

OPEN SESSION: There were 6 members of the public present interested in items on the agenda.

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

Held on Friday 7th September 2018 at 10.00am at Ringwood Gateway, The Furlong, Ringwood.

PRESENT: Cllr Christopher Treleaven (Chairman)
Cllr Philip Day
Cllr Hilary Edge
Cllr Christine Ford (*until 11:45 am*)
Cllr Gloria O'Reilly
Cllr Tony Ring
Cllr Angela Wiseman

IN ATTENDANCE: Jo Hurd, Deputy Town Clerk
Nicola Vodden, Meetings Administrator

P/5530 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Deputy Town Clerk reported that apologies for absence had been received from Cllrs Briers and Ward.

P/5531 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Ring declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications 18/11034 and 18/11035, as the applicant is an acquaintance.

Cllr Ford declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 18/11102 as the applicant is a friend.

Cllr O'Reilly declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications 18/11004 and 18/11096, as the applicant is/was a client, and also 18/11034, as the applicant is a neighbour.

Although there was no declarable pecuniary interest, Cllr Day indicated that the applicant for 18/11102 was a client of his firm and he would not speak or vote on the matter.

It was also noted that Cllr Day had a financial interest in the agenda item relating to the Friday's Cross sign painting, as he had made a donation to the project. He remained in the room and spoke on the matter, but did not vote.

P/5532 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 3rd August 2018, having been

Chairman's initials



circulated, be approved and signed as a correct record.

P/5533

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Members considered the list of planning applications.

(With the agreement of all Members, 18/10976 (3, Strides Lane) and 18/11099 (Little Mansfield) were brought forward as there were members of the public present who were interested in the applications.)

It was noted that individual Members knew a number of the planning applicants, however no disclosable pecuniary interests were declared (see P/5531).

18/10976 3, Strides Lane:- The applicant presented the application indicating that the plans had been revised and now included a garden area and parking space. He confirmed that the replacement windows would be wooden. Members agreed to recommend permission (1), but would accept the officer's decision.

18/11009 Little Mansfield:- A neighbour of the application site spoke in opposition to the proposal, indicating that it was out of character for the area and there were concerns about its dominance and being unsympathetic to the Listing Building and neighbouring properties in Mansfield Mews. Members agreed to recommend refusal (4), adding that it was felt that the proposal was not in keeping nor appropriate in the context of the nearby Listed Building and wall and in Ringwood's Conservation Area. The design was out of keeping and would impact on the amenity of surrounding properties. Access would be problematic and parking spaces within the site were contrived and could result in additional parking on Southampton Road.

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

ACTION Nicola Vodden

P/5534

NFDC CONSULTATION ON SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Members were asked to consider the draft responses to NFDC's consultation on the three draft supplementary planning documents:- Strategic Sites Masterplanning SPD, Mitigation for Recreational Impacts Strategy SPD and the Guide to Developer Contributions SPD (*Annex B*).

<http://www.newforest.gov.uk/article/14288/Supplementary-Planning-Documents-and-other-guidance>

The Deputy Town Clerk and Town Clerk were thanked for the work done in providing the draft responses.

The Chairman indicated that he, Cllr Ring and the Deputy Town Clerk had attended a meeting, with NFDC's Urban Designer, to discuss how sites are to be developed, should they go through as suitable sites, as part of the Local Plan Review.

Chairman's initials



In respect of the two sites in Ringwood, the design statement provided more information on the reasoning behind the outline plans in terms of provision of green space, how the road network serves the residences, the mix and layout of houses, locating taller dwellings nearer to industrial areas, ensuring continual views through the sites and a semi urban feel to the area, with countryside around, etc. The proposals were still in the design stage and could be amended, if considered appropriate.

Maximum number of dwellings

The NFDC's decision to not specify a maximum number of dwellings on site was explained, and argued to be self-regulating, due to the requirement to provide 8 hectares of open space per 1000 population (in developments of more than 50 houses). The more housing, the more open space will have to be provided and this will limit the number of houses. In some areas where increased density was desirable, this would have to be matched with green space on site.

Provision of Open Space SS13 (Moortown Lane)

It was noted that, in order to satisfy the open space requirement (8 hectares of open space per 1000 population), the area indicated on the plan, falls outside of the site. This section of Green Belt land is not included in the strategic sites identified as suitable for development, is already used as open space (playing fields and allotments) by the Town Council and cannot be allocated as open space provision for the development of SS13. The mandatory requirement has only been achieved by extending into the Green Belt, which is not part of the plan. (Add comment to SS13 Landscape Framework)

Road network

The new roads suggested would not just serve as access roads to the new development(s), but would provide a through route from Moortown Lane to A31 and vehicles would use this new link to by-pass the town. This would require mitigation measures and improvements to the junction with Christchurch Road to properly provide for the needs of the residents. Care is required in respect of the exact location of the access road in Moortown Lane. (Add comment to SS13, Site specific considerations)

Green space buffer

This has been included on the SS14 site due to drainage issues, providing Eastfield Lane properties with a buffer, but not on SS13 site to protect the privacy of residents, in Christchurch Road, from the new development. The Urban Design Officer had explained that this would be achieved by long gardens and a tree line, which would also provide secure boundaries. However, it was agreed to leave this comment in the draft response.

Sewage

It needs to be demonstrated that the sewage system can cope with the increased capacity from new development as there are concerns with development putting additional pressure on the system and that it will not cope. Similarly there are issues with surface water, drainage and flooding. This evidence should be more vigorous than flood risk assessment at the planning stage.

Mr Graham, a representative of A Better Ringwood, gave a presentation to the Committee in relation to site SS14. He suggested that an improved layout would see more homes in the north east of the site, closer to A31, providing a shield of noise protection and lessen the impact on the amenity of dwellings opposite the southern

Chairman's initials



boundary, where the feeling of being in the countryside would be lost. He had concerns regarding the gradient of the road from the roundabout onto the site and suggested that the access onto Hightown Road be nearer the Elm Tree Public house.

Cllr Ford left the meeting at 11:45am.

Members were very impressed with the presentation made by Mr Graham, on behalf of A Better Ringwood, and thanked him for all the work he had put in to producing an alternative option for the site layout of SS14. It was agreed to support this alternative proposal in full, and to include a copy of the plan, which demonstrated how some of the built form could be relocated from the south of the site to the north east. This would protect the important views outlined in the Local Distinctiveness SPD and mean that the SANG area would be more accessible to a greater number of residents.

