



4th December 2023

PALLS response to re-consultation on amendments to New Forest District Council planning application 22/11424 and New Forest National Park Authority planning application 22/01024OUT

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. This response should be read as an addition to our original responses to both of the above planning applications objecting to the original proposal.

The amendments to both planning applications in no way overcome the objections raised in respect of the original proposals all of which remain extant. It is our view that in relation to the impact on the Lanes which is our key concern, the amendments now proposed would have a greater harmful impact than those originally proposed. In attempting to address the 17 pages of Highway Authority issues and objections to the original plans, the amendments would result in the further urbanisation and environmental degradation of the Lanes through the loss of verges, culverting of ditches and significant loss of vegetation including mature trees.

There are still multiple errors, inaccuracies, inconsistencies and misrepresentation within the revised documentation and the applicant continues to try to obfuscate and confuse rather than provide a clear and honest representation of their proposals.

All of our original objections to both authorities still stand and we would ask that they be clearly represented to the respective Planning Committees when the applications are considered.

On the grounds given in our original objections and further objections below, and on behalf of its 773 members drawn from a wide area of Lymington, Pennington and the surrounding area, PALLS respectfully requests that New Forest National Park Authority and New Forest District Council refuse these planning applications.

Detailed Objections:

A separate response on transport and highways issues will follow shortly.

In relation to the amended plans we would wish to make the following further comments:

1. The applicant continues to pay lip service to consultation. In the revised submission, the applicant does not acknowledge or address the hundreds of objections to the original plans.

2. Referring to Lower Pennington and Ridgeway Lanes, the Design and Access Statement (page 3 – Vision) states:

‘There are no changes proposed to the carriageways, the soft verges or their tree lined character.’

This statement is false. The amended plans propose the introduction of pavements and vehicle passing points in both Lower Pennington and Ridgeway Lanes which will involve the removal of verges and probably also the culverting of the adjacent ditches (which are outside the public highway on third party land over which the applicant has no control). Widening of both lanes is also proposed which will result in the loss of the existing verges, hedgerows and trees. Passing points along narrow stretches of lane will cause tailbacks onto the driveways of existing properties restricting access of residents to and from their homes. The creation of passing points and the widening and straightening of Ridgeway Lane in the vicinity of Poles Lane will encourage traffic to travel at higher speeds rather than relying on self-regulation to negotiate oncoming vehicles, thereby increasing the danger posed to recreational users such as pedestrians and cyclists.

3. PALLS strongly objects to this proposed urbanisation of the Lanes as a result of these proposals.
4. Nowhere is there any recognition of the high existing level of recreational use of the lanes bordering the site nor the wider network of lanes south of Lymington and Pennington. Nor is there any acknowledgement that in view of the absence of footpaths the Lanes are shared surfaces where the carriageway is shared between all users - pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. Much of the traffic analysis is based on a survey in the 4th week of December, therefore giving a much lower traffic baseline, a material difference for both lanes which service a park, the salt marshes, a car park and a camping and caravan park.
5. Section 2.11 of the WCHAR is incorrect. There is no developer and the site promoter has made no effort whatsoever to engage with PALLS or any others (to our knowledge) to address concerns raised.
6. Section 3.3 of the WCHAR incorrectly states that consent has been achieved for a footway/cycleway within Woodside Park. No such consent has been given and the Lymington and Pennington Town Council have made it clear in their initial response to the

pennandlymlanes@gmail.com www.pennandlymlanes.com [@pennandlymlanes](https://www.instagram.com/pennandlymlanes)



planning application that a cycleway within Woodside Park would not be supported. It would have to be lit and it is far from clear whether this will be acceptable on planning and conservation grounds.

7. The rebuttal statement by Cotswold Archaeology does not in any way address the concerns raised by the National Park Authority Conservation Officer in respect of the impact of the proposal on the Grade II listed Wood End House, concerns which we share. The Lanes are ancient drovers routes and the widening and straightening of Ridgeway Lane, which is still proposed, would damage both the setting of this listed building and the character and appearance of this part of the New Forest National Park.
8. The applicant (page 5 Design and Access Statement) seeks to downplay the scale of development proposed within the New Forest National Park. An additional 1ha of land is now proposed to be developed for housing infrastructure purposes which was not part of the original Local Plan allocation and was never considered at the Local Plan Examination. The determining planning authority for those works, together with the proposed access onto Ridgeway Lane and the widening and straightening of that lane, is the New Forest National Park Authority. There is no hierarchy of primary or secondary planning authority as stated in the Design and Access Statement.
9. In seeking to provide segregated pedestrian access to Lower Pennington Lane the applicant is reliant upon the development of adjacent land (the remaining part of SS6). The applicant has no control over and no agreement with the developer of that parcel of land. Unless the two sites are linked contemporaneously, pedestrians will either have to walk along the southern section of Lower Pennington Lane or negotiate the northern section of Footpath 83 as it exists at the moment, an unsurfaced (grass), rural path.
10. The proposed 'upgrading' of Footpaths 82 and 83 would urbanise both paths to become hard surfaced and lit paths or roadside pavements which will detract from their rural character and their protected function as part of the public rights of way network. Siting part of the paths within proposed public open space does not overcome this as the paths will still be urban in character.

11. PALLS would support works to better define the soft surface of the short section of footpath across the green triangle at the junction of Lower Pennington Lane and Fox Pond Lane. There is no pedestrian infrastructure in Fox Pond Lane itself as claimed in the WCHAR.