



Sway Parish Council

Planning and Transport Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Sway Planning and Transport Committee held at the Jubilee Field Pavilion, Station Road, Sway; on Thursday 10th March 2016.

Present

Councillor Name	
Stephen Tarling (Chair)	P
Peter Dance	
Alex Pepper	P
Len Thomas	P

Councillor Name	
Kevin Cripps (Vice Chair)	
Hugh Marchant	P
Melanie Seacombe	

P = Present

Also in attendance: John Warden (Transport Representative), Steve Avery (NFNPA Executive Director [Strategy and Planning]), Sway News, Lymington Times and twenty-three members of the public.

PT16/034 Apologies

Received from Cllrs. Peter Dance, Kevin Cripps and Melanie Seacombe

PT16/035 Declarations of Interest

Cllr. Marchant declared his membership of the New Forest Association (NFA) Planning Committee. Cllr. Tarling declared his membership of the New Forest Association.

PT16/036 Minutes of the Meeting held on the 11th February 2016 and Matters Arising

The draft having been previously sent out and posted on the web, the minutes of the meeting held on the 11th February 2016 were unanimously agreed, and were signed by the Chair. The agreed minutes would be added to the web soon. There were no matters arising not otherwise covered on the agenda.

PT16/037 Mr. Steve Avery: New Forest National Park Authority Executive Director (Strategy and Planning)

Mr. Avery was warmly welcomed, recognising that local government and associated authorities are under pressure from above both in terms of policy-making, and the squeeze on resources.

Steve Avery outlined the big picture: the government is committed to more housebuilding – which it believes has slowed because the UK has an archaic planning system. In the National Park we do have some exemptions and special status for some planning regulations; but more proposals are on their way – particularly in the consultation for the Housing and Planning Bill. Within the NFNPA area the first test of a planning application is to measure it against the Local Plan (dated 2010), in which Sway Civil Parish includes one of the four ‘defined villages’, inside which more development is allowed. His estimate was that the requirement for new house completions within the Park might end up around 30 to 50 per year.

The Local Plan is to be updated – an initial consultation included a ‘call for sites’ that might be suitable for housing, and some 80 came forward including a couple of possible sites in Sway. The defined villages would probably be retained; and the current policies are all being reviewed, and have served us well the last five years. Outside of London, the New Forest has some of the most expensive housing in the country. Insufficient affordable housing for social rent has come forward so alternatives will be considered – including ‘starter homes’.

Mr. Avery outlined some of the concerns of the proposals in the latest consultations, including introducing competition in processing planning applications; a new 'permission in principle' covering brownfield land not requiring planning permission; shorter determination periods – down from eight weeks from start to finish, to just five weeks, which would be a strain locally – even more so when there are changes to the application mid-way through the period; a register of 'small sites' ready for development; and the promotion of financial benefits of planning permission. The NFNPA will be looking at these proposals carefully.

In performance terms the NFNPA determines some 90% of applications within the eight weeks, thanks partly to the resources put into providing free pre-application advice; and some 70% of appeals against NFNPA refusals are dismissed; but the suggested new target is 90%. NFNPA and Sway Parish Council are generally in agreement, and less than one in ten applications needs to go to the NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee.

The Chair responded thanking Mr. Avery for his insights and reassured Sway residents that the Parish Council has been, and will, represent Sway's views in the update of the Local Plan. Cllr Tarling thanked Mr. Avery for his kind offer to visit Sway to examine examples of local planning outcomes; and reminded the audience that for a smooth and successful planning application, the applicant should take the free pre-application advice offered by the NFNPA, talk to their neighbours and dimension their plans. Finally the chair observed that Steve Avery and his NFNPA colleagues are our champions for maintaining the special qualities of the New Forest National Park.

In the question and answer session Cllr. Pepper wondered whether the permission in principle would encourage more commercial, employment or retail sites to be converted to residential; and Mr. Avery agreed that this could be the case – with the New Forest becoming more of a dormitory territory. He also pointing out that the current NFNPA policy encourages maintaining employment sites, although recently more permissive rights allow offices to be re-developed as housing.

