

Beaulieu Parish Council Planning Committee minutes for meeting held July 29<sup>th</sup> 2024

Present: Cllr Steele [chairman], Cllr Hubbard, Cllr Dolbear, Cllr Knight and Cllr Reece

In attendance: Nicky Deering [clerk] and for the River House application CHris Busby and Deborah Slade

Apologies: None

Minutes of the meeting held on June 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 were unanimously passed:

Proposed: Cllr Reece

Seconded: Cllr Dolbear

The following planning application was discussed:

24/00119 River House, Dock Lane, Beaulieu, SO42 7YJ

Replacement of dwelling [demolition of existing], replacement of staff accommodation [demolition of existing], outbuildings, gates and fencing, garden wall with attached glasshouse.

The chairman stated that amended plans had been submitted which included:

1. The staff accommodation has been reduced from two to one cottage
2. The reduction in size of the staff accommodation reduces habitable space across the site by 29 sq. metres to 543 sq. metres compared to the existing situation
3. Basement has been reduced in size
4. The use of solar control glass is offered on the south west facing second floor bedroom and bathroom
5. A similar Construction Management plan to Oxleys would be used for the build.

The Chairman briefly reminded the meeting that the Parish Council had recommended refusal of the initial planning application for the following reasons:

1. The proposal was not felt compliant with the National Park's main planning policies on habitable space as:
  - a. The Parish Council consider the main dwelling and the staff annex to be two separate buildings and therefore moving 75sq. metres from the annex to the main dwelling contravenes planning policy DP35
  - b. If the two buildings are to be regarded as one, a problem arises in moving the staff accommodation up to the Tukul border as this would contravene planning policy DP37 on Outbuildings.
2. The Parish Council feels that a more dominant two storey house is unsuitable for this low lying highly protected stretch of the Beaulieu River where there is very little tree cover in front of the properties raising the risk of unnecessary light spillage.

The Chairman began by discussing with the applicants the reasons why the Parish Council felt that the planning application did not conform with the National Park's main prescriptive planning policies

on habitable space The Parish Council outlined their view that they did not consider that the main dwelling and the staff annex can be considered as one building as a result of a covered way that does not seem to have been built. The question was asked if two sets of council tax were paid on the buildings. The applicants made the case that it is to be assessed as one planning unit and is therefore compliant with DP35 and pointed out that habitable space across the site was actually being reduced as a result of the amended plans.

The Parish Council made the point that if the building is to be considered as one planning unit moving the one unit of staff accommodation inland onto the Tukul border would be in contravention of planning policy DP37 on outbuildings which prevented habitable space in new outbuildings. This was refuted by the applicants who suggested that re siting existing habitable space in outbuildings was within policy and cited examples where this had been the case. The applicants agreed to provide the Parish Council with planning examples where this had been allowed by the National Park Authority.

A brief discussion took place as to the possible misunderstandings that had arisen at the pre application stage for the proposed plans and Chris Busby stressed that they had tried to engage with all relevant parties and neighbours during the formulation of their plans for the River House.

The Committee moved on to discuss with the applicants their concern that a more dominant two storey house was not suitable in this low lying stretch of the Beaulieu River with little tree cover possible in front of the proposed property. It was pointed out to the applicants that the proposed new dwelling is in fact positioned further forward towards the river than the existing single storey property it is replacing. The Parish Council noted that at the pre application stage it had been suggested that the property be moved further back into the site to reduce its dominance and asked the applicants if they would consider doing this. A pictorial representation of what the property would look like set further back was presented by the Parish Council and discussed with the applicants. The Parish Council indicated that they would prefer the new dwelling to be set further back in the site to give new trees the chance to grow in this low lying tidal area.

Chris Busby explained that moving the property further inland had been dismissed as they wished a bigger gap between the main dwelling and the Tukul bund which formed the side of the adjacent lake. Also it would limit the amount of parking. He showed the Committee a table containing the distances between various other properties and the river which showed the River House set back further than most at 150 metres. He informed the Committee that the National Park Tree Officer had advised them where to plant the new trees indicated on the planting plan.

The possibility of extending the use of solar control glass on more of the front elevation was discussed and it was agreed some sort of screening of the terrace windows would be a good idea to deal with the extra massing of fenestration in this area. It was suggested that this could be conditioned if necessary. The applicants pointed out that the proposed new property contained less glazing than the existing one.

It was agreed that Deborah Slade would provide the Parish Council with examples as to where the National Park had allowed habitable space from elsewhere on the site to be included in the main dwelling which she felt justified a similar approach to re arranging the habitable space on the River House site. She would also forward us a copy of the National Park's pre application advice and some indication of how tree cover on the site could be increased to make the house look less dominant.

The Chairman thanked Chris Busby and Deborah Slade for coming to discuss the planning application and they left the meeting at 7.30 pm.

The committee continued their discussion and it was agreed that a further extension would be sought from the National Park to give time to consider the information requested from the applicants.

The Chairman informed the Committee that she had received a telephone call from Mr Middleton who was the new owner of Speared Copse informing us that a new planning application for the site had now been lodged with the National Park. He suggested August 2<sup>nd</sup> as a possible date for a site visit. It is understood that the new plans are for a Contemporary Design and that Lord Montagu is currently looking at the plans.

The Chairman informed the Committee that she had received a number of complaints regarding the poly tunnels that had been erected by the New Forest Fruit Company at Penerly on the Lyndhurst Road for growing grapes. They are covering around 25 acres and are expected to double in size and are clearly extremely unsightly for those overlooking them. She reported that it was unclear as to what planning permission was needed in the Conservation Area but she was trying to find out from the planning officer as there is nothing in the Local Plan on poly tunnels. The residents most affected have reported the issue to the Enforcement Officer who is now looking into the situation. The Chairman informed the Committee that she would keep the situation under review.

The meeting ended at 8.00 pm