

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF LYNDHURST PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT LYNDHURST COMMUNITY CENTRE ON TUESDAY 10 OCTOBER 2017 COMMENCING AT 7.00 PM

Present: Councillors M Rollé (Chairman), the Revd Dr C Wilkins (Vice Chairman), Dr P Burrows, T Dunning, F Green, K Kaljura, S Se-Upara, A Trend, A Wiltshire and P Wyeth

Clerk/RFO: Mrs M Weston
Mr Steve Avery
Ms Clare Ings

In attendance: 109 members of the public (part of the meeting)
Carolyn Griffiths (Press) (part of the meeting)

86. Disclosures of Interest

The Chairman reminded Councillors of their responsibility to declare an interest in any matter on the Agenda where they might be considered to have a prejudicial interest. There was one declaration of interest in Agenda items as outlined below.

Councillor Wyeth stated that she would not take any part in the discussions regarding Agenda Item 6 (Minute 88) Application No 00732 – Lyndhurst Park Hotel as she was a member of the NFNPA and sat on their Planning Committee. She had called the application in for deliberation and decision by the Planning Committee and did not want to prejudice herself from being able to discuss, pass opinions and vote at that meeting.

87. Apology for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor G Bisson.

88. Public Participation

The Chairman asked if members of the public would like to contribute at this point regarding any items other than the planning application relating to the Lyndhurst Park Hotel.

A resident stated that the traffic problems were increasing and he felt that everyone should become more proactive on obtaining a bypass as the present problems were stopping people coming into the village. Steve Avery reported that the Chief Executive of NFNPA had received a letter from the Parish Council voicing concerns regarding traffic problems and the Parish Council would receive a full response in due course. It was recognised that there were traffic problems in the whole of the New Forest National Park. A resident said she had some “quick fixes” that she thought might be useful to alleviate the problems and it was further recognised that County Councillor Edward Heron should be invited to become involved. It was known that the sheer volume of traffic and the fact that it became static at times had led to severe pollution problems.

RESOLVED: To write to County Councillor Edward Heron to ask him to become involved in any talks that might take place.

89. Application No 00732 – Lyndhurst Park Hotel

This planning application had been submitted to NFNPA by PegasusLife for the creation of 75 age restricted residential units integrated with communal wellness and support facilities; 15no affordable dwellings; associated car and cycle parking; landscaping; refuse store; sub-station; alteration of existing vehicular and pedestrian access; demolition of existing hotel and buildings.

Councillor Kaljura gave a Powerpoint presentation. He outlined the previous application in 2016 for 74 age restricted apartments and 12 holiday lets which had been rejected by NFNPA. Comparisons of the site showing the present hotel and the proposals were shown as well as the plans for the previous application and the current application, pointing out that some of the drawings appeared misleading with trees shown to hide buildings as well. The proposals were not materially different from those previously submitted and therefore did not address the reasons for refusal. No account had been taken of the overwhelming number of detailed objections that had been received last time. New evidence clearly shows that Glass Hayes House should be classed as a Non-designated Heritage Asset (Ref: Greenacres APP/B9506/W/17/3167885). The Developer has failed to take note of the previous refusal reasons from the LPA and has also refused to listen to the overwhelming objections from local residents. It was clear that the Developer has disregarded Local and National planning policy. Councillor Wilkins had received information from the Georgian Society and Historic England with reference to the Arthur Conan Doyle connection, whereby it could be evidenced that he had designed part of the building. It was also noted that the nearby War Memorial had now been listed and there was a strong local connection between this and the Lyndhurst Park Hotel.

It was noted that it was necessary to deal exclusively with the facts and that all reasons for refusal must stand up. It was suggested that there might be Government finance available for community use.

Councillor Wilkins enquired about the possibility for a local listing for the building. Steve Avery said the developer could not demolish the building at this stage and NFNPA were assessing the heritage designation of the building.