John Warden asked how the need for more small dwellings might be met; and Steve Avery felt the drive for a substitute for affordable housing and for new starter homes would help, and pointed to the current policy to maintain small dwellings. There was wider discussion over the need for 'finisher' homes for those older residents looking to downsize – especially given the demographics within Sway; and how developments like hotels are being converted into care homes.

A member of the public asked about the lack of clear dimensions on plans – and the link to ensuring that any development is built according to the plans. Mr Avery said the NFNPA must follow national rules in terms of the minimum plan requirements to submit an application; The NFNPA then need to rely on neighbours and Parish Councils to report back where development is not according to plans. He also recognised how difficult it can be for a member of the public or a Parish Council to know the precise dimensions since plans do not scale when printed (the only accurate way to measure dimensions, he said, is on-line using an electronic scale bar – which he acknowledged is awkward and difficult for third parties). Mr. Avery was clear that the NFNPA would be encouraging applicants to include dimensions, particularly when building close to a boundary, but could not compel this – and the chair felt that Sway Parish Council would also encourage such an approach as being helpful to smooth the granting of permission. The question of datum points was also raised – particularly important on a sloping site, but again this is not a legal requirement.

One resident asked about the pressures of the threat of costs being awarded against the NFNPA being a consideration in refusals and enforcement, and whether there is any contingency budget for this. Mr. Avery pointed out that costs are only awarded against a party that has acted unreasonably – it is thus vital that decisions should be justified within the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents – including Village Design Statements. The NFNPA carries forward a budget of some £30K for such contingency, which has only been used once in the last 5 years – and then to the tune of some £1500. The NFNPA has also won costs in a few cases.

A question about incorrect location plans and site plans and distances to boundaries evoked the response that the NFNPA cannot compel applicants to include such details but will encourage them – for instance when the Authority's planning team meet with local developers, agents and architects.

PT16/038 - Outcome of Planning Applications Considered at Previous Meetings (including those applications referred to the NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee or on appeal to the Planning Inspectorate) and related matters.

The list of outcomes, having been previously circulated, was noted and is appended to these minutes as Appendix 1.

PT16/039 - New Tree Preservation Orders

None

PT16/040 – Applications for Tree Works

Cllr. Seacombe's report having been previously circulated was approved and is appended to these minutes as Appendix 2.

PT16/041 New Planning Applications

16/00107	11 Widden Close SO41 6AX	Roof alterations including raising ridge height and box dormer window to facilitate additional first floor accommodation; 3no rooflights.
--------------------------	-----------------------------	---

The committee listened carefully to the applicant. The dormer was proposed on the side away from the immediate neighbour, and the views to/from neighbours in Manchester Road would be protected by a hedge. However the committee felt the large, wide dormer was not appropriate or within the guidelines of the Sway Village Design Statement. Hedges are not always maintained; even hidden development must follow the current rules. Helpful suggestions were made as to how this application could be improved by softening the impact of the large dormer. The committee unanimously agreed that the recommendation of Sway would be:

2. We recommend REFUSAL, for the reasons listed below, but would accept the decision reached by the National Park Authority's Officers under their delegated powers.

The near full-width dormer is not appropriate to the current dwelling, nor sympathetic in terms of scale or form, and does not fit within policies DP11 or DP1. The Sway Village Design Statement (SPD) guidelines on page 19 that say "Flat roofs in future developments or extensions should be avoided." and "Dormer windows with pitched roofs are preferred" are not followed.

16/00075	Meadowbrook Lodge, Barrows Lane SO41 6DD	Double garage/utility with office/storage over; balcony to main house.
--------------------------	---	--

The committee listened carefully to the applicant who explained that whilst the Conservation Officer was concerned over the size and mass of the garage; it is detached, not a lot larger than the present garage, uses appropriate materials and design matching those of the main building, and the adjacent coach house is more dominant to the street scene. The committee noted that garage is close to the road at the front of the crowded plot, close to the neighbouring coach-house, and the only similar recent local example is on the current enforcement investigation list as being overbuilt (albeit in a larger curtilage). The applicant has agreed with the neighbour that amended plans would be forthcoming with the proposed garage built further away from the boundary. Nevertheless the committee unanimously agreed that the recommendation of Sway would be:

2. We recommend REFUSAL, for the reasons listed below, but would accept the decision reached by the National Park Authority's Officers under their delegated powers.

