

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 8 JUNE 2016**

**UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE**

- 5. COMMITTEE UPDATES (Pages 1 - 2)**

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE ` - 8 JUNE 2016.**

## **UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE**

### **Item 3(a) - The Old Railway Station, Woodgreen Road, Breamore (Application 16/10231)**

The Applicant has written further in support of the application stating that the property was purchased for £110,000 6 years ago and that advice was taken from Woolley and Wallis Commercial before advertising it for £122,000 which was considered to reflect the unusual and historic nature of the building (while expecting to accept a lower offer).

### **Item 3 (c) – 28 Flushards, Lymington (Application (16/10358)**

In light of the Highway Authority's confirmation that it has no highway safety concerns, Lymington and Pennington Town Council has withdrawn its recommendation of refusal and now recommends approval.

### **Item 3 (d) – 6 Highfield Avenue, Ringwood (Application 16/10360)**

An additional representation of support has been received from the occupiers of number 18 Highfield Drive.

### **Item 3 (g) - Land at Roeshot and Burton Hinton, Bransgore (Application 16/10443)**

In respect of this application the Planning Policy section refer to policies CS5, CS7 and DM2 of the Local Plan and comment that the design of the natural green space appears to be consistent with policy in terms of creating a number of new circular routes and access points across the whole site. It is also stated that the success of the project in mitigating the impacts of the new development will be determined by Christchurch Borough Council as the housing development to which this proposal relates lies within their Borough.

**Natural England** have commented that they have no objection to the principle of the proposal but do have concerns relating to the lack of information currently available in relation to the value of the land as SANG. They also recommend conditions in relation to this issue which would be a matter for Christchurch Borough Council as the competent authority for the proposed housing development.

**Condition no. 2** needs to be updated with the current plans as follows:

The development permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: CS:613.05 Rev. A, D2394L.101 Rev. A, D2394L.102 Rev. A, D2394L.103 Rev. A, 0617/CO/1 and 0617/RS/1.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of the development.

**The Applicants** have written a detailed response to consultee comments that have been made and emphasise the fact that this Council does not need to consider whether the SANG

will fulfil its function – this test is for the Competent Authority to consider when the application for housing development is assessed by Christchurch Borough Council. It is also stated that the issues raised by the Ecologist will all be dealt with at the planning condition/Section 106 stage when the residential development is considered.

They comment that the lack of a formal LVIA process noted by the Landscape Officer as a “considerable concern” is not an indicator that there has been no consideration of the landscape impacts of the proposal and they state that a LVIA is not a requirement for a development of this type with no operational development of any significance. They also say that the details of the scheme will be secured through a SANG delivery strategy which is for Christchurch Borough Council to agree.

Finally they state that the matters raised by the Public Open Space Team in relation to how the timing of the adjacent proposed quarrying works may impact on users of the proposed SANG and who will own/manage the SANG is not for consideration as part of this application as this will be a matter for Christchurch Borough Council to consider as they are the competent authority.

### **Item 3 (h) - Forest Lodge Home Farm, Fawley Road, Hythe (Application 16/10450)**

Further comments have been received from the Environmental Health Officer in respect of potential air quality implications with regard to human receptors, which requires further clarification. This has been sent to the County Council for their action.

In addition the Environmental Health Officer has requested the imposition of conditions to limit the level of noise generated by the site. As a result the recommendation is revised to read:

**Raise No Objection** and recommend the following:

- i The matters in respect of air quality raised by the Environmental Health Officer are resolved; and,
- ii The imposition of the following conditions:
  1. The mineral workings shall not operate other than between the hours of 07:00 to 18:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays; nor Saturdays other than between the hours of 07:00 to 13:00 and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.
  2. The total noise from operations at the hereby approved site shall not exceed 55dB LAeq 1 hour (free field) at the boundary of noise sensitive premises.
  3. The noise level from work such to facilitate essential site preparation, restoration and construction of baffle mounds shall not exceed 70 dB LAeq 1 hour (free field) at the boundary of noise sensitive premises for a period of up to eight weeks in one calendar year.
  4. All reversing alarms fitted to vehicles using the site shall be of the ‘white noise’ type.