RESOLVED: To recommend to NFNPA that the application be refused. This decision was unanimous, apart from Councillor Wyeth, who took no part in the foregoing discussion or the vote for the reason given above. The reasons for refusal are as follow:

The application has been assessed by Lyndhurst Parish Council (LPC) against the planning policies set out in the current Local Development Framework (December 2010) and the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.

It is requested that if the National Park Authority (NPA) concurs with the LPC view any documentation setting out the reasons for OBJECTION should be comprehensive and include ALL of the areas that did not meet the relevant criteria set out in the current Local Development Framework (December 2010) and the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.

It should be noted that in the foreword of the current New Forest National Part Local Development Framework, the statutory obligation of the National Park is to; "Seek to conserve and enhance the special qualities that make the New Forest the place it is, whilst at the same time ensuring that what development does take place is focused on catering for the needs of local people". It goes on to say that "Major Development proposals should not take place in designated areas, except in exceptional circumstances..." Major development proposals should be demonstrated to be in the overriding public interest before being allowed to proceed.

This site offers a very sensitive location, and an extremely exciting opportunity to enhance the approach to the village of Lyndhurst and create a good quality edge to the forest and to one of the most popular iconic open spaces in the New Forest. It is clear that the scale and design of this development are not in keeping with a village environment, and that the proposal has not changed significantly since the original application (16/01000), in 2016 and shows a distinct lack of understanding of the character and local needs of Lyndhurst. Indeed, rather disappointingly, the applicant has completely ignored the enormous strength of local and wider opposition to their previous application and the detailed reasons for refusal of that scheme. It has failed to make

anything other than the substitution of the 14 holiday units with a small amount of affordable housing and a few other non-material changes to the application.

Accordingly, this revised application still contravenes the vast majority of policies as set out by the NPA and National Planning Policy Framework.

The specific objections to the proposed development are as follows:

Development Plan

Designation Outside Defined Village Boundary:

The Proposed Development is outside of the defined village boundary for Lyndhurst and therefore should not be allowed as this will be in breach of the current Local Development Framework (NPA Core Strategy page 37 Paragraph 7.7 / 7.8).

In addition, even if the proposal was within the village boundary it would fall outside of policy CP9 as it has been classed, by the NPA, as a Major Development and not a small-scale development to meet local needs.

The categorisation of the application is at odds with similar applications Pegasus has submitted elsewhere. Pegasus are insisting it is offering an institutional level of care or C2, making it exempt for the need to provide social housing – this is incorrect as the dwellings being proposed are for single and multiple occupancy and are not rented. They are normal residential dwellings, which in turn means that under the National Park Core Strategy Policy CP12 any residential development outside of the defined village boundary should only be affordable / social housing.

Principal Development Plan Policy objections

CP1 Nature Conservation Sites of International Importance

The proposed development sits within 400m of the boundary of a New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA), the proposal has not demonstrated that adequate measures have been put in place to mitigate any potential adverse effects on the ecological integrity of the SPA.

CP2 The Natural Environment:

The proposed development will adversely affect the surrounding conservation area due to the incongruous visual impact against the rural setting. The National Park designation applies which has the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

Impact on protected trees on the site. All trees falling under a tree protection order and wildlife within will be adversely impacted by the close proximity of the proposed development. The proposal would result in attrition of landscape with the building being too dominant.

In the original (16/01000) Pegasus Planning Statement, the bat survey identified that 'There was a high level of bat activity recorded... both foraging and / or commuting.' At least 8 species were identified. Although not referred to as such in the report Executive Summary at least three of the species listed appear to be amongst the rarest and most threatened species whose protection and enhancement is a key objective listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act. It should also be noted that the current application states that the Bat survey is not complete.

The space adjoining the eastern edge of the site is open grazed forest, a wide seasonal pond and a setting for the iconic Bolton's Bench. The proposal presents a series of

oversized blocks of flats at three storeys with a foil of retained trees and an attempt to screen at lower levels by restoring a laurel hedge. The building will look institutional especially on winter evenings when the trees provide little cover and the regular grid of three rows of windows is lit up to spoil the backdrop to the open forest.