The proposed balcony would be acceptable. The proposed outbuilding (garage, internal staircase, office, boot room, WC etc.) is overlarge in scale and form, visually intrusive to the detriment of the amenity of neighbours and the conservation area and is an over-intensive development too close to the road. This contravenes DP1, CP7, CP8 and DP6 and is not in alignment with the NFNPA Design Guide or the Conservation Area Character Appraisal. This proposals contravenes the Sway Village Design Statement (VDS) guidelines (page 22) that

“Garages, outbuildings or carports should not be positioned in front of the house”; and the Sway VDS guidelines that direct us to avoid overcrowding and maintain space between properties.

16/00130	Cheriton Cottage, Manchester Road SO41 6AS	Replacement dwelling; outbuildings.
--------------------------	--	-------------------------------------

The committee listened carefully to the neighbours and saw photos of the current view from one neighbour's window across the front of the current Cheriton Cottage, and were surprised that the intention in the current application is to bring the new build forward, which would radically block the light and detract from the privacy of both neighbours. The committee felt this is a less desirable development than the previous one (15/00964: which was recommended for refusal before it was withdrawn). The committee was astonished to find that there is still a garage proposed in front of the building (which it is now proposed should be built closer to the road); despite having previously drawn attention to the Sway Village Design Statement SPD Guidelines, and further felt that with the current proposal there is insufficient turning space to make good use of the garage for a vehicle. If there is no design on this narrow plot which can accommodate a garage at the side or rear of the dwelling then clearly there is insufficient width to include a garage at all and it should be omitted. Without hesitation the committee unanimously agreed that the recommendation of Sway would be:

4. We recommend REFUSAL, for the reasons listed below.*

On the whole this is a considerably less desirable development than the previous application 15/00964 which Sway recommended for refusal with a 4 and was withdrawn. The plot is narrow – but deep - and the *current* building is modest and well sited in the plot, with a rear garage, and does not extend to the boundaries at full height. Sway's most serious concerns about this application include:

- 1. The garage at the front is not compliant with the Sway Village Design Statement (VDS) Guidelines. The Sway VDS is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and the Guidelines are “express specific design criteria that will influence planning decisions”. The guidelines (page 22) state “Garages, outbuildings or carports should not be positioned in front of the house”. Most front garages in Sway were built before the current guidelines came into force. If the applicant cannot find an alternative where the garage is at the back or side, then the plot is clearly too narrow to add a garage and that should be removed from any application.**
- 2. With the proposed repositioning of the house and the garage and additional fenestration; the overlooking and shading (policy DP1 d refers) of adjacent properties will now be an important issue as the proposed building would be both higher and/or closer, with further fenestration. Sway suggest that any concerns of the immediate neighbours are taken into careful consideration as this could be a major visual intrusion, blocking light and detrimental to their amenity.**
- 3. DP10 says a replacement dwelling can only be on a new footprint where there is a clear environmental benefit. In this case there is a benefit in moving it away from the southern boundary, but probably a greater dis-benefit by moving it far closer to the northern boundary and a considerable dis-benefit in moving the footprint forward at the expense of the amenities of both immediate neighbours. There would be benefits attached to siting the building further back.**
- 4. There are misgivings over a number of serious inconsistencies in the drawings, which drawings lack clear dimensions; and we would want to be far surer of the exact position and dimensions of any subsequent proposal.**
- 5. We feel the bulk and overbearing nature of this proposal is still unacceptable.**
- 6. As always in Sway: and in any future application, surface water disposal would need to be fully managed and kept within boundaries – as noted in the Sway VDS Guidelines on page 21.**

16/00144	Kings Hyde Farm, Kings Hyde SO41 8LT	Cladding; replacement windows; roof alterations.
--------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

The committee listened carefully to the agent who outlined the application and to the applicant.

