

# MILFORD-ON-SEA PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the 631st Planning Committee held 12<sup>th</sup> of January 2026

Held in All Saints Church Hall, Green Banks Close at 6.30pm



## PLANNING MINUTES

### Members: (P = present)

Patricia Banks (Chair)	p	Christine Hopkins (Vice)	Gary Fox	p
Bernard Bennett	p	David Royle	Anne Cullen	p
Sue Pepper	p	Bob Bishop	Donald Darbishire	p
		Lynn Wylde	Helen Rutherford	p

### Also in Attendance:

District Councillor David Hawkins, Niamh Morrison (Planning Clerk) and 4 members of the public.

-----

Cllr Banks, Chair of the Planning Committee, welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 6.30pm.

#### 1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST ON AGENDA ITEMS

Cllr Royle and Cllr Bennett have a non-pecuniary interest in item 25/10754. They may wish to speak on the item, and neither would vote.

#### 2. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES

Cllr Hopkins.

#### 3. TO RECEIVE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS PLANNING MEETING DATED 8<sup>th</sup> OF DECEMBER 2025

A discussion was held about the legality of the last planning committee meeting and the procedure surrounding the meeting, minutes and decisions that were recorded.

Cllr Bennett proposed an internal investigation/enquiry be held and independent advice be sought. Cllr Cullen seconded this proposal; all members voted unanimously in favour.

It was resolved that an internal investigation be held and independent advice be sought to conclude the matter. The findings would be published to the Council.

#### 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

#### 5. CHAIR'S OPENING REMARKS

No opening remarks were made by the Chair.

#### 6. TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS (Spokespersons as lodged with the Clerk prior to the meeting)

No deputations were received prior to the meeting.

#### 7. TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATIONS; SEE PARISH LIST

## **Tree Work Applications**

**Application No:** [TPO/25/0704](#)

**Site:** Shorefield Country Park, Shorefield Road, Downton, SO41 0LH

**Proposal:** Monterey Pine x 3 Fell (T1, T2, T3), Elm x 1 Fell (T4), Oak x 1 Reduce (T5)

**Reason:** T1 -Excessively leaning, T2 – Fallen, T3 – Leaning, T4 – Dead, T5 – Causing damage to the highest tuet of roof

**There were no objections raised to the tree works outlined in this application.**

-----

**Application No:** [TPO/25/0705](#)

**Site:** Barn Cottage, Lymore Valley, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0TW

**Proposal:** Oak x 1 Reduce

**Reason:** General maintenance and keeping a good size

**There were no objections raised to the tree works outlined in this application,**

-----

## **Planning Applications**

**Application No:** [25/11112](#)

**Site:** 24 Sea Road, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0PG

**Proposal:** Demolition of conservatory and replace with rear and side single storey extension; front porch

Cllr Pepper proposed Par 3, Cllr Wylde seconded this proposal. All members voted unanimously in favour.

**PAR 3: We recommend PERMISSION**

-----

**Application No:** [25/10398](#)

**Site:** 20 Keyhaven Road, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0QY

**Proposal:** Alterations to existing garage to facilitate a change of use to form a convenience store. Retain first floor C3 use.

A lengthy discussion was held, and various aspects of the proposal were discussed. These have been recorded in the response to New Forest District Council.

Cllr Darbshire proposed Par 4, Cllr Bishop seconded this proposal. 5 members voted in favour, Cllr Cullen, Cllr Pepper and Cllr Banks abstained. Par 4 was carried.

**The Parish Council recommends PAR 4: We recommend REFUSAL for this proposal.**

## Introduction

The proposed redevelopment of the site at 20 Keyhaven Road raises serious concerns regarding its impact on the surrounding residential environment, local infrastructure, and community wellbeing. Located within a predominantly residential and conservation area, the proposal for a convenience store with associated parking and deliveries presents multiple planning conflicts — ranging from significant noise disruption and visual intrusion to risks to highway safety, residential amenity, and the character of the area. This representation outlines the various adverse effects of the development, referencing professional assessments, planning policy conflicts, and local conditions that collectively argue against the approval of this application.

Please find reasons for the Parish Council's recommendation for refusal below.

### **Impact on residential amenity of adjacent neighbouring properties, in respect of light, visual intrusion and privacy;**

With reference to the Delivery Noise Assessment written by Noise Solutions Limited dated March 2025

- At paragraph 9.3 the following is stated in the document.