Special Area of Conservation – adjoining:

This will be fully commented on by Natural England

Special Protection Area – adjoining:

This will be fully commented on by Natural England

Site of Special Scientific Interest – adjoining:

This will be fully commented on by Natural England

Ramsar Site adjoining:

The proposal will have a negative impact on a site of ecological importance (Area between Beaulieu Road and Lyndhurst Park Hotel Boundary) and be in direct conflict with the government's commitment to take the steps necessary to ensure that its ecological character is maintained.

CP6 Pollution:

Due to the relationship with the High Street, the proposal, in effect extends the high street and will bring a closing in affect where it is currently more open. It is also likely to extend the pollution corridor already within the high street, which is already an Air Quality Management Area due to high levels of pollution.

CP7 The Built Environment:

The proposed development does not Conserve and enhance the wealth of individual characteristics that contribute to the local distinctiveness of the built environment of Lyndhurst or the wider New Forest. In addition, one of the National Parks Statutory purposes together with national planning policy (Particularly PPS1 and PPS5) recognises the importance of conserving and enhancing an area's character. This should not allow for the destruction of the culturally important Georgian part of Lyndhurst Park Hotel (the former Glasshayes House), or the erection of a series of overbearing incongruous blocks of flats.

As noted in the original pre-application response letter from the NPA to Pegasus; 'the overall development approach appears to cover most of the space not occupied by trees and mature vegetation with built form or hardstanding. The scheme has the feel of an urban infill proposal rather than one which addresses this sensitive landscape edge to the site and the village'.

CP8 Local Distinctiveness:

The addition of 75 age restricted flats and 15 affordable houses in the current proposal would erode Lyndhurst's local character and would result in increasing the urbanisation of the village. The proposals primary aim is to meet an external demand and Pegasus have failed to demonstrate any local need (CP9) and therefore is not aligned with the local planning policy.

Despite the work put into the design and access statement the designers have clearly misunderstood the context in some fundamental ways. The result is a set of buildings which fail to respond to the context of their siting and are not inspired by what actually characterises Lyndhurst.

The design of this scheme falls very far short of what one would expect for such a development opportunity and would be harmful to the character, vibrancy and quality of Lyndhurst Village. The proposal is fundamentally inappropriate in its context and within the neighbourhood, failing to respond to the character of this area, which is one of transition, the approach and arrival to the village centre and the edge of the open green area of the forest.

The buildings are too large, too bland and laid out in a way that fails to respond to the landscape, to the street and to the spaces around them. Spaces between buildings are not given due consideration and the result is a poor layout demonstrating that ultimately this proposal is one of overdevelopment.

Many smaller dwellings nearby are rich with detail and delight. The proposal on the other hand is unfussy with simple clarity of detail, clean lines and simple forms. This is a contemporary design solution which could work in the right location especially if there is a wide unfussy spacious setting or where there is room to personalise or create garden colour and variety. These buildings however have a setting which is fussy and fragmented, the landscaped areas leave little opportunity for personalisation or colour and variety where it matters, the design subsequently looks inappropriate and out of place in its setting.

CP9 Defined Villages:

This proposal in no way supports local needs and does not strengthen the well-being, identity and sustainability of the rural community. It should be noted that the New Forest has always had a significant local population, sadly these people, who are an essential part of the character of the New Forest, are being forced out by the lack of affordable housing, and this is driven by profit and external demand over local needs and is clearly in breach of policy CP9.

CP11 Affordable Housing:

The National Park's Core Strategy Policy CP11 states "small-scale affordable housing may be permitted as "exceptions" on sites in or adjoining villages to meet the identified needs of local people in these areas. Proposals for exception sites should: "meet a particular local need that cannot be accommodated in any other way;"

This development makes limited provision for local affordable housing (being 15 out of 90 units, or just over 16%); the design of the affordable housing however appears as an afterthought and is segregated from the main development forming a ghetto of dwellings with an enclosed parking area dominating the interior of the proposed courtyard. In addition, the lack of useable garden or open amenity space is equally unacceptable, failing "to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings" (NPPF para 17).

