



BRAMSHAW PARISH COUNCIL NEW FOREST HAMPSHIRE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 26th July 2016, AT BRAMSHAW VILLAGE HALL.

Members Present:

Sue Bennison - Chairman (SB)
Sally Day (SD)
Kay Harrison (KH)
Martin Vann (MV) (Vice Chair)
Jenny Watts (JW)

111.16 Apologies for Absence - to agree any absences of councillors.

Apologies were received and accepted from David Johnson and NFDC Cllr Diane Andrews.

112.16 Disclosure of Interest.

There were no disclosures of interest.

113.16 Minutes.

It was agreed that the minutes of the 26th July 2016 were a true record of that meeting and were signed by the Chair.

114.16 Co-option Procedure.

The Co-option procedure had been circulated by DJ prior to the meeting. SD proposed accepting the procedure with one amendment that the words "absolute majority" were changed to "simple majority".

JW seconded the proposal and the procedure was adopted.

115.16 Co option

Rachel Garrett was nominated by SD, seconded by KH. Mark Medley was nominated by MV and seconded by SB.

A secret ballot was conducted and Rachel Garrett was duly elected.

Mark Medley was thanked for putting himself forward to serve.

116.16 Reports to be received.

Jake White ; National Trust; Northern Commons Ranger

Mr White gave a presentation of the proposed tree work on the Northern Commons which would include removal of Turkey Oak, thinning of Pines and the occasional Birch and clear felling a stand of mature conifers. The aim was to improve the open spaces of the commons and increase the open habitat which at present is designated "unfavourable" particularly because of fleabane.

MV. Martin reported the more than 30 people in Fritham had registered an interest in broadband improvement and negotiations with BT were continuing.

MV reported that he and KH had produced a document “Living in the Forest to go on the website particularly for newcomers. It was agreed that this would be entered as an item on the next agenda for discussion.

SB said she had had no response to her enquiries about dragon’s teeth and the “brick building” but she would chase.

SB had received a document “Our Past, Our Future” from the NFNPA and would circulate it for discussion at the next meeting.

117.16 Public Forum

Members of the public present : Juliet Halliday, Marie Heinst, Penny and John Hankinson, Chris Powell, Elizabeth and Bruce Dugmore, Mark Medley.

Marie Heinst spoke for Fritham residents and raised their very serious concerns about the Forestry Commissions Planning Application for Latchmore. They had 4 main areas of concern.

- The rationale and its implications.
- The lack of evidence-based research.
- The accountability and value for money
- The environmental impact as assessed in the Environmental Statement.

She gave a detailed explanation of the groups thinking in each of these areas.

John Hankinson raised the issue of the work undertaken at Howens Bottom stating that it had not been successfully completed and had caused destruction of forest habitat. He also raised the issue of the horrors of the prospective traffic through Fritham if the Application were to be approved.

118.16 Planning

i) Planning applications for comment:

[LATCHMORE RESTORATION](#)

Ref No 16/00571 – Wetland restoration comprising the restoration of meanders, bed level raising (including the main channel, tributaries and side drains), channel infill (including parts of the existing main channel) tributaries and side drains); removal of spoil banks, trees, scrub and vegetation; installation of debris dams; repair of knickpoints; installation of three culvert crossings and the construction and/or replacement of a total of three vehicle and 12 pedestrian fords on the line of the restored watercourse. (2 September 2016).

SB read the Note drafted by David Johnston for the benefit of the public present. There followed a discussion with regard to the BPC response.

A unanimous decision was made to recommend REFUSAL of the Application, No 4. The council adopted the reasons drafted by DJ which had been circulated before the meeting and which were read out in full.

It was also agreed that the decision together with a copy of the reasons should be e-mailed to residents to encourage them to respond individually to the application. The e-mail should include the Application number, the date of 2nd September which is the end of the consultation period, the address of Steve Avery at the NFNPA and the address of Julian Lewis MP.

The title of the e-mail should be "ALERT TO RESIDENTS, URGENT RESPONSE REQUIRED." This is to encourage residents to open the e-mail !!!!!!!

The heading should read "HGV MOVEMENTS FOR NEXT THREE SUMMERS IN FRITHAM AND BROOK".

Full response attached.

[TILE COTTAGE - REPLACEMENT GARAGE](#)

Ref No 16/0633 – Replacement Garage. (26 August 2016).