Recreational Impacts Mitigation Strategy for European Sites

Members wished there to be an enforceable condition regarding the ongoing maintenance of the open spaces once they were handed over. Reference was made to the existing lengthsman scheme and Members were of the opinion that this would need to be extended in order to maintain new developments. (Add comment)

A Guide to Developer Contributions

Q7. Add 'agreed and funded management plan for maintenance'.

Q9. Add 'when developers contributions are provided for a specific purpose, there is a need to ensure that the relevant authorities have the resources available to deliver projects. If not, there is concern that developers could ask for contributions to be returned, if unspent'.

Q10. Add a comment regarding the proposed location for the new primary school, if required, falls outside SS13.

RECOMMENDED: That the amended responses to the 3 supplementary planning documents be approved and submitted. (*Annex B*) (*amendments in italics*)

ACTION Jo Hurd

P/5535

DEVELOPERS' CONTRIBUTIONS

The Deputy Town Clerk updated Members on the use of transport contributions held by NFDC. The two schemes that were being taken forward by HCC were the joint cycle and pedestrian path across Carvers playing field and the footpath joining the north-east section of the Linden Homes development with the existing footpath on the west of Crow Lane.

There had been no update on the pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of the Lidl's roundabout.

Chairman's initials



In respect of the proposed crossing in Castleman Way, HCC had indicated that the criteria cannot be met for a Toucan crossing, but that it would consider whether an uncontrolled crossing at this location would be suitable, should Members wish. It was suggested that developers contributions be sought to improve signage and that there be more publicity of the new cycle path running from the rear of Lidl's to New Street, before this is pursued further.

RESOLVED: 1) That the update in respect of developer contributions be received;
2) That NFDC be requested to release developers contributions to improve signage and promote the new cycle path through Forest Gate Business Park.

RECOMMENDED: That the County Councillor be asked to support the Town Council in progressing these schemes.

ACTION Jo Hurd

P/5536
A31 IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

The Deputy Town Clerk provided an update following a meeting with Highways England on 28th August. She reported that in respect of delivery, Highways England had aspirations of reducing the construction period significantly; the current programme allowed for 33 weeks. A copy of the notes of the meeting are attached (*Annex C*).

In relation to the bid for designated funds, a meeting with HCC took place on 28th August. Previously, the Council had suggested items for inclusion in the bid and commented on each of the proposals put forward by HCC.

Members were disappointed that a number of their comments did not appear to have been considered by HCC and some proposals were seen as unnecessary or not achievable and it did not meet the Council's aspirations. It had been explained that this was due to the strict criteria for bidding.

With regard to the proposal to reverse the traffic flow on Meeting House Lane, it had been agreed to include adjustments to facilitate a right hand turn from High Street, and that this proposal would only be taken forward provided the pedestrian environment is not compromised.

The suggestion to provide a pedestrian crossing from the Gateway Square to the Meeting House Shopping Centre had been taken on board.

The final document had been submitted to Highways England and it is hoped that once funds have been successfully obtained, the finer detail of each project could be assessed further.

RESOLVED: That the updates on the A31 Improvement Scheme and the notes of the meeting with Highways England (*Annex C*) on 28th August 2018 be received.

Chairman's initials



ACTION Jo Hurd

P/5537

HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE ISSUES

The Deputy Town Clerk tabled the update on outstanding highways maintenance and flood alleviation issues at the meeting (*Annex D*).

She highlighted R/005 Market Place and the arrangements to co-ordinate Hampshire Highways (HH) work with the Council's work to the Human Sundial paved area and surrounds. HH have indicated that as the workload contribution from HCC has escalated beyond the initial request, that an engineer has been offered to project manage the scheme early in 2019, however HCC cannot commit to any other funding other than keeping the area safe, until budgets for next year have been confirmed.

R/009 Meeting House Lane is showing on the schedule as completed, however the Deputy Town Clerk would chase this as it had been agreed that further works were required to bring the repairs up to standard.

In respect of flood alleviation works, F/002 bottom of Crow Hill, it was suggested that developers contributions could be devolved to the Council in order to progress the works required. It was noted that all work programmed for Crow Hill would be ineffective as the flow of water cannot get to Crown Stream.

A meeting was scheduled with HCC and NFDC in October to discuss drainage and flooding issues in the area, including the Linden homes development and the Moortown Lane flood relief scheme.

RESOLVED: That the update in respect of highways maintenance and flood alleviation issues be received (*Annex D*).

ACTION Jo Hurd

P/5538

SIGN PAINTING AT FRIDAYS CROSS

It was noted that Cllr Day had a financial interest in this item, as he had made a donation to the project, but this was not a disclosable pecuniary interest. He remained in the room, spoke on the matter, but did not vote.

The Deputy Town Clerk indicated that the item had arisen as Ringwood Society had obtained a single quote for the sign painting at Friday's Cross. As the Council would manage the project, and the total expected cost would exceed £1,000, Financial Regulations dictate that three quotes should be obtained.

As a specialist contractor was required for the traditional hand painting, it was suggested that it would be appropriate, in these circumstances, for Financial Regulations to be suspended.

Chairman's initials



Members agreed to recommend to the Policy and Finance Committee that Financial Regulations be suspended, although it was possible that another two quotes would be forthcoming by its next meeting. It was noted that there were concerns with the increasing costs of the project as a whole and that the Council may be asked to contribute funds.

RECOMMENDED TO POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE:

That Financial Regulations be suspended for the purposes of procuring the sign painting at Fridays Cross.

ACTION Jo Hurd

**P/5539
PROJECTS**

The Deputy Town Clerk indicated that any progress made with current projects was highlighted on the reports provided (*Annex E*).

RESOLVED: That the update in respect of projects is noted.

ACTION Jo Hurd

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 12.50pm.