Any residential development that sits outside of the defined village boundary should only be permitted if it provides 100% local affordable housing on the development site as required by the Core Strategy Policy CP12 of the Local Plan. New Forest National Park Authority is fully aware that current demand is for local affordable housing to meet the level of need in the area. There is significant evidence that demographics showing an increasing older age profile within the National Park is driven by an **external** demand. Therefore, more must be done to prevent the increase of the age profile by making a significant provision for affordable housing, particularly for younger residents who are being driven out of their local communities by high housing costs.

CP12 New Residential Development:

CP12 states that an additional 220 dwellings will be required within the National Park between 2006 and 2026. The proposed scheme represents, in one development, ~39% of the total new housing across the whole of the National Park over a twenty-year period (7.8 years' worth of development).

The proposal clearly does not adhere to the Local Plan that states "new residential development will be permitted within the National Park to maintain the vitality of local communities and support local services, where the proposal is":

- Within the defined New Forest villages set out in CP9; or
- A replacement of an existing dwelling in accordance with Policy DP10; or
- An extension to an existing dwelling in accordance with Policy DP11; or
- An agricultural or forestry workers dwelling in accordance with Policy DP13; or
- Affordable housing for local needs in accordance with CP11.

The proposal by its very nature will have a material impact on local support services. The doctor's surgery is currently overstretched, with many local residents having to wait weeks to gain an appointment. In addition, the local pre and primary school are currently taking in pupils from outside of their catchment due to lack of children. The proposal will further increase this problem and may eventually lead to the closure of the school which in turn will reduce young families desire to live in the area and affect the vibrant community spirit in the village.

There is significant evidence that demographics show an increasing older age profile within Lyndhurst and the wider New Forest National Park. Statistics taken from the NFDC website from 2015 show that the population of Lyndhurst was 3292 of which 662 were over 70 (20.7%). It is not unreasonable to expect an increase of ~150 over 70's from this development making 25% of the population over 70.

The proposal sits outside of the village boundary and does not include any form of facility that is for community use that could potentially drive community spirit. It should also be noted that in local and national press the developer seeks to attract "high end" home owners. This shows the developer has no intention of housing local people intent upon "downsizing" when they retire thus releasing local housing stock. As at October 2017, the average price of properties in the New Forest stood at £418,000 (Source: www.zoopla.com) and Pegasus has not demonstrated how it can meaningfully show that the likely prices will allow people to downsize, particularly given prices of its other developments.

The Housing Needs Report, prepared for Pegasus Life, explores in considerable detail the increasing numbers of older people in Lyndhurst. However, it fails to recognise that one of the reasons for this is the lack of affordable housing and the resulting difficulty young people and new households have in remaining in the village as a result of high prices. This is inexorably eroding the balance and therefore vibrancy of the community. Pegasus Life claims (PS para 6.28) that "there is a significant pressure upon sites that come forward for development to reflect the demographic changes of the community and therefore provide homes suitable for older people." In fact, providing more such homes for older people only helps to exacerbate the demographic imbalance and not meet the needs of local people.

In addition, the Boltons development has 23 residential units of 1 and 2 bedroom retirement homes, many remain unsold since December 2015, despite prices of most units being in the range of £150,000 to £300,000 and this clearly shows there is no local need for this type of development, even where the values would allow older people to downsize.

CP15 Existing Employment Sites:

The proposal is in breach of the policy as no employment will be retained on site.

CP16 Tourism Development:

The loss of the hotel, both in terms of its function (as serviced accommodation) and its associated heritage will impact tourism. No clear evidence has been put forward to demonstrate there is no demand for at least part of the site to continue to operate as a hotel, nor has the building been marketed as a hotel. At the time Pegasus purchased the hotel, they did so in competition with other hotel operators, but ultimately succeeded in purchasing the property by paying significantly above market price of the hotel as a going concern, in order to secure the site. As well as the loss of local jobs there is also the loss of tourist income for existing Lyndhurst and wider New Forest businesses.

