

SDNPA Planning Committee – Thursday 13 June 2024

Planning Committee Update Sheet

| Agenda Item | Page No | Para | Update | Source/Reason |
|-------------|---------|------|--|---------------|
| 6 | 17 | 4.6 | <p><u>Additional consultee response, in response to re-consultation</u></p> <p>The Environment Agency confirmed a ‘no objection’ response.</p> <p>OFFICER NOTE: No change to previous response. No change to recommendation.</p> | Update |
| 6 | 18 | 4.11 | <p><u>Additional consultee response, in response to re-consultation</u></p> <p>The Lead Local Flood Authority confirmed that:</p> <p>The LLFA considers the surface water flood risk to be related to the fluvial flood risk, i.e. associated with the watercourse. We therefore consider that the fluvial flood risk modelling report is applicable for assessing surface water flood risk in this situation, and our earlier response remains valid.</p> <p>OFFICER NOTE: No change to previous response. No change to recommendation.</p> | Update |
| 6 | 18 | 4.16 | <p><u>Additional consultee response, in response to re-consultation</u></p> <p>Petersfield Town Council confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members welcome the development in principle but would like to see a secondary route out of the development and for the developers to work with other landowners to find a solution to the access and egress from the site. • Councillors are concerned about the new amendment to the traffic calming on the Causeway as this could cause queuing into and out of the Town. Members would like the developers to engage with Hampshire Highways to find a suitable solution to this. • Members would like to see solar panels to be installed on the properties. | Update |

| | | | | |
|---|----|---|--|--------|
| | | | <p>No change to recommendation.</p> <p>OFFICER NOTE: This does not raise matters not already covered in the Agenda report.</p> | |
| 6 | 19 | 5 | <p><u>Additional letter of representation (objection) from neighbouring occupier, summarised as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PNP design principles states that there should be multiple connections onto The Causeway; the site proposes a single access. • How can the Authority consider approving a single access and does not carefully consider traffic implications. • The non compliance with HCC Highways Standards dictates the submission of an Application to Highways for a Departure from Standards, as defined in HCC Technical Guidance Note TG17. • An FOI request did not disclose the audit trail to date. • A single lane chicane on a busy Highway purely to allow a developer to achieve access to his site, because he is unable to demonstrate a safe junction, appears totally flawed and if implemented will definitely be to the detriment of all Residents of the Causeway and Road Users in general. <p>OFFICER NOTE: This does not raise matters not already covered in the Agenda report.</p> | Update |
| 6 | 19 | 5 | <p><u>Additional letter of representation (objection) from neighbouring occupier, summarised as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users have been illegally obstructed in their use of the defined line by the landowner's 1.8m (approx) wire fence - the deviation is not of the users making. • There is currently no pedestrian safety issue with FP41b, the use of the word "improve" suggests otherwise. Any safety issue arises from the application itself which actually creates one by forcing pedestrians to cross a junction in excess of 12m which is proposed as part of the site access. Currently they | Update |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-----|---|------------|
| | | | <p>walk across a private drive with little vehicular movement. It will not improve walkers “enjoyment” of the public footpath.</p> <p>OFFICER NOTE: This does not raise matters not already covered in the Agenda report.</p> | |
| 6 | 19 | 5 | <p><u>Additional letter of representation (neutral) from neighbouring occupier, summarised as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted landscape plans do not show the TPO tree (EH855)10 on boundary of property to be reduced. • This tree is presenting a risk to the house (37 Otter Walk) and results in poor satellite reception and creates shade in the garden. • Would like to see a reduction in the height of the tree approved and be added to the landscaping plans. | Update |
| 7 | 50 | 3.3 | <p><u>Correction to description of proposals:</u></p> <p>The existing site access on Tankerdale Lane (near to its junction with the A3) would be used-closed and a new access 16m east on Tankerdale Lane is proposed, which would join up with the existing access track and be designed to ensure suitable visibility is proposed, to enable two way traffic and accommodate the anticipated traffic from the development.</p> | Correction |
| 7 | 53 | 5.1 | <p>Deletion of the ‘drainage’ sub-heading and its 5 bullet points in the summary of representations, as they do not apply to this application.</p> <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discharging into river and concern over maintenance/risk of failure of foul drainage. • Insufficient information provided; ground investigations, calculations; flood risk. • Discharging into mill stream and concern about flows. | Correction |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--------|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative of discharging into mains drainage or infiltration on site to be explored. • Need to ensure adequate flows in summer, and at peak holiday times. | |
| 8 | | | <p><u>Summary of letter circulated to Members on 10.06.2023 from the Applicant's agent:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have sought to address Members' previous concerns. • A three stage process for foul drainage proposed, which involves a package treatment plant, a new reed bed filtration system, and maintenance/monitoring. • Package treatment plant designed to be leak proof and treat water to a sufficient quality; the reed bed would be an additional safeguard. • Foul drainage has been designed with sufficient capacity. • Foul and surface water drainage would be separate systems, so heavy rainfall would not affect the foul drainage. • Package treatment plan would be subject to regular contractual maintenance/monitoring. The plant is designed to send out automatic notifications if a failure occurs. • Package treatment plant located at the lowest point on the site to avoid pumping of foul water to elsewhere on site, making the system more resilient and reduce the extent of engineered infrastructure. • Councillor Lee wishes to see stringent planning conditions on drainage, which are proposed including delivery of the reed bed. • Proposals previously supported by statutory consultees and the reed bed goes above their requirements. • Conditions give the Authority further opportunity to consider the drainage scheme and ensure it is installed prior to occupation. <p>Officer comment: It is considered that the points raised are addressed in the committee report, including the previous report at appendix 2. A re-consultation exercise was undertaken upon receipt of amended drainage plans that included the reed bed system and no objections were raised by statutory consultees.</p> | Update |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-----|--|--------|
| 8 | 76 | 5.1 | <p>Expanded comments from submitted third party representations to include under drainage sub-heading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative of discharging into mains drainage or infiltration on site to be explored. • Insufficient detail on ground investigations, drainage calculations and flood risk. • Need to ensure adequate flows in Summer and at peak holiday times. • Alternative of discharging into mains drainage or infiltration on site to be explored. | Update |
|---|----|-----|--|--------|