RECEIVED
26th September 2018

APPROVED
5th October 2018

TOWN MAYOR

COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

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

Chairman's initials

Annex A to Planning, Town Environment Committee Minutes 7th September 2018
Ringwood Town Council - Planning Observations - NFDC

Number	Site Address	Proposal	Observation	Comments
18/10976	3, Strides Lane, Ringwood. BH24 1ED	Change of use from office to residential; dormers; rooflight; fenestration alterations; boundary fence; parking	Permission (1)	The Committee were pleased to see that the replacement windows would be wooden and that the plans included additional garden space and a parking area.
18/11004	16-18 Southampton Road, Ringwood. BH24 1HY	Removal of condition 3 on planning permission 18/10726 facilitate use of the first-floor flats as independent dwellings	Permission (1)	
18/11009	Little Mansfield, 36a, Southampton Road, Ringwood. BH24 1JD	1 terrace of 3 houses & associated parking; demolition of existing dwelling and garage	Refusal (4)	The Committee felt that the proposal was not in keeping nor appropriate in the context of the nearby Listed Building and wall and Ringwood's Conservation Area. The design was out of keeping and would impact on the amenity of surrounding properties. Access would be problematic and parking spaces within the site were contrived and could result in additional parking on Southampton Road.

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

Number	Site Address	Proposal	Observation	Comments
18/11034	39, Southampton Road, Ringwood. BH24 1HE	Shopfront alterations	Refusal (4)	Members disagreed with the Planning Officer's comments and considered that proposals were out of keeping in the Conservation Area. This property is in a prominent position within the town and will have a detrimental impact on the nearby Listed Building. The scale of the proposal, suggested materials and use of lights is not appropriate and they supported the Highways Officer's comments in respect of lighting 'dazzling' drivers.
18/11035	39, Southampton Road, Ringwood. BH24 1HE	Display 2 illuminated wall-mounted signs; 2 fascia signs; 1 vinyl sign (Application for Advertisement Consent)	Refusal (4)	Members disagreed with the Planning Officer's comments and considered that proposals were out of keeping in the Conservation Area. This property is in a prominent position within the town and will have a detrimental impact on the nearby Listed Building. The scale of the proposal, suggested materials and use of lights is not appropriate and they supported the Highways Officer's comments in respect of lighting 'dazzling' drivers.
18/11065	142, Southampton Road, Ringwood. BH24 1JF	Two-storey side extension	Permission (1)	
18/11073	1, Joyce Dickson Close, Ringwood. BH24 3ET	Single-storey rear extension	Permission (1)	

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

Number	Site Address	Proposal	Observation	Comments
18/11074	25, Bickerley Road, Ringwood. BH24 1EF	Single-storey side and rear extension; replacement porch	Refusal (2)	The Committee supported the Planning and Conservation Officer's comments. Whilst the rear extension was acceptable, the extension to the side of the property compromised the street scene and was out of keeping with the character of the area.
18/11082	Hazel Cottage, Gorley Road, Ringwood. BH24 1TJ	Detached garage	Permission (1)	
18/11096	Unit 5E, GP Centre, Yeoman Road, Ringwood. BH24 3FF	Mezzanine floor; 4 new windows to first floor	Permission (1)	
18/11102	Piquet House, 12 Wellworthy Way, Forest Gate Business Park, Ringwood. BH24 3FH	Display 2 internally illuminated fascia signs; 1 internally illuminated totem sign (Application for Advertisement Consent)	Permission (1)	
18/11152	10, The Mount, Poulner, Ringwood. BH24 1XX	Single-storey rear extension; change of use of garage to living accommodation and store	The decision on this application was deferred to the October meeting	

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

Annex A to Planning, Town Environment Committee Minutes 7th September 2018
Ringwood Town Council - Planning Observations - NFNPA

Number	Site Address	Proposal	Observation	Comments
18/00632	Knaves Ash, Crow Hill, Crow, Ringwood. BH24 3DD	Conversion of outbuilding to facilitate additional ancillary habitable accommodation	Refusal (2)	The Committee recommended refusal unless a condition be attached to expressly prevent the outbuilding being used as a separate residence, or for business use.
18/00633	Knaves Ash, Crow Hill, Crow, Ringwood. BH24 3DD	Single storey rear extension; garage conversion to facilitate additional habitable accommodation; alterations to fenestration; demolition of existing conservatory	Refusal (2)	There is no reference in the application to adequate parking provision on site, given the loss of the garage. Taking into account (along with 18/00632) that the proposals would result in 5 bedrooms on site (4 in the house and 1 in the outbuilding), this needs to be addressed.
CONS/18/0734	Greyfriars Community Centre, 44 Christchurch Road, Ringwood, BH24 1DW	Prune 1 x Ash tree Prune 1 x Copper Beech tree Prune 1 x Oak tree	Permission (1)	
CONS/18/0738	64 Croft Road, Poulner, Ringwood. BH24 1TG	Prune 1 x Oak tree	Permission (1)	
CONS/18/0765	9 Barrows Mews, Ringwood. BH24 1GU	Prune 1 x Ash tree	Permission (1)	

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

Number	Site Address	Proposal	Observation	Comments
CONS/18/0830	Keepers Cottage, Hangersley Hill, Hangersley, Ringwood, BH24 3JN	Prune 1 x Pin Oak tree Prune 2 x English Oak trees Prune 1 x Yew tree Prune 1 x Magnolia tree Prune 1 x Sycamore tree Prune 1 x Ash tree Prune 1 x group (across road from property) consisting of 1 x Sycamore and 2 x Oak trees	Permission (1)	
TPO/18/0781	11 Bishop Court, Ringwood. BH24 1PE	Prune 1 x Walnut tree	Permission (1)	

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

 New Forest <small>DISTRICT COUNCIL</small> New Forest District Council Local Plan	Ref: (For official use only)
Strategic Sites Masterplanning SPD Supplementary Planning Documents Representation Form	
<p>New Forest District Council has prepared a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the above topic to provide further details on certain policies contained within the New Forest district (outside of the National Park) Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1 Planning Strategy – Pre-Submission Draft</p> <p>These documents are available for public consultation from 7 July 2018 to 30 September 2018. All comments made should be restricted to the content of the draft SPD.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Do not use this form to make representations on the Pre-submission draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Further copies of the form can be obtained from the Planning Policy Team, downloaded from the Council's website or you can photocopy this form.</p>	

Part A

1. Personal Details*	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
<small>*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.</small>	
Title	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>
Job Title	<input type="text"/>
Organisation <small>(where relevant)</small>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 2	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 3	<input type="text"/>
Postal Town	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>
Email Address <small>(where an email address is given, this will be used as the primary means of contact)</small>	<input type="text"/>
Signature: <input style="width: 300px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	Date: <input style="width: 150px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>

Would you like to hear from us in the future?