Pegasus have stated, in their planning statement that the New Forest currently has 2,447 serviced bedrooms and that the loss of 60 bedrooms from the hotel only equates to 3%, this is clearly misleading as the impact to Lyndhurst would be significantly higher

CP19 Access:

Traffic, access and parking. The proposal does not include sufficient parking and so the overspill will be into the adjoining forest and village car parks; this will prevent tourists accessing this part of the forest.

Only 3 visitor spaces have been allocated for visitors, tradesmen and an array of domestic care workers. Based on the mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments the development should have in the region of 150 spaces based on NPA policy guidelines rather than the 108 proposed in the application. The NPA Development Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2012 states that for new residential schemes, the minimum parking standards are as follows:

- 1 bedroom units 1 space per unit
- 2-3 bedroom units 2 spaces per unit

The fragmented nature of car parking, with residents unable to view their own car and with spaces squeezed into any gaps available adjacent to buildings, are not ergonomic and would be inconvenient, the design layout is clearly driven by overdevelopment.

In addition, the amenity space around each block is somewhat random, based upon tree protection areas with buildings inserted everywhere there is space between these. The open spaces are contrived from that land which is left over after the car parking has been added. Considering also that the footpaths are often poorly considered leaving odd shapes and ignoring desire lines, the layout is poorly designed.

DP1 General Development Principles:

The extent and scale of the proposed development. The volume of the buildings and the residential density is completely out of keeping with what would be appropriate in a village. There are many elements of the development which are poorly designed, again this is as a result of over development

The Local Plan states that only appropriate small scale housing development to meet the needs of the local communities will be supported. No evidence has been submitted to show why this application should be an exception to the Local Plan.

The proposal does not sit separate to the High Street and the frontage space does not act as an important buffer that promotes a gradual change from rural to urban. This does not

create any uplifting termination to the vista on arrival at the village. It does not enhance the rural edge and does not enhance the street frontage with limited greenery or delightful and rich buildings.

In addition, when looking eastwards from the high street, the proposed High Street frontage would dominate the view and destroy the current transition from the built environment to rural.

When viewed from the rear gardens of properties situated on Gosport Lane to the West of the proposed development, the blocks of flats would be incongruous and overbearing in nature.

Whereas bland buildings can be attractive if set within good spaces which support the architectural quality or alternatively if they are enhanced with the seasonal colour of planting and the opportunity to personalise, the Southampton Road frontage falls between stalls by offering a narrowing wedge of nominal front gardens instead of the more appropriate large set-backs and settings evident from the cottages and gardens opposite.

DP3 Open Space:

Policy DP3 requires that development should either provide for the enhancement of existing open space and amenity areas, or provide on-site open space to a set standard. In this proposal, the spaces around the site would be entirely private to the occupants.

DP6 Design Principles:

Larger houses on the approach to the village are rich with articulated rooflines, gardens, hedgerows, gaps and occasionally a feature to celebrate a corner or highlight of the building. The proposal responds with long roof planes of terraced houses or flatted blocks with tedious, rhythm and repetition within the fenestration and building facades. There are few gaps, little in the way of gardens and no discernible highlights on the buildings. Certainly no celebration of the corner where the designer identifies a key vista on the approach to Lyndhurst.

These buildings are bland and although they are proposed with a range of facing materials the development as a whole lacks the richness which a location of this sensitivity requires. The proposed buildings are not in keeping with the local vernacular, the proposed design is overbearing and suburban in style and not at all in keeping with the rich heritage of Lyndhurst nor the unique style of the original parts of Glasshayes House.

The designer has only looked inward towards the village centre for inspiration, failing to take due notice of the defining qualities of the street and the open countryside adjacent to where the site actually lies. Cottages set back behind, and within, garden settings are a 'defining element'. The proposal offers no garden fronts to the affordable buildings with front doors opening directly onto the busy pavement next to the main A35 as it enters the village.