It was agreed to recommend PERMISSION, No 1, as the Council had approved the previous application which was replaced by this application and this was a smaller construction. The Council would accept the decision reached by the NPA's Officers under their delegated powers.

ii) **Planning decisions to note:**

[OFFICE BUILDING and TIMBER CLAD STORE](#)

BELL INN & BRAMSHAW GOLF CLUB, LYNDHURST ROAD, BROOK, LYNDHURST, SO43 7HE. Ref. No: 16/00367 (30 June 2016). Bramshaw Parish Council recommended permission be granted, NFNPA recommended refusal – deferred by Development Control Committee at Members request.

iii) **Tree applications for comment.**

[EYEWORTH LODGE, FRITHAM, SO43 7HJ](#)

Application No: 16/0588 - Fell 5 x Conifers. (21/09/2016).

Bramshaw Parish Council no comments to make on this application.

[STOCKS CROSS HOUSE, BRAMSHAW, SO43 7JH](#)

Application No 16/0757 – Fell 1 x Silver Birch tree Fell 1 x Lawson Cypress tree.

Bramshaw Parish Council no comments to make on this application.

[FELLING LICENCE FOR NORTHERN COMMONS](#)

Bramshaw Parish Council no comments to make on this application.

iv) **Tree applications to note:**

[CONS16/0680 – SOUTH HILL, CANTERTON LANE, BROOK, LYNDHURST, SO43 7HF.](#)

Fell 1 x Group of Spruce trees Prune 2 x Oak trees. No objection.

v) **Enforcement as per N F NPA's website on 17/06/2016 and as per list published–**

QU/16/0135: PENN MANOR FARM (Formerly Penn Vale Farm), PENN COMMON ROAD, BRAMSHAW, SO43 7JL

Description: Habitable use of outbuilding contrary to Breach of Condition Notice (served 20 July 2012); Use of different roofing materials on conservatory (Breach of condition 3

of pp 08/93170); Creation of additional bedroom in the roof of the dwelling contrary to S106 agreement; Use of French doors rather than window in first floor rear elevation.

Case Status: Complaint Acknowledged Priority: Standard

119.16 Finance and policy

- i) Payments for authorisation – at Appendix 2 .

Jane Mullan (Clerk) July 2016 -	Salary + expenses –	000777	£283.50
Sue Bennison	Mileage for June and July	000776	£43.20
Information Commissioner	Data Protection	000778	£35.00

- ii) Financial Report.

Income £3310.00
Outgoings £2477.08
Balance £9795.50

- iii) Consideration adding the three phone boxes to the Insurance policy, with the cost of £28.25 being added to the renewal premium in June 2017.

The decision as to what action should be taken, including the payment of the additional insurance premium, was deferred to the next meeting as it was the consensus of the meeting that the future of all the telephone boxes should be considered. JW and SD were concerned that the expenditure of public funds was not justified.

- vi) Review of Annual Return including BDO's certificate.

The council had reviewed the report and noted the very slight error. (1p)

120.16 Ongoing issues with reports if not brought to the attention of the meeting under Councillor's reports. Please note this will be for information purpose only.

No ongoing matters raised.

121.16 Consideration of Items for meeting on 27th September 2016.

Verge Restoration.

Small Grants Scheme and whether this could be used in conjunction with the lengthsman scheme.

Our Past, Our Future.

Living in the New Forest: information for the website.

Consideration of what to do about the telephone boxes.

122.16 Confirmation of dates of future meetings.

27th September 2016; 25 October 2016; 22 November 2016; 20th December 2016.

Meeting closed 9.20 pm

Signed: Date:

Bramshaw Parish Council's response to planning application 16/00571 as prepared by David Johnston.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFUSAL:

Bramshaw Parish Council (BPC) opposes the proposed application in the strongest possible terms.

This Parish encompasses part of the land where the proposed work is to be done and the villages of Brook and Fritham whose residents face hugely damaging and harmful consequences as a result of the projected HGV traffic movements.

BPC recognises that there may be an arguable case that the land subject of this application has been damaged by erosion attributable to past human interference. We understand that there is a case for considering measures to repair damage and to prevent further harm to the environment but there is no urgent requirement for such work to be undertaken. The visible damage appears to have occurred over the past 150 years or so. If left alone it might deteriorate further but any deterioration will not be rapid. Meanwhile in other areas on the Forest which have suffered erosion, previous, well intentioned, repair works have failed or not yet succeeded.

There is no justification for undertaking a project as potentially damaging and disruptive as this before proving from experience that similar projects already in hand are successful.

The Forestry Commission should demonstrate that a project of this type and scale will succeed, producing measurable benefits that outweigh the damage and disruption incurred in the process. They should be able to do this using the sites where previous repair work has been attempted. The funds now available for Latchmore might be better used to ensure that previous repair schemes in the Forest are fixed, monitored and demonstrated to be effective.