I would like to be added to the database to receive updates on the Local Plan

Please do not contact me again

B

Strategic Sites Masterplanning SPD

Supplementary Planning Documents Representation Form

Ref:

(For official use only)

Sharing your personal details

Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our website alongside your name. If you are responding as an individual rather than a company or organisation, we will not publish your contact details (email / postal address and telephone numbers) or signatures online, however the original representations are available for public viewing at our council office by prior appointment.

PART B: Your Comments

Please set out your comments below using additional sheets as necessary. Your comments should be set out in full – this will help the Authority to understand the issues you raise.

Please return completed forms to spd2018@nfdc.gov.uk by midnight on the 30 September 2018.

Where possible please refer to paragraph numbers at the start of each comment and restrict comments to the relevant chapter

For site specific comments, please refer to the site by number and site name. Each site starts with a copy of the policy from the draft local plan. If your comments relate specifically to this, please ensure that you also make those comments clearly via the **local plan consultation process** as no alterations to these parts of the document can be made within this supplementary document if they are not already to be made within the local plan policies.

(Continue on separate page /expand (or add) box if necessary)

Chapter / Para No. / Site Policy or Name	Comment
Chapter 3, Para. 3.2 Connectivity	We are concerned that the importance of avoiding overlooking and overcrowding of existing neighbourhoods by new development may be somewhat lost by framing that relationship purely in terms of “connection ... through ... visual links” and “knitting into” the fabric of existing development. Privacy matters too and needs to be mentioned here.
Chapter 4	We consider that suggesting both maximum and minimum numbers of dwellings or densities (albeit as approximations and guides only) would be both more realistic and helpful in assisting good design. We also suggest cross-referencing this section to section 5 and Appendix 2 of the Mitigation for Recreational Impacts SPD so applicants are left in no doubt as to the probable effects of required planning obligations on dwelling density and numbers.
SS13, Masterplanning Objectives c.	We disagree with the opening statement here and consider that because the western site allocation boundary is so close to the rear elevations of existing dwellings at this point, a swathe of greenspace beside this boundary will be required to avoid overlooking or dominating of these dwellings.
SS13, Masterplanning Objectives Site specific considerations	We see no possibility whatever of the traffic impacts of development of this site being capable of satisfactory mitigation other than by way of the new strategic link to the A31 through SS14. We strongly suggest that it would be both more realistic and helpful in assisting good design if this situation could be clearly stated here along with some reference to the Guide to Developer Contributions SPD. In addition, as this link road traverses large new areas of housing, site designs should demonstrate how the amenity of residents will be protected

New Forest District Council respects your privacy and is committed to protecting your personal data. Further details of our Privacy Notice following the introduction of the General Data Protection Regulation can be found on our website <http://www.newforest.gov.uk/article/4549/Privacy-Notice>

	<p>from the impact of traffic. The volume of traffic using this road will be significant as it will not only serve new housing development but also traffic using this new route between the A31 and Christchurch Road, in preference to the existing route through town.</p> <p><i>Improvements will be required to the junction of Moortown Lane with Christchurch Road to cope with the increase in traffic, and careful consideration will need to be given to the location of access roads to the new development and to the sports facilities off Moortown Lane.</i></p>
<p>SS13, Masterplanning Objectives</p> <p>Site specific considerations</p>	<p>We understand that serious doubts remain about the capacity of the local drainage/sewerage infrastructure to cope with the demands of development on the scale proposed here. We strongly suggest that it would be both more realistic and helpful in assisting good design if this situation could be clearly stated here along with some reference to the need for early engagement with the relevant utility providers and the Guide to Developer Contributions SPD.</p> <p>There is also a need for the FRA to take into consideration the wider area south and east of the town. The recent example of drainage implications of the Linden Homes site in Crow Lane demonstrates this need.</p>
<p>SS13, Landscape Framework, para. 5</p>	<p><i>The mandatory requirement to provide alternative natural recreational green spaces has only been achieved by extending into an area of Green Belt outside of the strategic site (south of Moortown Lane). This land is already in use as public open space and cannot therefore be allocated as mitigation for the site. The requirement should be met in full on site.</i></p>
<p>SS13, Landscape Framework, para. 6</p>	<p>Our work to date on assessing feasible options for developing and improving use of this land for sports and recreation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly suggests that trying to accommodate a new school (even only potentially) complicates the process at very least and may well render any scheme unviable and unsustainable; 2. Is hampered by the lack of a current Playing Pitch Strategy for the New Forest District (the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study for the New Forest area published in 2007 being no longer considered relevant). It is hard to see how good design can be reached without adequate and coherent policy guidance from the District Council in this respect; and 3. Strongly suggests that a new access from Moortown Lane will be needed (with possible impacts upon the precise siting of the proposed new crossing and/or access points into the development site). <p>The proposed use of Green Belt as a reserve site for a new school is in conflict with paras. 145 and 146 of the revised NPPF, which state that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt; although there are a few exceptions, a school is not one of them.</p>
<p>SS13, Built development Framework</p>	<p>Since Local Plan Strategic Site Policy (para. iii. c.) provides for a “community focal point”, should not at least a possible location for it be indicated on this map?</p> <p>The central areas is intended as low rise bungalow dwellings – considering the increase in planning applications to add first floors to such properties, is there action that can be taken to prevent these properties being extended in the future?</p>

