

**HYDE PARISH COUNCIL**  
**Minutes of the extra ordinary meeting of Hyde Parish Council held on**  
**23<sup>rd</sup> August 2016 at 7pm in the Church Community Rooms**

Councillors present: Cllr Arigho, Cllr Dowling (Chair), Cllr McKenzie, Cllr Potter, Cllr Sevier, Cllr Whitehead and Cllr Woodley

In attendance: Mrs M Coatham (Clerk), Mrs H Richards (Clerk), DCllr Dow, and seventy two members of the public

- 1. Welcome:** Cllr Dowling welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that the Parish Council were here to consider the full submission and environmental statement submitted with the planning application. The Parish Council have not been able to speak about the proposals for Latchmore in detail prior to this meeting so that we are able to submit a response to the planning application without evidence of pre-determination. It was noted that legal advice had been sought regarding which members were able to vote: it had been agreed that all members were permitted (no disclosable pecuniary interests). Cllr Dowling noted that on the NPA planning portal, to date, there had been 137 objections raised and 33 in support of the application. It was important for the response submitted by the Parish Council to consider planning policy and where the proposed application does or does not meet the policies of the New Forest National Park Authority. Members of the public would be called to speak during the open session and once everyone has had their opportunity to speak, the meeting will return to closed session so that members are able to reach a decision on behalf of the Parish.
- 2. Apologies:** None
- 3. Declarations of interest in the planning application under discussion:** Cllr Sevier as a Farmer and a Commoner, Cllr Potter as Friend of Latchmore, Cllr Whitehead as Friend of Latchmore and Cllr Woodley as Farmer and a Commoner.
- 4. Objective of meeting:** to enable the Parish Council to reach a decision on planning application 16/00571 Latchmore Wetland Restoration submitted to the New Forest National Park Authority by the Forestry Commission: 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.

**PUBLIC SESSION**

Of the 72 members of the public present, 17 had registered to speak, these have been summarised below. Please note that all the points raised are the personal views of the individuals speaking and have not been verified or agreed by the Parish Council, the purpose of including all of this information is for openness and transparency.

Speaker	Points raised
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects – concerned about the affect the works will have upon land in the bottom of the catchment and would like reassurance from the applicant that if it does not work and there are adverse affects on the land, there will be compensation available.</li> <li>• Would also like confirmation on how the Parish Council votes – is it individual views or the</li> </ul>

	view of the residents?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has spoken to Sir Desmond Swayne (MP) and when parliament session re-opens he intends to ask for the application to be called in.</li> <li>• Noted that riding in the area during the winter will be ruined.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that this was a difficult decision for the Parish Council and that her interest was as a resident with an interest in fungi.</li> <li>• Concern about the loss of habitat in Studley Wood (stream and environment has developed for over 100 years) and there is a need to protect the historic area.</li> <li>• Concern about the use of foreign hoggin/materials – noting that English Nature have an obligation to offer land as compensation for loss of habitat.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the impact on wildlife</li> <li>• Flawed assessment – claims that there will be no difference downstream is not acceptable. It is likely that loose materials will wash down and properties may flood as a result.</li> <li>• Traffic/transport along the Gorley/Ogdens route is not acceptable – a suitable assessment has not been undertaken or mitigation considered.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surveys for the Environmental Statement inadequate, too short a period used and not relevant to the area – erroneous evidence.</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object: CP4 Climate Change – there is a problem (particularly with the mires) but the methodology in the wooded area to be used with caution.</li> <li>• The Met Office figures suggest more intense rainfall than shown in the studies, wetter winters – so the key climate threat is flooding.</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archaeological concerns: the catchment is historic and should be protected.</li> <li>• The surveys used for the ES are flawed with missing information and areas ignored – sites have been left out of the survey</li> <li>• Lidar mapping incorrect</li> <li>• Historic landscape not properly considered</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ES flawed – incorrect/missing baseline data collection</li> <li>• Hydrological report/modelling based on another area</li> <li>• Southern Damsel Flies – habitat destroyed</li> <li>• Geological SSSI – if this area is filled in it will become unfavourable (against objective of the project)</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Birds – resident has kept a diary of birds in the area for a number of years, including many red and amber listed species. Once the right habitat conditions are destroyed they will never be suitable again.</li> </ul>
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A resident with an interest in fungi and fishing – the EIA states that the habitat will be home to Mayfly again within a couple of years of the works being complete – this is not the case from his experience elsewhere</li> <li>• If there are severe floods, materials WILL be washed downstream</li> </ul>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engineer by profession: meanders are made by rivers not man or the EU</li> </ul>
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Called upon Parish Council to reflect the view of the village – and asked for a show of hands to demonstrate feeling</li> <li>• Experts have advised that the scheme is good, but no one in the village has spoken in favour of the scheme</li> <li>• There will be an unknown increase in flooding downstream</li> </ul>
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No faith that the scheme will ever be finished – there is currently funding available from the EU but after Brexit, who will pay for the on-going works?</li> <li>• Also wanted a show of hands</li> </ul>