The committee agreed that this is a significant improvement on application 16/00051 (withdrawn) and noted that this is now within DP11. This is a prominent building in a rural setting. The Sway Village Design Statement guidelines page 19 say “Boarding should be natural in colour or stained black” and felt that boarding implied natural wood. The Sway VDS suggests brick work should match the locality – where little is painted, let alone painted white and the Sway VDS guidelines say wall finishes should be compatible with those of “adjacent buildings”. The committee unanimously agreed that the recommendation of Sway would be:

2. We recommend REFUSAL, for the reasons listed below, but would accept the decision reached by the National Park Authority's Officers under their delegated powers.

The construction and overall proposal is acceptable – including the changes to the roofing which would enhance the property. The committee had some concerns over the cladding in terms of the style, finish and colouring of the proposed changes which we feel do not chime with the Design Guide SPD, or the Sway Village Design Statement SPD. The Sway Village Design Statement guidelines page 19 say “Boarding should be natural in colour or stained black” and suggests brick work should match the locality, and that wall finishes should be compatible with those of “adjacent buildings” – not those of one or two dwellings in distant seaside towns. The Building Materials section of the Design Guide SPD goes a long way to explain why light grey artificial cladding and a white building is inappropriate within the New Forest National Park. Perhaps this could be addressed with a condition, and the agent was amenable to such a suggestion.

16/00145	The Swallows, Kings Lane SO41 6BQ	Single storey rear extension.
--------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

The extension is modest and at the rear of the building, and with a pitched roof it complies with the Sway Village Design Statement guidelines, provided matching facing materials are used. Since this dwelling would now be at the DP11 limit it would be important to prevent further development under the GPDO. So on balance the committee’s recommendation was agreed as below **provided** every effort is made to keep this dwelling within DP11 in the future:

1. We recommend PERMISSION, for the reasons listed below, but would accept the decision reached by the National Park Authority's Officers under their delegated powers.

The extension planned is within DP11 and the Sway Village Design Statement, provided matching facing materials are used. Now that this dwelling is at the DP11 limit we would want to be sure that no further development is possible without NFNPA Planning approval. The officer wisely points to conditioning the garage, and we would also like to see the removal of further permitted development rights without specific planning permission, and an agreement that no work under GPDO is to be started before the work of this application is complete (in order to comply with DP11).

16/00154	9 Bond Close SO41 6DR	Single storey rear extension.
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

The committee were disappointed to see that no free pre-application advice was sought. However this appears to be a relatively modest rear single storey extension (surely close to that allowed under the GPDO), with a pitched roof which complies with the Sway Village Design Statement guidelines, provided matching facing materials are used. The committee unanimously agreed that the recommendation of Sway would be:

1. We recommend PERMISSION, for the reasons listed below, but would accept the decision reached by the National Park Authority's Officers under their delegated powers. The modest extension planned is within the Sway Village Design Statement, provided matching facing materials are used. However given the size of the plot, further development might not be appropriate so perhaps further permitted development rights should be removed and an agreement made that no work under GPDO is to be started before the work of this application is complete (in order to comply with DP11).

Resolved:

The Chair to forward these responses to NFNPA Planning.

16/00143	Kings Lane Nursery, Kings Lane SO41 6BQ	Application for a Certificate of Lawful development for proposed use of land for the siting of 2 No. existing mobile homes.
--------------------------	--	---

Although this application is not open for consultation, given the previous history at this site and concerns of neighbours, there was disquiet that this could allow the development of a caravan park for holiday lets which the committee felt was not appropriate on this site – given that permission was originally temporarily given for their use by nursery workers. Cllr. Marchant outlined the details and it was unanimously resolved that he would draft a note to the planning case officer and circulate that for comments and approval, before it is sent on behalf of the committee.

PT16/042 Update on Planning Enforcement

The list of current Sway Enforcement investigations, having been previously circulated and also being available on the NFNPA website, was noted.