B

SS14, Masterplanning Objectives, Additional considerations	<p>We understand that serious doubts remain about the capacity of the local drainage/sewerage infrastructure to cope with the demands of development on the scale proposed here. We strongly suggest that it would be both more realistic and helpful in assisting good design if this situation could be clearly stated here along with some reference to the need for early engagement with the relevant utility providers and the Guide to Developer Contributions SPD.</p> <p>There is also a need for the FRA to take into consideration the wider area south and east of the town. The recent example of drainage implications of the Linden Homes site in Crow Lane demonstrates this need.</p>
<i>SS14, Proposed site layout</i>	<p><i>In line with proposals put to the Town Council by A Better Ringwood group, we recommend an alternative site layout as shown on the attached plan. This demonstrates how some of the built form can be relocated from the south of the site to the north east, thereby protecting the important views outlined in the Local Distinctiveness SPD and making the SANGS area more accessible to a greater number of residents. The layout proposed in the draft SPD would result in an area of SANGS providing poor amenity and landscape value due to its proximity to the A31, and enjoyment of this space would be compromised by traffic noise. The alternative layout also shows a green verge either side of the main north-south access road, echoing parts of Hightown Road, and an alternative access point to lessen the impact on existing dwellings.</i></p>
SS14, Landscape Framework, para. 6	<p>Consideration should be given to the proximity of the existing Ash Grove Play Area, which is adjacent to proposed new play areas.</p>
SS13 and SS14 – Landscape Frameworks	<p>There are many references to the importance of well-designed landscapes, including references to the importance of trees, hedgerows and planting schemes. However, there is concern that there is insufficient protection for these features in the longer term – house owners remove trees and shrubs for increased light, better views or improved access; planting becomes overgrown; community spaces become shortcuts; vehicles encroach on verges etc. It is suggested that planning permissions should include more enforceable conditions to prevent the loss of landscaping features and that, where the local authority is to take responsibility for these areas, that a funded, well managed and monitored landscape maintenance plan is adopted.</p>
Do you have any further general comments to make on the document?	



New Forest District Council Local Plan

Ref:

(For official use only)

Recreational Impacts Mitigation Strategy for European Sites (Review 1)

Supplementary Planning Documents Representation Form

New Forest District Council has prepared a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the above topic to provide further details on certain policies contained within the New Forest district (outside of the National Park) Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1 Planning Strategy – Pre-Submission Draft

These documents are available for public consultation from 7 July 2018 to 30 September 2018. All comments made should be restricted to the content of the draft SPD.

Do not use this form to make representations on the Pre-submission draft Local Plan.

Further copies of the form can be obtained from the Planning Policy Team, downloaded from the Council's website or you can photocopy this form.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

Title

First Name

Last Name

Job Title

Organisation

(where relevant)

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Address Line 3

Postal Town

Post Code

Telephone Number

Email Address

(where an email address is given, this will be used as the primary means of contact)

Signature:

Date:

Would you like to hear from us in the future?

I would like to be added to the database to receive updates on the Local Plan

Please do not contact me again

B

Recreational Impacts Mitigation Strategy for European Sites (Review 1)

Ref:

(For official use only)

Sharing your personal details

Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our website alongside your name. If you are responding as an individual rather than a company or organisation, we will not publish your contact details (email / postal address and telephone numbers) or signatures online, however the original representations are available for public viewing at our council office by prior appointment.

PART B: Your Comments

Please set out your comments below using additional sheets as necessary. Your comments should be set out in full – this will help the Authority to understand the issues you raise.

Please return completed forms to spd2018@nfdc.gov.uk by midnight on the 30 September 2018.

Chapter / Para / Project	Comment
4.14, 4.15 and 4.16	<p>We suggest that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the District Council also commit to working with relevant town and parish councils which undertake or fund work on the PROW network within their parishes; 2. references to “improvement” of the PROW network be clarified and amplified to include essential maintenance work; and 3. mention be made here of the HCC Parish Lengthsman Scheme as a medium for promoting and funding improvement and maintenance of the PROW network. <i>This scheme will need to be extended in order to maintain new developments.</i> <p>We observe that the word “strategy” is misspelt in para. 4.15, line 7.</p>
4.17 to 4.32 inclusive	<p>We support the suggested access and visitor management and monitoring proposals in principle but should like to raise to following issues of particular concern and suggest that consideration be given to making specific provision in respect of them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fires started accidentally or deliberately; 2. The impact of organized recreational or sporting events such as group cycle rides or runs (especially if these take place after dark); and 3. The impact of car parking outside designated areas.
4.37	<p>We recommend adding flexibility by providing here for the transfer of land (and associated payment of the commuted sum) to be made to the relevant town or parish council where this is practicable, best serves the public interest and is agreed with the District Council.</p> <p>In addition, to ensure that the quality of greenspace does not lessen over time, it is recommended that an agreed management plan for maintenance and upkeep is agreed at the time of handover.</p>

Appendix 2	<p>Appendix 2 is a summary of offsite mitigation proposals and outlines agreed projects for 2018-2025 (improving links between the Avon Valley and Blashford Lakes, and to the eastern part of the Castleman Trailway), and projects that have provisionally been identified for 2026-2036 (enhancements to Poulner Lakes and of the Castleman Trailway route through town, and provision of a new riverside walk between Pocket Park and West Street).</p> <p>Project ri1 should include reference to the Avon Valley Path and the need to improve the route to provide a safe crossing of the B3081 (the current route suggests pedestrians cross the dual carriageway to the north of the town roundabout).</p> <p>See suggestions below for additional schemes to be included.</p>
Appendix 4	<p>Integrating Sustainable Urban Drainage features</p> <p>We strongly support the saving for these features on alternative natural recreational green spaces but suggest that essential flexibility would be added by making clear that the surface water to be managed by such features need not be restricted to that arising from new residential developments but could include surface water arising off-site or from pre-existing causes.</p>
Appendix 7	<p>New Forest SAC</p> <p>We observe that the eighth paragraph appears to be a duplication of the seventh with only minor differences.</p>
Suggestions for additional mitigation measures and projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿ Castleman Trailway (between Embankment Way and Crow Lane) - This unmade section of the Castleman Trailway is in the ownership of Burry and Knight. As part of the development of land at Embankment Way for 21 industrial/storage units (Planning Permission 17/11230), we understand that they intend to strip back the weeds and tarmac the path, to join up with the section recently made up by Linden Homes, although work is not due to commence until next year. However, the land underneath the bridge is not in their ownership (it is possibly British Rail). Action needs to be taken to establish how this small section of the Trailway can be improved, as well as ensuring that Burry and Knight carry out the abovementioned proposed improvements. ¿ Continuation of Castleman Trailway from Barrack Lane to Holmsley – the Trailway (PROW 509) comes to a stop at Barrack Lane, yet the dismantled railway continues east to Holmsley. <p style="text-align: right;">(Continue on separate page /expand box if necessary)</p>

A Guide To Developer Contributions

Supplementary Planning Documents Representation Form

New Forest District Council has prepared a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the above topic to provide further details on certain policies contained within the New Forest district (outside of the National Park) Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1 Planning Strategy – Pre-Submission Draft

These documents are available for public consultation from 7 July 2018 to 30 September 2018. All comments made should be restricted to the content of the draft SPD.