14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the Parish Council decide how to vote?</li> <li>• Does the planning application tick all the boxes or should the parish council listen to the residents?</li> </ul>
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vet – concern over fish as the meanders will create shallows where the temperatures are too high for fish to survive – the food supply will also be affected – birds will be able to wade into the meanders and predate the fish.</li> <li>• No mention of Eels in the EIA or lampreys</li> <li>• Concern about the noted works upon the bacterial dog infection</li> </ul>
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owns property with frontage onto Latchmore Brook – there has been damage already and potential damage to the ecosystem will affect wildlife and archaeology.</li> <li>• Transport damage to roads, verges and buildings</li> <li>• Danger to horse riders, stock, cyclists and pedestrians</li> <li>• Tourism affected</li> </ul>
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worked for FC and used to live in the parish – there is a lack of resources/ FC unable to manage the woods</li> <li>• Use of hoggin/imported materials will kill the habitat</li> </ul>

Cllr Dowling thanked everyone for their views and comments and noted that the meeting would return to closed session.

There was a public request for a show of hands, which took place.

## CLOSED SESSION

**Planning application:** Latchmore Wetland Restoration (16/00571) submitted to the New Forest National Park Authority by the Forestry Commission.

Member	Comments
PD	<p>The FC have a legal responsibility when SACS &amp; SSSIs have been assessed by NE to be unsatisfactory – works must be undertaken to restore favourable conditions. This planning application is to undertake all the works together. The application is not a question of whether it is affordable.</p> <p>Cannot support the size and complexity of the works – but could support phased works. The catchment should not be faced with this onslaught over the next 4 years – there is too large a risk for disaster.</p> <p>CP1 – development (engineering works) may affect the area of conservation and other options have not been explored.</p> <p>CP2 – harm to the natural environment – the EIA is flawed and fails specifically on historic and archaeological data (the proposal to infill/cover the geological SSSI does not protect and enhance)</p> <p>Concerned with the well-being of humans and nature; the impact of transportation – no provision made for passing places (which would affect the SSSI on each side of the proposed transport routes); quality of water sources/springs – not been able to identify what analysis has been made along the western end of the catchment?</p>
AS	<p>Has had 4 years to study the proposals and has an interest in other restoration works since 2003 NOT 2013. Has enjoyed the natural environment – the NF is now a National Park which must be managed appropriately to protect the landscape, wildlife and habitats. Need to be aware of the Sandford Principle that puts conservation first. Has an interest in natural environment – has looked at various reports about the wildlife which raises many issues in support of the application: the birds listed in the EIA are predominantly wetland birds;</p>

