

Working to Protect the New Forest



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reply to: -

Brookley Farmhouse Sway Road Brockenhurst Hampshire SO427RX
01590 623935 brookleyfarmhouse@btinternet.com

Sent as attachment to Email only

22 November 2014

Deborah Slade
New Forest National Park Authority
Lymington Town Hall
Avenue Road
Lymington SO41 9ZG

Dear Deborah,

Application 00808 PETER PAN, HIGHWOOD ROAD, BROCKENHURST, SO42 7RY
Outline application for 4 dwellings; associated access and parking; Demolition of existing bungalow

1. New Forest Association (NFA) objects to this application.
2. The site falls within the 400M exclusion zone around the New Forest SPA and CP1 applies. I will not bore you by reproducing it but remind you this policy was included at the insistence of national government and reflects the first purpose. The "loose change" solution to the second part of the policy contained in *Development Standards SPD* might just be satisfactory if the Authority managed its new dwelling provision in line with central government targets but it is not satisfactory when they are allowed to run at over twice that rate. NFA have had some correspondence with Natural England on this matter who have accepted in principle that the formula would need revision if housing provision changed significantly. Indeed it must be questionable if the inclusion of any of the 400 metre zone within the village boundaries could resist a legal challenge
3. Is there room for four houses? Certainly there are areas of Brockenhurst where density is higher and layout is even more complex, but in this case the layout shown falls foul of policies DP1, DP6 and CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD, Design Guide SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework. As the proposed dwellings, by reason of their siting, would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in this part of Brockenhurst resulting in a poor relationship with adjoining properties to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, due to the plot size and shape the development would result in a cramped form of development which is out of character with the more spacious nature of surrounding development.
It might be possible to overcome this objection with a different layout e.g. two semis.
4. With the layout shown the privacy of the neighbour is not compromised it is destroyed.
5. What community benefit does this application bring to Brockenhurst?

The Parish may welcome the parcel of land offered or they may consider that there is no overcrowding in the existing play area and that the initial cost of expanding the area and the increased on-going maintenance cost mean the offer of land is a negative - the Parish should be paid to accept the burden of maintenance. NFA would urge the Parish to the latter view.

Working to Protect the New Forest



The Authority's record in providing affordable housing is shameful and its comments regarding the *no affordable in developments of 10 or less* on the consultation *Planning performance and planning contributions* might have carried some weight had it been able to demonstrate the policy it was seeking to preserve had yielded any

results. The starting point on this application is that of the three extra properties, one should be affordable and the analysis undertaken in the consideration of 00008, *September Cottage* suggests this is a realistic ambition.

The Authority's slogan *Preserve, Enjoy, Prosper* noticeably omits its duty to *foster the social well-being of local communities*. If it is the judgement of the planning officer that an affordable home (not contribution) cannot come from this applicant then there is no benefit to the social welfare of the village or the national park and CP1 considerations become overwhelming.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Graham Baker'.

Graham Baker, NFA Planning Committee