The Chair reported that Sway started the month with 11 investigations, one was essentially a duplicate, and for another the breach has now ceased. Three new investigations are added: unauthorised vehicle storage; one example of egregious overbuilding; and some minor advertising. So 12 investigations were carried forward. At least two of these should soon be resolved as a result of action taken or retrospective planning applications.

PT16/043 Planning Inspectorate and Enforcement Appeals –

No changes from last month.

PT16/044 NFNPA Planning Development Control Committee (PDCC)

One Sway application came before the 16th February 2016 PDCC meeting:

15/00767	Shirley Holms Farm, Shirley Holms SO41 8NH	New Commoners dwelling; new agricultural barn; new stables.
--------------------------	---	---

Further details of the application are in previous minutes. Sway had supported this application strongly – with a 3; and as noted in Appendix 1 the PDCC unanimously granted it, subject to the conditions recommended by the officer and noting our suggestion of screening from Jealous Lane.

Two Sway items are to come before the 15th March 2016 PDCC meeting:

16/00023	Driftwood, Middle Road, Sway SO41 6BB	Retention of decking.
--------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------

Since this had been added to the PDCC agenda the neighbours had come to an excellent compromise, which would have changed Sway's recommendation. It was therefore unanimously resolved that the Chair would write to the officer to explain the situation and would represent Sway

at the PDCC meeting on this item, following the draft that had previously been circulated to members.

[TPO/0038/15](#) Land of Anderwood Drive, Sway TPO: One oak tree at the front of 3 Anderwood Drive; one oak tree at the rear of 7 Anderwood Drive; one oak tree at the rear of 29 Anderwood Drive and a group of 10 oak trees at the rear of odd numbers 15 to 25 Anderwood Drive.

There is an objection to this proposed TPO. Sway supported the TPO and the committee saw no reason to do otherwise, so the Chair would represent Sway at the PDCC meeting on this item supporting the Tree Team's paper.

PT16/045 Other Planning Issues

a. The Wootton Riverine Woodland Wetland Restoration.

Cllr. Marchant showed photos of the flood plain of the Avon Water adjacent to Lower Mead End Road and the Arnewood Bridge Road.

b. Further items from the recent NFNPA SW Quadrant meeting.

- i. **Grazed Verges:** There's a project to improve grazed verges (inside the Perambulation) – if anyone knows of any that are being driven on or where materials are left, please let Sarah Kelly (NFNPA Landscape Officer sarah.kelly@newforestnpa.gov.uk 01590 646686) know – preferably with a marked up map.
- ii. **Local Plan:** excellent briefing from David Illsley: 4 planning briefings are planned this year – details soon. On the draft Local Plan itself: Sway's comments on hierarchy (defined village) noted – boundaries were set in 1986. Current consultations with neighbouring planning authorities and estates are underway, and a consultation draft will probably be out in about October / November.

PT16/046 Report by the Parish Council's Transport Representative

John Warden (Transport Representative) reported that CANGO use is recently lower, but there are plans for the route to go up to Gracewell of Sway (formerly The Shelbourne) and we are hopeful that County Cllr. Ken Thornber's suggestion that the Cango bus could also act as a shuttle between Sway Jubilee Pavilion and Sway St. Luke's School will come to fruition.

PT16/047 Roads, Hedges and Ditches

- a. Parking and congestion around Westbeams Road and Church Lane at school arrival and leaving time.

Cllr. Marchant reported that there had been a meeting between County Councillor Thornber, Councillor Rickman, the Headteacher of St. Luke's and a Hampshire County Council Highways representative; and they have launched a 'Sway Village Congestion Project' with a webpage on the St. Luke's School site and a survey for parents of children at the school, and are proposing a paper survey for residents available at Sway shops. The committee await further details, and look forward to hearing from this group.

PT16/048 Community SpeedWatch (CSW)

Cllr. Thomas was pleased to report that in the last Sway CSW period 134 vehicles were reported, and although Sway CSW had not yet received confirmation that letters are going out, CSW are given to understand that letters are being sent out. A CSW web page is now added to the Parish Council website.