A significant adverse noise impact is predicted due to main warehouse deliveries to the site, although it must be noted that the site is located on a busy road. All best practical means have been considered to minimise the impact of deliveries including the restriction of delivery hours to ensure deliveries will only occur during daytime hours (not defined), and the inclusion of a suitable noise management plan. The conclusion also considers that the HGV deliveries will be limited to one or two per day per unit and will be of short duration

- The report states that the impact on the residents will be significant with regards to noise. This could involve activities like sleeping, relaxing, or using the property for its intended purpose.
- The report references a suitable noise management plan which assumes that the store will receive deliveries by HGV once or twice per day. This conclusion fails to address the direct deliveries that would be made to store daily by untracked HGV and vans such as bread, milk and newspapers. Therefore, it would be reasonable to suggest the report is not an accurate assessment.
- At paragraph 7.9 the report outlines the noise management plan for deliveries. Apart from a mat placed under the tail lift all the control measures rely on human behaviour and as such are at the lower end of the hierarchy of controls that should be applied. The applicant should be requested to identify noise elimination to the receptors through engineering controls or be able to demonstrate that they have used the best practicable means to stop or reduce the noise. When planning store developments, consideration needs to be given to the proximity of delivery bays to residential properties, effectively 'designing out' potential conflict as far as practicable

Noise from commercial premises, including store deliveries, can be considered a statutory nuisance if it is unreasonable and substantially interferes with the use or enjoyment of a home or other premise, or if it injures or is likely to injure health.

- The proposal would have a negative impact on existing residents and their homes in terms of their privacy and light.
- It would create visual intrusion on what is a residential and conservation area.

The Local Plan 2016-2036 in respect of Policy ENV3 Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness states (amongst other relevant points) that:

"New development will be required to:

- Avoid unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion or overbearing impact, overlooking, shading, noise and light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character or residential amenity.

- Create buildings, streets and spaces which are accessible to those with disabilities or of reduced mobility, that are safe and easy to navigate, and that minimise opportunities for anti-social and criminal behaviour or other public threats.
- Integrate sufficient car and cycle parking spaces so that realistic needs are met in a manner that is not prejudicial to the character and quality of the street, highway safety, emergency or service access or to pedestrian convenience and comfort.”

The proposed re-development of the site at 20 Keyhaven Road has contravened all these 3 points. Keyhaven Road is a residential area with housing immediately opposite and adjacent to the proposed site, with the property immediately to the East being within the Conservation Area and listed. All these properties will be adversely impacted by noise (deliveries, cars), the proposals for noise abatement during service deliveries are minimal and insufficient, reliant on human behaviour as detailed by the Noise Assessment. This is unacceptable in such a densely populated area.

Whilst Milford is by no means a crime hot spot, there are problems particularly in the summer with youths hanging around the Green and outside shops, causing noise, creating litter and drinking underage. The creation of an additional area in which to ‘hang out’, especially one with a large frontage and an outlet which will open later, will exacerbate the problem in a densely populated residential area.

The Parish Council believe there are proposals for a total of 8 car parking spaces, 1 of which is a provision for disabled drivers. This is likely to be insufficient if the Retail Impact Assessment proves correct and additional car parking can be expected along the Keyhaven Road, Carrington Lane and Lawn Road, providing problem and issue for those residents requiring access and egress to their properties.

#### **Impact on the character and appearance of the area, including Conservation area and adjacent listed buildings;**

This site is located within a conservation area of the village and therefore not suitable for what could be potentially bright lights and illuminations, long opening hours and heavy traffic and vehicle movement out of hours.

- This site is in what is a predominately residential area, the White Horse public house being the latest commercial property to be converted into residential accommodation.
- To consider allowing a small supermarket, with limited parking, on this site, is out of keeping with the street scene and a residential area.
- Given the location and surrounding character, the Parish Council’s opinion that the existing building should be converted into affordable homes. The Parish Council would urge that both the applicant and NFDC to consider this.
- If affordable homes were to be considered this would appear to be an ideal site and would align with the government's ambitions to secure sites for new homes. Guidance can be located within NPPF Chapter 5.

#### **Impact on highway safety, including matters relevant to car parking and servicing;**

*Employers have duties under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 to ensure so far as is reasonably practicable the health and safety at work of their employees and others who may be affected by their work activities (such as members of the public). These Regulations also require employers to carry out a suitable and sufficient risk assessment of the hazards involved and to identify measures needed to comply with Health and Safety legislation.*

- The Traffic Survey that was conducted between the 25<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> of January is not a true or accurate reflection of the movements on the associated roads.
- The statistics in the reports suggest that the residents of the potential 170 homes on Manor Road are more likely to walk if a convenience store located on the opposite side of the village as parking is simply not reliable.
- Whilst access and egress are displayed there is no consideration given to additional parking that is expected on Keyhaven Road in the vicinity of the store and the negative and dangerous impact this will have.

### Impact on public health and safety (land contamination, air quality, hazardous substance;

- We are concerned that the Contamination Report dated April 2025 was not released to the public until December 2025.
- The Contamination Report concludes that there are potentially significant risks from contamination, and a number of further investigations are required. All 4 underground tanks (1 of which is still in use) require inspection and a petrol/oil interceptor tank which remains full from former car-wash activity requires pumping out and checking.
- Investigation is also needed of the former inspection pit, which is inside the building and would be part of a grocery store under the proposed change of use.
- The report concludes that there is a High Risk to human health from VOCs (hydrocarbon vapours) given the proposed usage of the site.
- The Parish Council believes that no planning consent should be permitted until these environmental matters have been satisfactorily resolved.