A space is provided for some existing trees but rather than creating a positive green space this is more a way of retaining trees merely to ensure there is some softening of the impact of the terraces and to take some of the scale off the end gable of the largest block.

If these buildings are poor enough to warrant screening etc. then they are not good enough for this location. It should be noted that the Planning Inspectors comments relating to the Cedar Mount Proposal in Lyndhurst stated, that "it is not correct to rely on vegetation for screening. A harmful design cannot be hidden by vegetation".

National Planning Policy Framework Objections

Sec 3 Supporting a prosperous rural economy:

It is not accepted that the further age restricted accommodation will enhance or support a prosperous diverse rural economy.

Sec 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes:

Clearly as a primarily age restricted community it does not deliver a wide choice of housing options and is therefore outside of policy.

Sec 11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment:

There are few opportunities for the tree stock to be perpetuated for the future in a way that is meaningful within the development and bizarrely the only aspect of the site's long heritage that is to remain and grace this proposal is the re-establishment of a laurel hedge along the forest front a feature appropriate to a large hotel or mansion of long standing, but in this case, merely a means of screening several blocks of flats.

Sec 12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment:

It is interesting to note that the Pegasus Life Philosophy is one where, "we are always inspired by the land we work on: it history, its surroundings and its future".

The proposal however does not fully consider the architectural heritage of the site and seeks to demolish all of the historic structure. It fails, to recognise the juxtaposition of the original part of the hotel (Glasshayes) set opposite the iconic view of Bolton's Bench. Loss of the earlier parts of the building would be to the great detriment of the visual impact of the entrance into Lyndhurst. It would also sever another connection with the history and heritage of the village which, through its connections with notable figures of the past, played such an important part in the life of the country.

It should be noted that the older parts of the building (Glass Hayes House) have been classed as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) by the applicant in their Heritage Assessment. This classification status has recently been used to refuse the demolition of a timber framed barn by the New Forest National Park, at Greencare's in Wellands Road. With this precedent now set, the Planning Inspectorate has a duty of care, as set out in their statutory obligations to protect the original structure of Glass Hayes House.

The NDHA as noted in Greencare's APP/B9506/W/17/3167885 is of far less importance than the Lyndhurst Park Hotel and any inspector would conclude that the complete removal of the existing structure would be harmful.

It is clear the proposed development contravenes Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

In the pre-application response letter from the National Park Planning Authority, it states that, 'Siting within the Lyndhurst Conservation Area. There has been considerable interest in the historic significance of the Hotel, in terms of its architecture; there is a historic core which contains some interesting elevations and historic rooms and features (e.g. staircase) which remain fairly intact and also its social history. It is acknowledged that some later changes to the hotel have eroded some of its visual presence within the street scene. However, its character as set out previously relies heavily on its position within the site and the verdant landscape setting which has defined the site from its early evolution.' The proposed demolition of the Georgian part of Lyndhurst Park Hotel would go against one of the core statutory purposes of the NPA and the National Planning strategy of protecting our cultural heritage and historic environment.

CLOSING COMMENTS

The proposal under consideration is not materially different from the original application (16/01000) and it is clear that the developer has disregarded the vast array of Local and National planning policies as detailed in this refusal or taken note of the previous refusal reasons from the LPA. The developer has also failed to listen to the overwhelming objections from local residents.

Lyndhurst Parish Council feels that as this site sits in a very sensitive location in the Capital of the New Forest; next to one of its most popular and landmark open spaces. The proposal falls far short of what would be appropriate for this location.

The scale and design of this development is not in keeping with a village environment. The development is clearly urban in design with significant overdevelopment of the site. The proposal shows a distinct lack of understanding of the character and local needs of Lyndhurst.

The application has been assessed by Lyndhurst Parish Council (LPC) against the planning policies set out in the current Local Development Framework (December 2010) and the Government's National Planning Policy Framework. The proposed application contravenes the vast majority of policies as set out by the NPA and National Planning Policy Framework and hence the proposal has been rejected.