Do not use this form to make representations on the Pre-submission draft Local Plan.

Further copies of the form can be obtained from the Planning Policy Team, downloaded from the Council's website or you can photocopy this form.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

Title	Mrs	
First Name	Jo	
Last Name	Hurd	
Job Title	Deputy Town Clerk	
Organisation (where relevant)	Ringwood Town Council	
Address Line 1	Ringwood Gateway	
Address Line 2	The Furlong	
Address Line 3		
Postal Town	Ringwood	
Post Code	BH24 1AT	
Telephone Number	01425 484721	
Email Address (where an email address is given, this will be used as the primary means of contact)	Town.council@ringwood.gov.uk	

Signature:

Date:

Would you like to hear from us in the future?

I would like to be added to the database to receive updates on the Local Plan

Please do not contact me again

B

A Guide To Developer Contributions

Supplementary Planning Documents Representation Form

Ref:

(For official use only)

PART B: Your Comments**Sharing your personal details**

Representations cannot be treated as confidential and will be published on our website alongside your name. If you are responding as an individual rather than a company or organisation, we will not publish your contact details (email / postal address and telephone numbers) or signatures online, however the original representations are available for public viewing at our council office by prior appointment.

Please set out your comments below using additional sheets as necessary. Your comments should be set out in full – this will help the Authority to understand the issues you raise.

Please return completed forms to spd2018@nfdc.gov.uk by midnight on the 30 September 2018.

(Continue on separate page /expand box if necessary)

Question 1 Are there any other types of general developer contribution not covered by Policy 34 that you feel should be covered in this Supplementary Planning Document?

Yes, contribution to the infrastructure required to deal adequately with surface water and foul drainage from development sites and the risk of flooding (either within the site or off-site where this is potentially exacerbated by the development).

We assume that the “Public Open Space” type is intended to include provision for children’s play, sport and recreation, though this might be made clearer here.

Question 2 Do you have any comments to make about the Council’s approach to determining contributions and viability as part of the application process?

It is unclear to us why section 3.2 mentions an Affordable Housing Statement and a Housing Mix Schedule but includes no indication of when documentary assessments of other types of infrastructure need will be required.

Given the particular circumstances currently prevailing here in Ringwood and expected to persist, we are especially concerned to ensure that the impacts of development on transport (especially road congestion, safety and parking) and drainage systems (both of surface water and foul drainage) are assessed realistically and thoroughly at an early stage and kept in mind throughout.

Section 3.3 on viability addresses the issue of viability at pre-application and application stages. We have concerns about the treatment of viability subsequently, for example when applications are made for approval of reserved matters, variation of conditions or revised/amended applications. We suggest that this section could usefully be clarified and amplified to explain the Council’s approach to viability testing at these later stages; to discourage developers from over-paying for sites or under-pricing the effects of planning obligations or market risks and then seeking to reduce or evade those obligations.

Question 3 Do you agree with the Council’s approach to negotiating affordable housing in the exceptional circumstances where on site affordable housing is not provided in accordance with Policy 17?

In exceptional circumstances, where off-site delivery or payment of commuted sums is agreed, dwellings should be delivered, or funds expended, in the same parish as the contributing development.

Question 4 Do you have any comments to make on the Council's approach to securing the necessary financial contributions towards to implementation of mitigation for recreational impacts of European sites?
Question 5 Do you have any comments to make on the Council's approach to securing the necessary financial contributions wards mitigating the impacts phosphorus in the River Avon?
Question 6 Do you have any comments to make on the Council's approach to securing the financial requirements mitigating the impacts on Air Quality in relation to the proposed residential development proposed in the Local Plan Review Part 1: Planning Strategy?
Question 7 Do you have any comments to make on the Council's approach to securing the necessary financial obligations for offsite provision and the necessary contributions towards to future management and maintenance of open space provided on site?
<p>We would like the requirement for provision of play space to be amplified by requiring it to complement existing provision in the vicinity and to be inclusive (i.e. to have regard to the needs of children with disabilities).</p> <p>To ensure that the quality of greenspace does not lessen over time, it is recommended that an agreed management plan for maintenance and upkeep is agreed at the time of handover.</p>
Question 8 Do you have any comments to make on the requirements to provide all necessary open space information as part of the application process and/or the potential for the Council to take an early transfer of open space provided on site?
<p>We recommend adding flexibility by providing here for the transfer of land (and associated payment of the commuted sum) to be made to the relevant town or parish council where this is practicable, best serves the public interest and is agreed with the District Council.</p>
Question 9 Do you have any comments to make on the Council's approach to securing the necessary financial contributions towards transportation and highways infrastructure?
<p>We are concerned that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the onus is placed on Hampshire County Council to provide advice rather than on applicants to produce comprehensive and robust evidence-based impact assessments in appropriate cases; 2. there is no mention here of the Secretary of State or Highways England and the potential need for infrastructure works and measures affecting the strategic road network 3. <i>when contributions are made for a specific purpose, there is a need to ensure that relevant authorities have the resources available to deliver projects. If not, there is a concern that necessary infrastructure will not be delivered and developers could ask for contributions to be returned if unspent.</i>

B Question 10 Do you have any comments to make on the Council's approach to securing the necessary financial contributions towards education provision?

We have the following concerns:

1. The approach is heavily dependent upon Hampshire County Council (and its input into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) but with many schools now having academy status HCC has no control over their admission policies, and no involvement in their strategic planning. No process exists to enable academy trusts, school managers and other interested parties to contribute to the process of keeping the IDP accurate and up to date.
2. It is unclear to us why there is no mention of Ringwood School in section 8.4.1 since everything there stated concerning the Burgate School at Fordingbridge is equally true of Ringwood School.
3. The potential requirement for sites for new schools can (where potentially suitable sites are scarce, as in Ringwood) run counter to the requirement for public open space yet it is unclear from the approach adopted how these competing needs will be managed. *It should be noted that the site identified for a new school in Ringwood falls outside of the strategic site allocation for SS13 and is located on existing playing fields.*

Do you have any further general comments to make on the document?