PT16/049 Correspondence and any agenda items for the next meeting

- a. Sway footpath 2 issues were noted and entered onto the HCC Rights of Way issues site.
- b. Sway footpath 4 is much improved along the stretch adjacent to Barrow Lane.
- c. A member of the public expressed continuing concerns over various dragons' teeth, posts and similar along public verges – a concern shared by the Committee and that member of the public kindly agreed to draft an article for Sway News and report these to Hampshire Highways.
- d. A member of the public drew attention to the fact that the limit of a 'pothole' is now anything deeper than 2.5 inches – this was noted with dismay.
- e. Cllr. Marchant updated the meeting on the works at the top of Manchester Road and Brighton Road where apparently water is leaking into the gas main and ongoing emergency works are continuing to locate and solve this issue, and anticipated to continue until at least 18th March. Access should be available to the cemetery.
- f. Signs were noted for forthcoming local resurfacing works including Back Lane, Barrows Lane, Coombe Lane, Mead End Road, South Sway Lane. Sway residents were delighted and hope for considerable improvements.

PT16/050 Date of Next Meeting

The next PaTC meeting will be held at Jubilee Field Pavilion at 7.30pm on Thursday 14th April 2016.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9:30pm.

.....
Chair of Committee

.....
Date

Appendix 1 (of the 10 March 2016 meeting of the Sway Planning and Transport Committee)

Outcome of planning applications considered at previous meetings (as at 12 noon 10 March 2016)

Number	Address	Title	Sway No.	Sway notes	NFNPA	NFNPA Notes
16/00016	Aloma, Kings Lane SO41 6BQ	2 No. single storey side extensions.	1	Sway are pleased to see that this falls within the DP11 guidance. The modest extensions generally fall within the Sway Village Design Statement guidelines. Although the conservatory has a flat roof it is modest and there is no obvious alternative. There are concerns over the additional rooflight and the Parish Council would want to encourage any condition that would maintain this property within the DP11 limits - including no further floorspace in the loft, and the removal of further permitted development rights. Surface water disposal capacity should be improved if possible.	Grant Subject to Conditions	Conditions: matching facing materials; no conversion of roof space to habitable accommodation and no further windows or rooflights; development only in accordance with the drawings.
15/01015	14 Widden Close SO41 6AX	Side extension; cladding to gable ends.	1	Sway PC have concerns over any rooflights and would want to encourage any condition that would maintain this as a small dwelling - including the removal of further permitted development rights, and insistence that the plans are followed. Although a large extension which could crowd the plot, this application broadly falls within the guidelines of the Sway Village Design Statement with a few concerns. Cladding is not in alignment with the Sway Village Design statement - which says "Boarding should be natural in colour or stained black". This development would result in a large increase in roof area and therefore it is recommended that surface water disposal capacity is upgraded.	Grant Subject to Conditions	Conditions: matching external facing materials; removal of further permitted development rights; no additional floorspace (e.g. mezzanine); no first floor windows, development only in accordance with the drawings.

16/00065	Gablemead, Manchester Road SO41 6AS	Replacement dwelling and garage with storage over; Demolition of existing dwelling and garage (Application for a Non Material amendment to planning permission 14/00261).	Obj	Objection as the plans are inaccurate and the new position of the staircase causes overlooking.	Raise objections	The change is considered to warrant material consideration and therefore in this instance a 'non material amendment' cannot be issued.
16/00031	Sway Tower, Barrows Lane SO41 6DE	Application for Listed Building Consent: Installation of 3 No. replacement antennas; 6 No. Mast Head Amplifiers; associated ancillary development; Removal of 3No. existing antennas.	1	A better colour match should be found than that of the existing antennae; bracketry should be designed with a minimum offset of the antenna from the building; every effort should be made to remove redundant bracketry and make good previous work in a suitable manner	Grant Subject to Conditions	Conditions: colour of the visible face of the antennae to match the concrete for the life of the antennas; when antennae and MHAs are no longer used they are to be removed and the site made good.
16/00030	Sway Tower, Barrows Lane SO41 6DE	Installation of 3 No. replacement antennas; 6 No. Mast Head Amplifiers; associated ancillary development; Removal of 3No. existing antennas.	1		Grant Subject to Conditions	
16/00065	Gablemead, Manchester Road SO41 6AS	Replacement dwelling and garage with storage over; Demolition of existing dwelling and garage (Application for a Non Material amendment to planning permission 14/00261).	Obj	Objection as the plans are inaccurate and the new position of the staircase causes overlooking.	Raise objections	The change is considered to warrant material consideration and therefore in this instance a 'non material amendment' cannot be issued.