As stated previously. It is requested that if the National Park Authority (NPA) concurs with the LPC view any documentation setting out the reasons for refusal should be comprehensive and include ALL of the areas that did not meet the relevant criteria set out in the current Local Development Framework (December 2010) and the Government's National Planning Policy Framework.

A large number of the members of the public present then left the meeting.

90. Minutes

The minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 12 September 2017 were approved as a true and accurate record.

91. Matters Arising

None.

92. District Councillor's Report

Councillor Wyeth presented her report, explaining that new lights were being installed in the car park to give improved after dark visibility in the middle area. It would be lower, less obtrusive lighting. The litter bin by the seat in Romsey Road (opposite the junction with Wellands Road) would be replaced. There would be free car parking on 2 December (Small Businesses Day), 9 December for Christmas Fun Day and on 23/24 December to encourage shopping. However, car parking charges would be increased from 1 January 2018 although NFDC had guaranteed no increases for two years. Councillor Wyeth said she would like to see the idea of a cycle path between Lyndhurst and Brockenhurst promoted wherever possible.

Councillor Wyeth left the meeting.

93. Committee Meetings

The minutes of the following Committee meetings held since the date of the last meeting were submitted:

Recreation Committee – Saturday 9 September 2017
 Planning Committee – 26 September 2017

94. Accounts

(a) The accounts paid and due for payment since the July meeting were presented as follows:

Income received since last meeting to current account

Allotment Fees	875.00	0.00	875.00
NFDC - Precept payment	37000.00		37000.00
J Davis - part payment for treework	135.00		135.00
Cemetery Fees	970.00	0.00	970.00
Total	38980.00	0.00	38980.00

Cheques requiring endorsement

<i>Cheque no</i>		Net	VAT	Total
2674	Sophie's Services <i>Office cleaning</i>	60.00		60.00
2675	SBC Solutions <i>Computer & software</i>	705.00	141.00	846.00
2676	Winsor Camera Company <i>Office CCTV</i>	2365.00	473.00	2838.00
2677	K Bennett <i>Cem/Amen/Allot/Rec</i>	3846.00		3846.00

New payments by cheque

Cheque no

2678	Lyndhurst & District Community Assoc <i>LPC/Planningx2 mtgs</i>	70.50		70.50
2679	Stackhouse Poland Ltd (Came & Co) <i>Inc insurance Chapel/Fitness equip</i>	66.64		66.64
2680	BDO <i>External Audit fee (2016/17)</i>	430.00	86.00	516.00
2681	Mary Corbett Accountancy Ltd <i>HMRC payroll service</i>	26.25		26.25
2682	Forestry Commission <i>Allotment & Coles Mead rents</i>	875.00		875.00
2683	HMRC <i>Clerk's PAYE/NI</i>	1469.78		1469.78
2684	Mrs M Weston <i>Clerk's Salary and Expenses</i>	2,725.08	155.02	2,880.10
Total cheques payment		12639.25	855.02	13494.27
Direct debit payments - BT		3.00	0.60	3.60
Total payments		12642.25	855.62	13497.87

(b) The bank reconciliation was presented as follows:

Financial Summary at date of meeting

	Opening Balance	109267.35
	New income	38980.00
	Sub-total	148247.35
less	Uncleared cheques	0.00
	Sub-total	148247.35
less	Payments to be made	13497.87
	Closing Balance	134749.48

(c) Lyndhurst Parish Council Audit for the financial year ending 31 March 2017

The Clerk reported that the Parish Council Audit had been concluded satisfactorily with no issues needing to be addressed.

RESOLVED: That the Annual Return including certificate is approved and accepted by Lyndhurst Parish Council.

95. Staffing

The Chairman gave a brief outline of proposals whereby the present Clerk/RFO could reduce her hours over a time period and an Assistant Clerk could be brought in to help with the workload.

RESOLVED: That more discussion take place at future meetings.

96. Cycle Path – Lyndhurst to Brockenhurst

This item had been discussed during Minute 92 – District Councillor's Report.