It seems that the only reason this project is being pursued now is the availability of HLS funding. That is no basis on which to justify an enormously intrusive and damaging intervention.

Those facts alone justify our opposition to this scheme but BPC has a greater responsibility and concern, being the health and welfare of our residents.

All the traffic movements on the Fritham Route to be used during at least two years of this project pass along the steep, largely single, lane that leads through Fritham, past the Royal Oak public house. Many of the houses in Fritham are close to the road. Fritham residents must ride, walk, cycle or drive along this road to go about their daily business. They are entitled to the quiet occupation of their homes. Yet the Applicant proposes to drive perhaps 60 HGVs a day down or up that road during all the summer holiday months of 2017 and 2019. That represents an HGV, laden or otherwise, every 12 minutes of the day, between 7 in the morning and 7 in the evening. The frequency of these movements will vary. The lorries will not pass in an instant so the disruption will extend for a significant part of every hour during the day. The lorries do not operate in isolation. Everyone who uses that road knows that it is not easy to pass ordinary vehicles so lorries and cars will be stopping, reversing, edging past, creating jams. HGV traffic will appear continuous and all this at peak holiday times. The burden on local residents will be intolerable and should not be visited on anyone unless absolutely unavoidable. No-one could argue that the proposed work is absolutely unavoidable.

The claim that there are presently 125 HGV movements per day into Fritham is extremely dubious. (Table 9.6 of Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES). The experience of local residents does not support that figure. The ES assert that 28.4% of current vehicle movements into Fritham are HGV's but no other route has such a preponderance of HGV traffic. Only 2% of the 3,450 vehicles using Telegraph Hill are said to be HGV's, yet that is a major feed route into Fritham. That anomaly casts doubt on the Fritham figure which suggests that nearly a third of vehicular movements in and out of Fritham are HGV's. There is no reason for significant HGV movements in and out of Fritham except possibly during exceptional farming operations or timber extraction activity. We don't know why the figure for Fritham should be wrong but the sample figures are plainly not representative. Even on that exaggerated present figure of 125 HGV movements a day the Applicants propose to nearly double the HGV movements (claiming a 46.4% increase). If the correct HGV usage figure is identified the increase in HGV movements will be seen to be colossal.

We note that Table 9.3 shows the daily average traffic flow into Fritham as 440; table 9.4 shows a similar measure to be 520 vehicles. We don't know which, if either, is right.

Much of the traffic using both Telegraph Hill and Fritham routes will also pass through Brook, over a three-year period. Those residents of Brook who live along the B3079 have endured years of blight from the HGV's serving the landfill site at Pound Bottom, rear Redlynch. As a Parish Council we have dealt with highly distressed residents, driven to despair by the remorseless, frequent passage of HGV's thundering past their doors; this proposal would hugely increase that burden. We have campaigned for years with, sadly, little success to reduce that problem. The Pound Bottom HGV's have had a seriously negative effect on the quality of life of many Brook residents. The prospect of a huge increase in HGV traffic through Brook is terrifying for our parishioners living on that road. Yet the Applicant and its partners propose to inflict on our Parish a greatly increased HGV traffic load.

The Applicant has made representations regarding traffic. There are glib, self-serving traffic assessments in the supporting papers based on a great deal of desk analysis but very little direct observation or consultation. Both Brook and Fritham are identified as "high sensitivity receptors" because of the proximity of housing to the routes. Chapter 9 of the ES, paragraph 9.66 acknowledges that the high percentage increases in HGV traffic at both Fritham and Brook requires a full assessment of the environmental effects in those areas but that has not been done. Instead, by a convoluted and highly dubious process the report finds its way to a conclusion that the roads in Brook and Fritham are physically capable of bearing the increased traffic. There is no consideration of the terrifying burden on residents.

There is no mention of the human cost in the Applicants remarkably long winded application but the inevitable damage to the health and general well-being of the residents of Fritham and Brook through at least two and possible four future summers far outweighs any possible benefit of the proposed scheme. The mitigation measures proposed are plainly inadequate, involving signage, a requirement for hauliers to join the "considerate contractor scheme" and obliging drivers to respect speed limits while being "made aware" of pedestrians, cyclists and livestock. Try explaining that to people whose house will shake every ten minutes, throughout most of the day for most of each summer for two or three years; people who can't listen to the radio or make a telephone call without interruption; who can't let their animals or children out of their houses.

There is fear and horror amongst our parishioners, particularly in Brook and in Fritham about what they face if this proposal is approved. There is no justification for inflicting on us the harm that will accompany the proposed work.

The human cost of this proposal overwhelms any possible environmental benefit of the scheme.