	<p>removing the scrubland improves habitat for the reptiles; the mechanical drainage has caused a decline in dragonflies as the life cycle is two years as larva ; loss of deadwood affects the red book beetles; lack of vegetation causes a decline in the numbers of butterflies and moths in the catchment; it has affected other invertebrates; lichen has declined due to sulphur dioxide and shading effects fungi.</p> <p>The extensive mires and bogs meant that there would be more water available during the summer.</p> <p>Geology – gravel overlying sands – it is a fragile structure and can be damaged by the streams. Many of the drainage ditches are not now needed. The FC should not be allowed to walk away from the damage they have caused – and should restore the drainage scheme.</p> <p>There was a weir at Latchmore which helped contain the flash flooding. Shallower meanders will spread the water over a greater area and reduce the flash flooding.</p> <p>There is a need for the restoration works – appreciate that there are issues – the works in the lower sections will take place later in the works and will only be for a short period. There are transport issues which must be considered.</p>
<b>DW</b>	<p>Has a background in hydrology – minded to refuse the application. Considering the application with the EIA conditions, the ES fails to provide a baseline to allow effective decisions, mitigation and monitoring to be put in place affectively.</p> <p>Sustainability – is the habitat gong to recover or will it require further engineering? The evidence fails on this.</p> <p>Viability –this is the first time the FC have undertaken a restoration of this size and there is no evidence that previous schemes have worked.</p> <p>There are concerns over stock safety.</p> <p>Stock also graze on new growth which prevents areas stabilising – the use of fencing in other areas to temporarily protect growth has not been suggested in the application.</p> <p>The EIA scoping exercises are incorrect.</p> <p>The project cost has been estimated at £1.5million (at least) – there should be a cost benefit analysis for a project of this size.</p> <p>There is no socio-economic study.</p> <p>Two NPA policies – any planning application which does not improve disabled access should be refused and any application which destroys ancient monuments should be refused – the application is therefore non-compliant with planning policy.</p>
<b>JA</b>	<p>Concerns about transport of hoggins during holiday peak period, damage to verges and impact on residents and livestock</p> <p>2012 and 2014 works by FC not successful – no confidence in FC to complete the project</p>
<b>MM</b>	<p>Latchmore a special place – for 30 years walking there with family and dogs.</p> <p>Much sympathy with the concerns raised especially for those residents living along the route, proposed speed limit should be 10mph not 15.</p> <p>The restoration work is a consequence of EU directives, which became UK law, and led to NE classifying Latchmore as unfavourable; the work was contracted to the FC which has a legal responsibility to carry it out - so No Work is not an option – and some work is needed, Complaints should have been directed at NE .</p> <p>Disappointing that very few comments gave positive alternate suggestions.</p> <p>If work is not done, there will be possible/probable deterioration over say 5 years, if work then is necessary there may not be funding? Part of FC remit is long term planning.</p>

	I accept the concerns but not that FC, NE and Verderers are all <i>wrong in all</i> their conclusions. The Verderers are there to safeguard a viable, sustainable future for Commoning and to conserve a traditional landscape and its wildlife; this is what the Forest is about.
<b>EP</b>	Lived in the village 40 years, has noticed a decline in wildlife – bats and snakes so already declining before the works. Bringing in outside materials is horrendous and the transport required will cause further destruction The middle of Latchmore used to be full of vegetation Does not see what these works will achieve
<b>TW</b>	The works will have a direct daily impact on her as a resident, farmer, commoner. Has looked at the EIA based on the planning policies. EIA has raised many concerns over the impact of the scheme and the proposed mitigation The wetland is drying out and declining and there is erosion – something needs to be done but not necessarily on the scale proposed. Need to approach tentatively.
<b>PD</b>	Hydrological – there are things wrong with the river and so improvements are needed – for example the herringbones at the top of the catchment. The mires need attention as they are drying out. Is the project viable? Could a different proposal be put forward. We must decide whether to refuse or approve.
<b>AS</b>	Need to accept that the catchment is drying out and needs attention – over the past four years no alternative solutions have been put forward by any of the opposing parties.
<b>MM</b>	Weirs were mentioned and may work – we need more positive input into alternative proposals.
<b>DW</b>	Spoke to FC whether there is a middle ground – this was not supported.

**Proposal/Decision:**

Cllr Whitehead proposed that the Parish Council refuse the planning application and do not leave the decision to the officers, this was seconded by Cllr Potter. 4 members voted for this proposal, 3 against.

There were no counter-proposals, the decision was passed.

The public left following this decision, members remained to agree the comments to accompany the response.

**COMMENTS TO INCLUDE:**

The following points were noted – the Clerk will submit a draft response for members to approve, using this information alongside planning policy.

EIA – no baseline; fails on sustainability; project is too large and fails on a viability front; gaps in mitigation (species and pollution)

Something needs to be done (legal obligation) but this scheme is too large and this is not it.

The timescales are too fast – the works should be attempted more gently.

DP1 – adverse amenity – walkers, inhabitants and businesses

CP2 – there is likely to be significant harm which cannot be proved to outweigh the benefit and no alternative proposals have been considered. There is likely to be a loss of irreplaceable habitat.

Hydrological plan – there is not full catchment management

Ecological – should improve

SSSI/geological – this should not be infilled

Poor archaeological fieldwork

Natural debris dams – these pose a conflict of evidence as it is suggested that these are the best solution but the Verderers will only allow them in the inclosures.

Concern about the use of clay plugs.

The deep ditches are a problem for stock and must be considered.

Transport concerns.

Would consider a revised application as work needs to be undertaken.

**NEXT PARISH MEETINGS:**

**Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2016 at 7pm in the Church Rooms, Hyde Church**

**CHAIRMAN..... 14<sup>th</sup> September 2016**

**[THESE MINUTES ARE UNCONFIRMED]**