We would welcome the addition of acknowledgements by the District Council that town and parish councils should be involved in processes when relevant. (This particularly affects sections 3,4, 6, 7 and 9.

DRAFT



A31 Improvements - Notes of meeting with Highways England

11am, 28th August 2018 – Ringwood Gateway

Present:

Daniel Kittredge	Project Manager, Highways England (HE)
Thomas Briggs	Highways England
Raluca Mitu	Highways England
Annie Tomlinson	HCC
Dean Brunton	NFDC
Jo Hurd	RTC

Councillors Ford, Heron, Ring, Thierry and Treleaven.

1. Update on the Scheme

It was re-confirmed that both bridges on the westbound carriageway would be replaced at the same time as the widening scheme, and options were currently being considered. It was likely that the bridge over the Avon would be replaced with a single span bridge, constructed of either iron or concrete. New foundations would be required for both bridges.

Environmental surveys and preliminary design work should be completed by the end of 2018, and it was suggested that the next meeting be held in early 2019.

The start date was still expected to be end of March 2021.

Every effort was being made to reduce the construction period in order to keep the impact on the network to a minimum. The current programme allowed 33 weeks. However, it was Highways England's aspiration to reduce this significantly. In order to achieve this, it would require a complete closure of the westbound carriageway, and current thinking was to set up a contraflow on the eastbound carriageway.

2. Designated Funds

HE and HCC had been working in collaboration on the bid for designated funds. RM would produce a business case, based on the feasibility study provided by AT, which would be submitted for consideration by the Investment Decision Committee on 23 October 2018. If the bid is successful, funds would be available for the proposed town centre improvements to be carried out prior to the start of the scheme in 2021.

3. Meetings with Stakeholders.

Somerley Estate – HE had now been granted access to the river channel and would be completing a Flood Risk Assessment. The results of this would be shared with RTC.

Parish Church – a meeting had been held with representatives of the Church to discuss noise and vibration. HE had agreed to erect an acoustic barrier along the length of the churchyard bordering the A31.

Go South Coast – a meeting would be held with the bus company that afternoon.

NFDC – DB confirmed that HE had been consulted on the draft Local Plan, and had raised no fundamental issues. It was confirmed that traffic data had been remodelled to take account of the housing numbers in the emerging Local Plan; DK stated that the new capacity would support development.

C

4. Risk Workshop

Attendees were invited to raise any further concerns, risks or issues for HE to consider and address. The following issues were raised:

The fact that the strategic route (A31) is also a local network was emphasised.

Cllr Heron challenged the traffic modelling data – he said that one of HE's own documents stated that there would be a significant delay on the main town roundabout due to the closure of West Street. It was agreed to send a copy of this document to DK, with the relevant section highlighted.

It is crucial that West Street remains open during construction.

Consideration should be given to the noise impact of the bridge construction, bearing in mind the proximity to the town.

Consideration should be given to extending the acoustic barrier further to the west, from the agreed provision in the churchyard, or to providing additional planting to protect residents in the area of West Street.

Advance lane discipline and signage was critical as far back as Picket Post.

The suggestion of a 50mph speed limit should be reconsidered, taking into consideration a recent spate of accidents and the fact that a 50mph limit was in place a short distance to the west. It was agreed to send DK a copy of the Council's document on the A31 prepared in 2012, which supported this request.

The following requests, made previously by the Town Council, were repeated and reiterated:

Requirement for the retention of emergency access from West Street to the A31

Requirement for the slip road at the petrol station to be extended the full length to the Verwood off-slip, and for investigations be made into alternative solutions for entry/exit to the petrol station, possibly from the Verwood road.

Schedule of outstanding HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE issues raised with Hampshire Highways

Ref. No.	Location in Ringwood	Nature of defect/issue	Additional comments	Comments from HCC (last updated 28/06/2018)
R/003	B3347 Mansfield Rd/Southampton Rd Roundabout	Recurrent damage to turf surface by turning HGVs	Perimeter paving is preferred solution.	Not a high priority given for funding the level of damage to the network currently having to be dealt with. Would the TC consider a contribution? This is currently not a maintenance problem, and there is a risk that if the area of overrun is surfaced it may encourage more overrunning, rather than less. No work currently planned
R/005	Market Place (Human Sundial paved area and surrounds)	Arrangements for implementation of agreed joint works	Specification of works and topographical drawing supplied by RTC. Agreement on costs and timing awaited from HCC.	Agreement in principle to share road space with HCC works. Timing and phasing yet to be agreed. Meeting to be arranged. The workload contribution here for HCC has escalated to beyond the initial request and the project really needs to be fully planned and coordinated. HCC have therefore offered an engineer to Project manage the scheme early in the new year. I should clarify though that HCC can currently not commit to any funding contribution other than keeping the area safe, as next years budgets have yet to be confirmed.
R/008	5/7 Christchurch Road Kerb outside The Cellar (previously YoYo)	Replacement kerb required		Order has been raised. Job 19077453 is in Skanskas work stack.





R/009	Meeting House Lane	Replacement of damaged/missing pavers and repair of dropped ironwork		Works due to be carried out, under road closure, on Sunday 1 st July. Completed
R/010	High Street	Repair/replacement of loose/damaged/missing pavers on pavement and in road.		Not yet programmed; monthly town inspection will pick up any safety defects. Monthly inspections deal with safety defects in appropriate timescale depending on severity. Re paving tarmac repairs is considered a low priority but will be targeted shortly.
R/011	The Furlong	Sunken blocks and some replaced with tarmac		Not yet programmed; monthly town inspection will pick up any safety defects. Monthly inspections deal with safety defects in appropriate timescale depending on severity. Re paving tarmac repairs is considered a low priority but will be targeted shortly.