16/00018	Sway Social Club, Westbeams Road SO41 6AE	4no. semi-detached dwellings; 1 no detached dwelling; garages; access; associated landscaping (demolition of existing building) (Application for a non-material amendment to planning reference 15/00652)	N/A	N/A	Raise no objection	Minor works (convert covered area at the back of the garage to utility room).
15/00767	Shirley Holms Farm, Shirley Holms SO41 8NH	New Commoners dwelling; new agricultural barn; new stables.	3	Sway residents thoroughly support commoning - as evinced by the survey for the Sway Village Design statement. We note the approval of the NFNPA Commoners Dwelling scheme Panel; the support of two close neighbours and the appropriate design and style of the commoners dwelling; We would want to be absolutely assured that this development - including the barn and any other outbuildings could only ever be used for commoners. We ask for the current screening to be maintained and would welcome any further screening from Jealous Lane.	Officer Recommend Granting; PDCC Granted	PDCC: unanimously granted with conditions including a legal guarantee that the development is only ever used for commoning. And surface water disposal is agreed; materials and machinery stored within site; no external lighting without permission, screening to Jealous Lane to be improved.
15/00992	Knight Bridge Farm, South Sway Lane SO41 6DP	Replacement dwelling; solar panels; new stable block; relocation of existing barn to be used as office/storage; new vehicle and pedestrian entrance gates and piers; demolition of existing dwelling and 4 No. existing barns.	4	This application exceeds the rules of NFNPA Core Policy DP11 (approved as part of the Planning Inspectorate's accreditation of the NFNPA Local Plan). Sway have consistently recommended refusal of any and every such application where we've been aware that it exceeds DP11, because in recent surveys Sway residents want to maintain the dwindling stock of smaller dwellings as far as possible, and do not want to see increased suburbanisation of the outer parish	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
16/00051	Kings Hyde Farm, Kings Hyde SO41 8LT	Orangery; two bay carport; cladding; replacement windows.	4	In response to the wishes of residents as revealed in surveys, Sway Parish Council has always been keen to support DP11 – to prevent the outer parish from becoming more suburban (and also to maintain small dwellings within the defined village), and will always recommend refusal where we know an application contravenes this rule. The Sway Village Design Statement SPD guidelines page 22 say “Garages, outbuildings or carports should not be positioned in front of the house” and should be detached or at the side of the house, and incorporate materials used in the main building. This proposal for a carport positioned at the front of the property and adjacent to the quiet lane with boundaries of hedge and trees is clearly inappropriate, although the design is entirely suitable	Withdrawn	Withdrawn

