

OPEN SESSION: There were five members of the public present, some of whom wished to speak regarding planning applications.

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

Held on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2012 at 2.00pm

Cllr Mark Steele (Chairman)  
Cllr Sophie Burgess-Kennar (Vice-Chairman)  
Cllr Steve Rippon-Swaine  
Cllr Stephanie Stokes  
Cllr Brian Terry  
Cllr Angela Wiseman

IN ATTENDANCE: Jo Stannard, Deputy Town Clerk  
Claire Perrens, Meetings Administrator  
Cllr L C Ford (*until 4.05pm*)  
Evelyn Robinson, Student Advisor

*The Deputy Town Clerk reported that apologies for absence had been received from Cllr Neville Chard and Cllr Jacqui Terry.*

### **P/4929**

#### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Burgess-Kennar declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application numbers 11/96962, 11/98010, 11/98016 and 11/98055 – see P/4931 below for details.

Cllr Steele declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (appeal regarding application number 11/97343) – see P/4932 below for details.

### **P/4930**

#### **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, having been  
circulated, be approved and signed as a correct record.

### **P/4931**

#### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

*Cllr Burgess-Kennar declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application number 11/96962 as the applicants were close family members. She also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application numbers 11/98010, 11/98016 and 11/98055 as the applicant was her landlord. She left the room whilst these applications were discussed, taking no part in the debates or decisions made.*

Members considered the planning applications as detailed in *Annex A attached*.

#### 11/98093 – 83 Eastfield Lane

The applicant, Mr Grant, wished to speak and circulated a briefing note to Members. He said that the property in question was neglected and in a state of disrepair. The existing character of the road was very mixed. The aim was to make the best use of the depth of the site and avoid 'widening' the building, which was set back 19 metres from the road. There would be no loss of light to the neighbours. Mr Grant confirmed

that all the rooflights would have a cill height of no less than 1.8m. After further discussion, Members concurred that the plans were appropriate for the location, and recommended the observation as shown in *Annex A*.

11/98061 – 24 Hampton Drive

Mr & Mrs Walker, who live at number 22, wished to speak. Mrs Walker pointed out that the block plan submitted by the applicant was inaccurate, and in fact their property extended to the boundary. This was important as it meant the proposed extension would have a considerable impact on their garden, as the planning officer had highlighted. Mr & Mrs Walker contended that they had a small patio area and lounge, which relied on sunlight from the SW only, which would be blocked. Mr Walker said this was a large extension, he estimated 85% of the original footprint. After further discussion, Members agreed an observation as shown in *Annex A*.

**RESOLVED:** That the observations summarised in *Annex 'A'* be submitted.

<b>ACTION</b> <b>Claire Perrens</b>
-------------------------------------

*Cllr Ford left the meeting at 4.05pm.*

**P/4932**

**APPEAL REGARDING APPLICATION NO: 11/97343**

*Cllr Steele declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item due to a business interest. He left the room whilst this matter was discussed, taking no part in the debate or decision made. The Vice-Chairman took the Chair in his absence.*

Members considered an appeal against condition 6 of the decision regarding planning application 11/97343 in respect of Flats 1,2, 7 & 8 Mary Mitchell Close, Lynes Lane – one and two-storey extensions; balconies; demolition of existing garage and bin store.

Condition 6 states:

The first floor window on the side [north] elevation of the approved extension serving the hallway and the first floor window on the side elevation (south) of the existing building serving flat identified as flat 8 (only the part of glazing on that window that faces south to be glazed with obscure glass) shall at all times be glazed with obscure glass and made non-opening.

The appellant wished to appeal against the condition referring to the first floor window on the side elevation (south) only.

Ringwood Town Council's original observation was Permission (1).

**RESOLVED:** That there be no objection to the removal of Condition 6.

<b>ACTION</b> <b>Jo Stannard</b>
----------------------------------

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 4.15pm.

RECEIVED  
25<sup>th</sup> January 2012

APPROVED  
10<sup>th</sup> February 2012

TOWN MAYOR

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

**Note: The text in the Action Boxes above does not form part of these minutes.**