### Impact on ecology and protected species;

- Potential contamination leaks are of ecological concern and there is no supporting evidence or guarantees within the application to deal with this.
- There is large badger sett located across from this site that are highly active. They are seen regularly at this site and the surrounding area. They have been established there for many years, and consideration needs to be given to their livelihood.

### Impact on Vitality and Viability of Village Centre;

With reference The Local Plan Part 2 Sites & Development Management states under Policy DM19 – Small Shops and Public Houses that:

“Outside of town centres and defined local shopping frontages, local convenience stores of up to 280 square meters will be permitted where they provide for the day-to-day needs of a community, **which otherwise would not be provided for**, and are located with the community served”.

- The proposal to develop the site at 20 Keyhaven Road, Milford is in clear breach/contravention of this policy as day-to-day needs of the community are currently served by the local Co-Op, One Stop, Village Veg, Coastal Bakery, Boots the Chemist, Milford News and many others.
- The addition of a further convenience store selling identical products to those which are readily available within the village impacts the viability of a number of our local businesses who are reliant on summer trade to survive over the slower/winter period.
- A requirement for the need of this additional store has been created by the Retail Impact Assessment in an attempt to provide questionable rationale and not driven by demonstrable need within the Village at any time during the year.
- Decisions should support the role that village and town centres play at the heart of local communities. Planning decisions should support the vitality of existing business and villages.

### Closing Statement

Considering the documented adverse impacts on residential amenity, heritage assets, local infrastructure, and public health and safety, the Parish Council believe this proposal is wholly incompatible with both local and national planning policy and the distinct character of the area. The Milford-on-Sea Parish Council urges New Forest District Council to refuse this application.

-----

**Application No:** [25/10760](#)

**Site:** Stable Holiday Let, 22 Keyhaven Road, Milford-On-Sea SO41 0QY

**Proposal:** Change of use from garden annexe to holiday let, fence and gate (Retrospective)

Cllr Fox proposed Par 4, Cllr Darbishire seconded this proposal. All members voted unanimously in favour.

**PAR 4: We recommend REFUSAL**

Milford-on-Sea Parish Council fully endorse and support the Conservation Officer's report and reasons for refusal. The cladding and proposed fence and the subdivision of the historic curtilage is not recommended.

-----

**Application No:** [25/10754](#)

**Site:** Bowling Green and Pavilion, Hurst Road, Milford-on-Sea

**Proposal:** Rear extension to clubhouse with parking provision.

Cllr Cullen proposed Par 3, Cllr Darbishire seconded this proposal. 6 members voted in favour; 2 members did not vote due to their non-pecuniary declaration of interest.

**PAR 3: We recommend PERMISSION**

-----

**Application No:** [25/11134](#)

**Site:** 19 Island View Close, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0PZ

**Proposal:** Single-storey rear extension; alterations to the external materials of the existing property to include cladding, new window frames and replacement roof tiles.

Cllr Royle proposed Par 3, Cllr Darbishire seconded this proposal. 3 members voted in favour, 5 against. This proposal was not carried.

Cllr Cullen proposed Par 1, Cllr Fox seconded this proposal. 7 members voted in favour, 1 member abstained. Par 1 was carried.

**PAR 1: We recommend PERMISSION but would accept the decision reached by the District Council's Officers under their delegated powers.**

-----

**Application No:** [25/10865](#)

**Site:** Beach Hut 77, Hordle Cliff, Milford-on-Sea

**Proposal:** Replacement beach hut

Cllr Royle proposed Par 3, Cllr Cullen seconded this proposal. All members voted unanimously in favour.

**PAR 3: We recommend PERMISSION**

-----

## **Lawful Development Certifications**

None.

### **8. A BRIEF ADJOURNMENT TO ALLOW MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO LEAVE THE MEETING PRIOR TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE OTHER BUSINESS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **9. DECISIONS**

#### **Granted:**

25/10507 – Corner Croft, Barnes Lane, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0RP – Milford PC recommended Par 5  
25/10738 – Land of 31-33 Carrington Lane, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0RA – Milford PC recommended Par 5  
25/11005 – 53 Knowland Drive, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0RH – Milford PC recommended Par 3  
25/11043 – 8 Bradley Road, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0AZ – Milford PC recommended Par 3  
25/11044 – Sedges, Blackbush Road, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0PB – Milford PC recommended Par 5

#### **Withdrawn:**

None.

#### **Refused:**

None.

#### **Definitions for the above:**

Par 1: We recommend PERMISSION but would accept the decision reached by the District Council's Officers under their delegated powers.

Par 3: We recommend PERMISSION.

Par 5: We are happy to accept the decision reached by the District Council's Officers under their delegated powers.

### **10. APPEALS**

25/10759 – Velood, Barnes Lane, Milford-on-Sea, SO41 0RR

### **11. UPDATE REPORTS ON NFDC PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE 15<sup>th</sup> OF DECEMBER**

Nothing to report.

### **12. ENFORCEMENTS**

None.

### **13. LICENSE APPLICATIONS**

None.

### **14. CORRRESPONDENCE**

None.

The Chair closed the meeting at 7.40pm

.....

Dated: .....