Appeal 3135677	14 Anderwood Drive SO41 6AW	Addition of two dormer windows and a roof light to facilitate first floor habitable accommodation.	4	This is a small dwelling and the application exceeds the rules of NFNPA Core Policy DP11 (approved as part of the Planning Inspectorate's accreditation of the NFNPA DPD). Sway have consistently recommended refusal of any such application where we've been aware that it exceeds DP11, because in recent surveys Sway residents want to maintain the dwindling stock of small dwellings as far as possible. We have a desperate need for smaller and hence less expensive dwellings for local young families and local downsizing empty-nesters to purchase or rent. The Case Officer's recommendation is exactly right, and we further note that the recent appeal decision APP/B9506/D/15/3005303 upholds the decision to refuse in such circumstances.	[Refused by NFNPA] On appeal: Grant Subject to Conditions	On appeal: the use of half the loft space for only domestic storage means this would then not exceed the 100m ² allowed for a small dwelling; the rooflight is provide light to that storage area. There are a number of similar dormers in the vicinity. Conditions are added to adhere to the plans and use matching material.
16/00008	The Swallows, Kings Lane SO41 6BQ	Application for a Certificate of lawful development for Proposed single storey rear extension and insertion of 3 no.rooflights	N/A	N/A	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
15/01000	Boundway Gate, Boundway Hill SO41 6EN	Replacement dwelling AMENDED (no garage)	1	We thoroughly approve of the redesign of the house which is a most significant improvement in style, and appropriate for the location, as well as coming within the 30% limit. Subject to appropriate facing and roofing materials this main house proposal falls broadly within the Sway Village Design Statement Guidelines. There is some flat roof at the back which is not in line with the Sway VDS guidelines on page 19; and there could be light pollution from the 'lantern' roof, and policy CP6 might apply in such a sensitive area as adjacent to the open forest, and with local bats. Perhaps a condition preventing any external lighting without further permission would be appropriate. Hard standing and car parking should be permeable, or appropriate drainage should be agreed.	Grant Subject to Conditions	Conditions: Matching facing and roofing materials and joinery all to be agreed; removal of further permitted development rights; no further fenestration or external lighting without permission; ecology report to be followed; machinery and materials to be stored onsite in a compound; surface water disposal to be agreed.

16/00014	Avon Wood, Arnewood Bridge Road SO41 6DA	Single storey rear extension.	4	<p>In response to the wishes of residents as revealed in surveys, Sway Parish Council has always consistently supported DP11 – to prevent the outer parish from becoming more suburbanised. For this reason we feel that the best option would be one which keeps the overall extension to floorspace within DP11. The officers’ observation that: “Unless all permitted development extensions are rescinded, and a condition is attached to ensure the garage is not converted in future, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DP11.” is paramount and that would probably be the best option. If a solution within DP11 can be found we would then have further concerns over contraventions of the Sway Village Design Statement guidelines in respect of the flat roof (page 19), and the style and fenestration of the proposed extension not being in keeping with the main building (page 20), and we would want to see those improved.</p>	Withdrawn	Withdrawn
16/00026	Quarr Lodge, Manchester Road SO41 6AS	First floor extension.	1	<p>This is a modest extension, but as the Officer points out this is in a sensitive and highly visible location directly opposite the SPA boundary. Sway would therefore recommend that particular care is taken to ensure exactly matching facing and roofing materials are used, and would suggest that construction vehicles are not to be parked on the soft verge on the opposite side of the road, which is adjacent to the SPA</p>	Grant Subject to Conditions	Conditions: matching external facing materials to be agreed; a suitable compound for materials and machinery to be agreed; development only in accordance with the drawings.

Appendix 2 (of the 10 March 2016 meeting of the Sway Planning and Transport Committee)

Tree Report relating to the PaTC Agenda of 10 March 2016

(SPC= Sway Parish Council)

TPO/16/0132 Carbery Manor, Adlams Lane, Sway, Lymington, SO41 6EG

Description: Prune group of Beech and Oak trees

SPC Tree representative notes:

The trees that are planted on land owned by Carbery Manor extend over the neighbours driveway and the ends of the branches are beginning to intermingle with overhead power cables.

It would seem prudent to carry out minor works to the trees to prevent damage to these cables and could be carried out with detriment to the trees.

SPC's comments

Sway Parish Council recognise that the fine row of mature trees are of HIGH amenity value to those that live and walk in the area. However judicial pruning to avoid damage to the overhead cables would not be to the detriment of the trees and have no objections to this work taking place although the trees should remain well balanced in shape.

Decisions since Feb 2016 P&TC meeting

TPO/16/0059 21 Anderwood Drive, Sway

Description: Fell 1x Oak tree

Reasons: T1 Oak (left corner of garden) - Fell, due to rot/decay at base / lower part of trunk. Tree could potentially fail.

SPC's comments

Sway Parish Council accept that where there are safety issues to this tree, we are happy to accept NFNPA tree officer's recommendations.

Decision Grant

Cllr. Melanie Seacombe, Sway Parish Council Tree Representative