was inappropriate to make any changes to the Order at this stage but that after a reasonable period, probably in twelve months time, the Order would need to be reviewed to determine whether at that time any further changes were required.

RESOLVED: That there is no case made to undertake a review of the newly implemented Traffic Regulation Order for Bickerley Road at this stage but that the matter be reconsidered after a reasonable period, probably about 12 months, have elapsed since implementation of the Order.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 4.15pm.