Ref. No.	Location in Ringwood	Nature of defect/issue	Additional comments	Comments from HCC
R/012	Southampton Road bridge over the A31	The surfacing around the expansion joints on the road bridge is breaking up and is in poor condition, with potholes	Logged on Hantsweb 10/5/18 ref. no 21364559	Site inspected. Not considered to be affecting safety so lower priority and works not yet ordered. We are awaiting approval from Highways England to undertake work, as this is their structure.
R/013	Rod Lane	The road is in very poor condition following its use during the 8 week closure of Moortown Lane in March/April	Originally logged on Hantsweb 3/4/18, ref. no 21353649	Site inspected recently and surface in fair condition. No action required at this time 22/05/18. No action
R/014	Layby off Christchurch Road, adjacent to Moortown House	The road has several potholes that require repair, and stones are spilling out on to the main carriageway	Hantsweb ref. no 21351722	This is on the schedule for the 'Pothole Busters'. The main defects have been repaired, but further work is planned on lower priority defects
R/015	Crow Hill	Faded road markings (cycle and edge markings) to be refurbished	Email correspondence dated 3/8/18 refers	Works ordered 19079352, 19079483, 19079352





Schedule of outstanding FLOOD ALLEVIATION issues raised with Hampshire Highways

Ref. No.	Location in Ringwood	Nature of defect/issue	Additional comments	Comments from HCC (30/7/18)
F/001	Rod Lane	Clearance of ditch	Action agreed at Flood Action Working Party on 28/09/2017	Ditch is clear and running but there is an order for it to be trimmed. Job 21013709 has been chased, but is currently not urgent. It will be when the weather turns though.
F/002	Bottom of Crow Hill	Ditch to the east of Crow Crossroads on the north side of the road to be cleared and piped	“	This was a low priority to be visited in the summer if resources allowed. This is still considered a low priority and new more pressing issues are being targeted with the limited resources. We would probably not wish to pipe the ditch (as we would then be responsible), but may serve notice on the land owner. Do we know who that is? Believe that Town Council are now going to deal with this?
F/003	Moortown Lane	Flood Relief Drain to be brought back in to use	“	The drain has been fully CCTV surveyed and cleaned and can now be brought back into use. Suggestion is to not fully open valve at first in order to determine effects on system downstream. This will be slowly opened when there is enough water to monitor the effect over a few days. We can then open it slightly more etc. Can Liam/Jo/FWM rep discuss this when they meet next week. It seems that 'we' could now send some water down the Moortown road system to see if it is all works and

				does not cause any problems. Who/how is flow then controlled? We cant be lifting covers etc regularly.
F/004	Crow Stream	Roadside verges – sections where there is no verge are dangerous in areas where the road is narrow and when the stream is in flood.	“	Verge markers have been provided and installed by local volunteers. No opportunity exists to widen or realign the road. no further action
Ref. No.	Location in Ringwood	Nature of defect/issue	Additional comments	Comments from HCC (30/7/18)
F/005	Crow Stream	Raising of deflector wall at confluence of watercourses to SW of Crow Crossroads.		Work complete.
F/006	Crow Stream	Two non-return flap valves are required on the two pipes entering Crow wetland south of Crow Crossroads to prevent backflow from Crow Stream in flood conditions, which is currently preventing the Crow ditch from draining.	“tidal flap to prevent back surge from the faster flowing adjacent river” identified in HCC report presented to Flood Action Working Party 06/06/2016	I am just checking if we did commit to this, but either way the water coming south will have to go somewhere, so until we are sure that directing water down Moortown road will work, we will not achieve anything by stopping the backflow (other than delay the water level rise on the N side of the flap) Also the installation of a flap would require consent from the land owner, land drainage consent, an easement to maintain the flap. I therefore don't think that HCC would wish to take responsibility for this long term liability. I also assume that this would be the case for the town Council.





Item No.	Name	Recent developments	Resource use				Finish in 2018-19?	Notes
			Finance			Staff time		
			Budget	Spent to date	Predicted out-turn			
Projects with budgetary implications (bids included in 2018-19 budget)								
A1	Traffic Assessment	Agreed not to proceed at Full Council 27/06/2018 (C/6167 refers)	£4,000 (Provision)	£0	£0	N/A	N/A	Budget revised from £7,000
A2	Cycle Stands	Included in plans for Market Place improvements	£500 (Provision)	£0	£500	Minimal	Probable	Awaiting choice/availability of site
A3	Crow Stream	Annual flail to be carried out by end August to be followed by clearance by volunteers 13/9/18	£1,020	£0	£1,020	Moderate	Probable	Annual flail, clearance and spraying RTC invited to a meeting with NFDC, HCC and Linden Homes to discuss drainage issues (date to be agreed)
A4	Human Sundial	Meeting held with Hampshire Highways; further work required to define more specifically who does what and exact scope of works – planning permission not required	£8,000	£0	£8,000	Moderate	Possible	Project overseen by Town Centre Working Party To be funded by CIL receipts (Agreed by P&F 13/12/18 (F/5518))
A5	Neighbourhood Plan	Recommendation to proceed not supported by PT&E Committee on 3/8/18	£3,000	£0	£3,000	Moderate	Probable	
A6	Sign Painting at Friday's Cross	Planning consent granted 24/7/18 Ringwood Society obtaining quotes for sign painting and scaffold	£400	£66	£400	Minimal	Probable	Ringwood Society project, with contribution and support from RTC See separate item on agenda re. procurement
A7	Street-lighting in Kings Arms Lane	Work not carried out as expected as pole disconnected from mains – awaiting details of other options and outline costs from HCC/SSE	£0	£0	£800	Minimal	Possible	To be funded by CIL receipts (Agreed by P&F 19/10/17 (F/5497)) HCC agreed to adopt for maintenance purposes.

Projects with budgetary implications (not included in 2018-19 budget but added since)

B



Projects with no budgetary implications

Item No.	Name	Recent developments	Resource use				Finish in 2018-19?	Notes
			Finance			Staff time		
			Budget	Spent to date	Predicted out-turn			
C1	Pedestrian Crossings Christchurch Road	HCC completed feasibility of crossing to south of Lidl roundabout and carrying out feasibility of crossing to north in revised location– awaiting approval prior to design and implementation				Minimal	Probable	Pressure to be maintained for additional crossings further south
C2	A31 improvement scheme	Meetings held with HCC to consider bid for designated funds, and with HE for a project update – see separate item on agenda				Moderate	Unlikely	Might involve use of developer contributions in addition to contributions from Highways England
C3	Moortown drainage improvements	HCC intend to open the Moortown Lane system this winter – the valve will be slowly opened when there is enough water to monitor the effect over a few days.				Moderate	Probable	To be carried out and funded by HCC. Non-return flap valves still to be fitted, to prevent stream backflowing.