

## LYNDHURST PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of Lyndhurst Parish Council held remotely by Zoom on Tuesday 2 March 2021 at 7.15 pm.

Present: Councillors C Willsher (Chair), S Se-Upara (Vice Chair), G Bisson, T Dunning, F Green, B Preddy, C Read, G Reeve and B Stratford

In Attendance: District Councillor H Brand  
Mrs M Weston (Clerk to the Council)  
Mrs Carolyn Griffith, Press representative  
Representatives from Hoburne Developments  
Mark Preston  
Giles Moir  
Paul Campbell  
12 members of the Public

The Chair welcomed everyone present to the meeting and explained the procedure that it was intended to follow throughout the meeting.

### 1. Disclosures of Interest

Disclosures of interest to be registered as they occur during the meeting. There were no disclosures of interest registered.

### 2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Rollé (work commitments) and A Wiltshire (lack of broadband connection).

**RESOLVED:** That the meeting accepted the reasons given for non-attendance.

### 3. **Planning Application – Lyndhurst Park Hotel (Application No 00718)**

Graham Reeve, as Planning Committee Chairman outlined the application which was for the part demolition of existing hotel and conversion of retained element to C3 residential and erection of a mixed-use development comprising a total of 79 dwellings and three commercial units (Class E), with associated landscaping, access and parking

Councillor Reeve gave a breakdown of the public comments registered on the NFNPA website for the benefit of all attendees as follows:

There were 46 neighbour responses from residents within the SO43 parish postcode area, comprising 24 in support, 16 objections and 6 comments only.

In addition there were 43 responses from interested persons outside of the parish area, comprising 5 in support and 38 objections, of which 32 were noted as being identical letters.

It was also noted that a previous application for in 2017 attracted 817 public comments of which 810 were objections.

Details of an exit poll carried out at the developer's public consultation evening in February 2020 were outlined, where 78% of responses were positive, 12% negative and 10% undecided.

Finally the results of a Village Design Statement survey, recently carried out in the parish, were detailed and in which the old Lyndhurst Park Hotel did not figure amongst a list of buildings important to the character of the village. The survey also suggested that the hotel was not considered a significant issue when considering brown field sites.

#### **4. Presentation on behalf of Hoburne (the developer)**

Mark Preston outlined the company making the application, giving a brief history of this long established, local, family company. This was followed by a presentation by Giles Moir who explained the development proposals and how they had sought to address, where possible, any local issues that had been raised with smaller units, some of which would be for shared ownership, a mixture of other units, three shops which would be retail (not cafes or restaurants). He explained the arboriculture impact designed to protect trees, the fact that a bus layby could not be accommodated and that the car ports on the western boundary would cut down light pollution to Rufus Court. Later site management would remain with Hoburne.

#### **5a Public Participation**

A local resident stated that he had concerns about the number of car parking spaces as he felt there was not enough provision.

Hoburne representative Giles Moir explained that the number met the planning requirements and provision has also been made for secure cycle parking which had been integrated into the buildings.

District Councillor Hilary Brand asked who Hoburne thought would be buying the properties, how pollution would be managed and said she felt there should be more provision for affordable housing.

Giles Moir replied that some properties would be available on shared ownership basis to assist local first time buyers and it was felt that there was a good mix to attract a full range of purchasers. Viability assessment is permitted for determining affordable housing levels and, although an assessment had shown that 100% ownership was needed to make the scheme totally viable, eight properties would be available through this scheme.

With regard to pollution management a report had been submitted on both noise and air quality which showed there to be no cause for concern.

#### **5b Councillor Discussion**

Councillor Bisson asked if, as a point of order, Councillor Stratford felt it was appropriate for him to vote as he had put his name to statements which were on view on the NFNPA website which might be seen as having a pre-determined view of the application. Councillor Stratford said he would take part in the discussion but would reserve his view on whether or not he should vote when the vote actually took place.

Councillor Reeve, as Planning Committee Chairman, summarized the points that had been made and documents that had been submitted concerning the density of dwellings, the heritage aspect, affordable housing, car parking and the effect on traffic. It was noted that a Tree Officer's report was not yet available online.

He also made mention of neighbour amenity and the proximity of the development to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), RAMSAR Site and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

Clare Ings, NFNPA Planning Officer for this case, said she did not wish to comment other than to say that NFNPA would be holding an internal meeting the following day to consider comments received on the application.

Councillor Stratford drew attention to the comments that had been raised from the Ancient Monuments Society and the Victorian Society concerning the architectural significance of the original building. However, he felt the plans showed good designs although the density was too high.

Councillor Bisson said the application should be taken as a whole. Regarding pollution, a tunnel effect would require two sides and the area opposite the site was clear. It was expensive to retain the old part of the building. The proposals were outside policy and next to a RAMSAR/SSSI/adjacent to the open forest. He also advised that, following a discussion with the NFNPA landscape officer it was considered that the footpath proposed at the north east corner need not now be included.

Councillor Green thanked the Hoburne architectural team for an excellent design and detail. She asked for clarification as to why the 11 town houses had been changed to six semi-detached properties. It was reported in reply that consultation with NFNPA had led to this decision in order to reduce pressure from trees on the property gardens. Councillor Green felt that parking would be a problem and she had concerns regarding the impact on Bolton's Bench.

Councillor Se-Upara thanked the Hoburne team for their openness during consultations with LPC.

Councillor Preddy voiced concern for the effect the proposals would have on the local infrastructure, particularly the Surgery and stated that the shops might be better used as services such as an optician. Councillor Dunning felt that the layout was urbanizing.

Councillor Read echoed previous concerns voiced regarding the effect the development would have on the village infrastructure.

Planning Officer Clare Ings reported that it was likely that the application would be decided by the NFNPA Planning Committee.

Councillor Reeve summed up by saying it would be preferable if the shop units could be occupied by services and said he felt the large number of housing units could have a favourable effect in that it may lend weight to declining further housing development in Lyndhurst in the future, should such applications be lodged. He explained the options for LPC's response to the NFNPA as follows:

- (1) To recommend PERMISSION for the reasons listed but to accept the decision reached by the NFNPA's Officers under their delegated powers.
- (2) To recommend REFUSAL for the reasons listed but to accept the decision reached by the NFNPA's Officers under their delegated powers.
- (3) To recommend PERMISSION for the reasons listed.
- (4) To recommend REFUSAL for the reasons listed.
- (5) To accept the decision reached by the NFNPA's Officers under their delegated powers.

## **5c Resolution**

**RESOLVED:** To recommend that permission be granted but to accept the decision reached by the NFNPA's Officers/Development Control Committee under their delegated powers. (6:2, 1 abstention) for the following reasons:

It was agreed that when considered as a whole rather than as individual issues, the proposed development offered many positives for the residents of Lyndhurst.

The development is well designed, taking cues from prominent existing village properties to inform the styles and finishes proposed for the various blocks. Councillors were impressed by the quality of materials proposed for use on the development.

Retention of the historic elements of the old hotel, together with the proposed sympathetic repatriation of some original design features, is to be applauded and was considered to complement the street scene upon entering the village from the East.

The number of dwellings proposed attracted much comment, however was subsequently considered reasonable when account is taken of the wording of policy SP24 of the local plan, which suggests 'around 50 dwellings alongside retention of the historic elements of the existing building'.

The proposed number is also informed by the maximum area of each dwelling permitted in policy SP21.

The tree officer's report was not publicly available at the time of the meeting; however it is recommended that the requirements of that report should be implemented during the development.

Chairman\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_