

Planning Committee Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
6	16	4.1	<p><u>Arboricultural Officer response received, as follows:</u></p> <p>Comments -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wish to see more detail on the extent of visibility splays and cutting into the roadside bank on the B3335 required, in regard to impact on trees. • Further detail needed on the distribution of spoil on site to ensure that it does not encroach into root protection areas of significant trees (also subject to a woodland TPO). <p><u>Case officer comments:</u></p> <p><u>Site access</u></p> <p>Comparing the visibility splays shown in the Transport Assessment with the Tree Protection Plan in the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal (AIA) and commentary in this report, 6 lower category trees would be lost to create the access (see para 3.16 of the committee report). Other trees outside of the visibility splays are shown to be retained.</p> <p>The AIA outlines further detailed work on ground levels for the new access would be needed for the construction stage, but sensitive works to create the access could be undertaken to avoid/minimise impacts upon retained trees.</p> <p>The above information provided is sufficient to impose conditions requiring further detailed information for protecting retained trees, if Permission was granted.</p> <p><u>Depositing material on site</u></p> <p>The Tree Protection Plan indicates imported soil and re-grading works would be outside of root protection areas and away from protective barrier fencing for</p>	Update

			trees around the boundaries of the site. These details could be conditioned if Permission was granted.	
6	16	4.4	<p><u>Response received from Winchester City Council drainage engineer, as follows:</u></p> <p>Comments – low flood risk; agree with the Environment Agency’s concerns regarding groundwater but also nothing to add to the Lead Flood Authority’s response and defer to their views.</p>	Update
6	18	4.14	<p><u>Southern Water response received, as follows:</u></p> <p>No objection, adequacy of SUDs to be considered by the Authority’s technical consultees.</p>	Update
6			<p><u>Objection received from Twyford School, as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HGV traffic likely to significantly impact upon the flow of school traffic; with vehicles backing up on local roads and the school grounds. • HGV traffic will compound congestion issues in Twyford. • Request Highways Authority to consider installing traffic lights from Bourne Lane onto the High Street. • Increased noise and disturbance upon staff accommodation, which is already impacted upon by traffic noise, and impact on staff wellbeing. • Potential structural impact upon School’s historic buildings situated alongside the High Street. 	Update
6	19	5.2	<p><u>Objection received from Ward Councillor Mrs Sue Cook, as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrary to policies and First Purpose; proposals do not conserve and enhance the landscape. • The landscape character needs to be better understood; landform changes alien and detrimental to its characteristics. 	Update

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site does not have capacity for the proposals without generating irreversible negative effects upon its open downland character. • Impact of increased HGV traffic, travelling through Twyford, Colden Common, Fair Oak and other villages. • Duration of increased HGV traffic – likely to take longer than 18 months. • Highway safety for pedestrians. • Supportive representations from Golf Club members with minor proportion who live locally. • Acknowledge the Club’s desire to be more sustainable. 	
6	26		<p><u>Additional commentary after paragraph 7.29 regarding the landscape considerations of the proposed access on the B3335.</u></p> <p>The proposed new access would be re-instating a former access which has been lost to trees and vegetation. The access would be retained after the works are finished.</p> <p>The new access would be 6.1m wide which is likely to be larger than the previous access based on the width of an existing roadside dropped kerb (although details of the original are unclear). It involves the loss of 6 lower quality trees and excavation of the existing roadside bank. The new access would be very noticeable within the street scene given its dimensions, surfacing, cutting across an existing pavement, loss of some trees to accommodate it, and the character of continuous trees and hedging along either side of the B3335. Its prominence would also be heightened by HGV movements during the construction phase.</p> <p>Longer term, the existing vegetation on either side would continue to mature, its surfacing and re-grading works would weather, and the access would be seen in the context of a busy B road. For these reasons, plus previous pre-application advice in 2019 which advised that an access here could be permitted development,</p>	Update

			no significant concerns are raised regarding its creation, subject to conditions on its detailed design in the event planning permission was granted.	
6	28	9.1	<p><u>Amended reason for refusal, to refine its wording for greater clarity and alignment with relevant policy wording:</u></p> <p>1) The proposals would fail to conserve or and enhance the landscape character and scenic beauty of the National Park, by virtue of the importation of soils material upon chalk downland which would create a development of an incongruous scale, form and appearance. of the development. Furthermore, the proposals would impact upon the natural processes of the land of infiltrating rainwater through as a result of the altered landform and extensive engineered irrigation scheme. The proposals, therefore, fail to achieve a landscape-led and ecosystems services approach to development. The site forms part of the surrounding rural landscape and the development would, therefore, not sensitively integrate with local landscape character, its special qualities, and would significantly intrinsically and visually harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding landscape. Consequently, the proposals are contrary to policies SD1, SD2, SD4, SD5, SD17, SD50 of the South Downs Local Plan (2019), policies SB2 and LHE2 of the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2022), the First Purpose of a National Park and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.</p>	Update
7	45	9.1	<p><u>Additional condition (condition 9)</u></p> <p>Notwithstanding the information required by Conditions 10 and 11 of SDNP/21/00627/OUT and submitted with the current application, prior to the commencement of development:</p> <p>a) Details of native plant species to be informed by soil testing for suitability;</p> <p>b) Details of hedgerow management, particularly with regard to non-private ownership arrangements;</p> <p>c) Details of the scale of tree planting;</p>	Update

			<p>d) Details of the planting and management of the coppiced areas;</p> <p>Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in full accordance with the approved details.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> to achieve an appropriate landscaping scheme and to secure the long term maintenance of the landscaping scheme, which will contribute to the setting of the development and the surrounding character and appearance of the area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--