97. Correspondence

Correspondence concerning the Parish Council's proposal that Mill Lane be closed at its junction with the A337. All correspondence was against this idea.

Citizens Advice New Forest – request for grant aid. The Clerk would reply stating that the Parish Council did not hold a Section 137 budget allocation and would be unable to accede to this request.

98. Commemoration of Armistice – World War 1/Remembrance Sunday

Councillor Wiltshire reported that it was hoped that plans to commemorate Armistice for World War 1 would evolve over the coming months and confirmed that the actual date did fall on a Sunday in 2018. However, it might be appropriate to have a commemoration concert on Friday 9 November in order not to clash with other events, some of which were national. It might be possible to get the Queen's Flight to come over the village. Councillor Wiltshire had 100 wreaths which he would lay on three sides of the war memorial, leaving one side open for wreaths the current wreaths which would be accepted in 2018. It was understood that Government grants were available for war memorials. Councillor Trend asked if someone could talk about the importance of the village in wartime and perhaps the school could also become involved.

With regard to this year's Remembrance Parade this would take place on Sunday 12 November and arrangements were well in hand. There would not be quite so many soldiers present this year but it was hoped to have a flypast. The marching bands from Copythorne would be attending.

99. Lyndhurst Football Clubs

Councillor Dunning stated that he had nothing further to report other than that the two local football clubs with a close association over a number of years with Lyndhurst would like to see the lease of Lyndhurst Football Club ground taken over by the Lyndhurst Parish Council. However, it was proving difficult to contact the two remaining trustees who held the existing lease. The Clerk said that if contact details could be obtained she would be willing to get in touch with them in order to try and get some resolution to this matter for all concerned.

100. Calendar

The Clerk showed Councillors a calendar that had been produced by Botley Parish Council and asked if this might be an appropriate project for consideration in Lyndhurst. The Chairman explained that it could be run as a photographic competition with the winning entries being used each month on the calendar. It was likely to cost in the region of £1,000 to produce sufficient copies for one to be given to each household.

RESOLVED: That the idea be accepted in principle but that the Clerk explore ways of financing the calendar in the first year and for it to be produced for 2019.

101. Request for Funding – Lyndhurst Village Decorations Committee

A letter had been circulated to all Councillors by the Secretary of the Lyndhurst Village Decorations Committee. He outlined the voluntary service they provided to the village both with summer bunting and Christmas lights. At the present time all expenses were funded through subscriptions, fundraising and donations. Recently it had proved necessary for testing procedures to be carried out by a qualified engineer rather than a competent person which led to higher costs. Average costs amounted to £10,000 and this left a shortfall each year. The request was for a sum of £1,500 in the Parish Council annual precept (£1.00 per household per annum) to support village decorations.

RESOLVED: That as any donation made would have to be considered as part of the overall precept this matter should be dealt with at the Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting.

102. Parish Champion

The Clerk explained that if Councillors were minded to make this award for 2017 it could be advertised in the November and December Community Centre What's On with the idea of judging taking place in time to make the award at the Annual Parish Meeting in March 2018.

RESOLVED: That the Parish Champion Award be promoted in What's On and the award given at the 2018 Annual Parish Meeting.

103. Reports from Representatives of Outside Bodies

Councillor Trend reported that she had attended a meeting of Minstead Parish Council at which the ongoing problems with traffic had been discussed. Councillor Trend stated that MPC had done a lot of work on this subject and would be meeting with Edward Heron for further discussions. It was realised that there were no easy solutions. The subject of Mill Lane, in particular, would be going to HCC for attention.

104. Dates for Future Committee Meetings

Planning Committee	Tuesday 24 October 2017
F&GP Committee	Tuesday 21 November 2017

105. Items for Discussion at the Next Meeting on Tuesday 14 November 2017

Items brought forward from the October Agenda.
Any items brought to the Clerk's attention by Monday 6 November 2017.
Pollution

_____Chairman
_____Date