

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY,
14 SEPTEMBER 2016**

UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE

- 6. COMMITTEE UPDATES (Pages 1 - 10)**

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING - 14 SEPTEMBER 2016

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Item 3(b) - Land rear of 29 South Street, Pennington, Lymington (Application 15/11725)

Lymington and Pennington Town Council have now commented and recommend permission.

Item 3(c) - Land adjacent 13 New Street, Ringwood (Application 16/10075)

Ringwood Town Council have now commented and recommend permission.

Item (3e) - The Coach House, 67 Keyhaven Road, Milford on Sea (Application 16/10919)

A further statement has been submitted by Hampshire County Council's Highway Engineer as follows:

The proposals are for the demolition of the existing hotel and the erection of 7 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom flats, parking for both cars and cycles would be provided in accordance with the SPD and the access and turning arrangements are considered satisfactory.

Should the LPA be minded to grant permission then any parking provision should be conditioned as unallocated, (this should be achievable given that the spaces are communal and not on plot), to make efficient use of the available parking facilities. The Highway Authority would also wish to see the turning visibility and access arrangements conditioned in line with comments contained within its response ref 018882)

Item 3(f) - Merryfield Park, Derritt Lane, Sopley (Application 16/10497)

Since the report was published the following additional comments have been received:

Councillor Mark Steele raises the following concerns with the proposals:

1. The existing Wiltshire sewer pumping station does not have sufficient capacity during heavy rain to cope with any further demand.
2. Both local Bransgore GP Surgeries are not closing their patient lists but the need to train and recruit new doctors and clinical staff is being pursued by one practice.
3. Derritt Lane is very busy and floods most winters, while improvements have been discussed no agreement or plan has been advised to either Sopley or Bransgore Parish Council by HCC Highways.
4. The change from the original proposal to residential appears "intense" and "overdeveloped" when compared to the approved employment uses. The open space which is part of the green belt test appears to have been significantly reduced due to the density of buildings with car parking provision for those houses.

He also states that when comparing the phase 1 “design and concept” currently being built which has a very much “open garden groups” layout, phase 2 sadly falls into the “packing sardine groups”.

Councillor Mrs Emma Lane raises the following concerns:

The current development has provided no mitigation for the surrounding village of Sopley. No improvements to infrastructure have been forthcoming. The pumping station is inadequate and cannot cope with current levels of usage, raw sewage is regularly pumped into a ditch and runs down the lane from Wiltshire Gardens, Wessex Water comments are not acceptable. There is concern that the levels of traffic will be greater than that claimed in the transport assessment and that the figures (112 extra movements daily) are hypothetical, there is no consideration for the effect on traffic flow through the tiny villages of Sopley, Avon and Winkton. Derritt Lane is a narrow rural road which carries significant traffic levels – further detailed transport assessments should be undertaken. Further development at Merryfield will encourage the joining of Bransgore and Sopley which needs to be considered very seriously, one of the key objectives of the Greenbelt is to provide a natural break to prevent urban sprawl. Further work needs to be done to provide support for the surrounding villages of Sopley and Bransgore before any further development is agreed.

One further letter of objection has been received concerned that there is no provision for affordable housing.

A further statement has been submitted from Hampshire County Coun’s Highway Engineer that reads as follows:

The proposals are for the erection of a total of 22 dwellings with access onto Derritt Lane.

The access onto the highway was previously approved as an emergency access serving the site. The applicant has provided additional information in respect of the visibility splays available at the access.

It is noted that the available visibility of 109 metres x 2.4 metres looking in the secondary xxx direction is marginally lower than the 120 metres x 2.4 metres recommended in DMRB given that this is the trailing direction and that vehicles approaching the access from the xx would still be within the 30 mph speed limit when they are able to view the access from the full width of the carriageway in Derritt Lane then any objection on the grounds of a marginally reduced y distance would be inappropriate in this instance and unlikely to be sustained on appeal.

Visibility in the primary xxx direction is in excess of 2.4 metres x 120 metres and therefore satisfactory.

It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised in respect of any additional traffic movements that might be generated by the proposals and the affect this might have on the local highway network.

The Highway Authority had previously accepted that the proposals for phase 1 of the development for 80 houses application ref 15/10914 would result in a reduction in 615 vehicle movements at the site compared with the previous extant lawful use permission for industrial use.

The applicant has produced a Transport Statement (TS) which demonstrates that the current proposals for 22 dwellings would result in 115 vehicle movements, which would decrease the reduction from 615 to 500.

It should also be noted that should the existing 1148 square metres of B1 use at the site continue this would be likely result in a total of 92 vehicle movements at the site compared with the 115 for the proposed development.

Given the above as with the previous application 15/10924 the Highway Authority would therefore not wish to raise an objection to the current proposals based on the overall reduction in vehicle trips over the previous lawful use of the site.

Should the LPA be minded to grant permission then the Highway Authority would wish to see the parking, turning and access arrangements conditioned in line with its previous comments.

Item 3(g) - 15 St Thomas Street, Lymington (Application 16/10689)

Lymington and Pennington Town Council have commented further and would accept a delegated decision stating that the amended plans now available would seem to overcome the issues of concern raised by the Conservation Officer but there is still the outstanding complaint by the owners of the Kings Arms regarding access via the rear door.

The description is amended to read as follows:

Use as hot food takeaway (Use Class A5); extraction/ ventilation equipment, external alterations; creation of level access to existing shopfront, rear door, shed.

3(i) - Land East of Stem Lane and North of Great Woar Copse, New Milton (Application 16/10780)

As this proposal is for inappropriate development in the greenbelt, as set out in the report, and the proposed floorspace exceeds 1000 square metres (1081 square metres) the application must be referred to the Secretary of State, for determination. As a result the recommendation at paragraph 15 is revised as follows:

That the Service Manager Planning and Building Control be **AUTHORISED TO GRANT PERMISSION** subject to the Secretary of State's confirmation that he does not wish to call this in for his own determination.

Four references to 'concerns raised by the Highway Authority' in paragraphs 14.2.5.4 and 14.3.1 and in Section 14.2.6 have been overcome in light of the Highway Authority's response of 'no objection, subject to conditions' following receipt of the amended access arrangements.

Since the report was published the Council has received further comments from the following consultees:

- Environmental Health Section (Pollution) - recommends the imposition of the following additional conditions and informative note. A Briefing Note has also been

prepared by the Environmental Health Section for the benefit of Members, which is attached to this update.

Conditions:

10. The Total Noise Rating Level from the site shall not exceed the existing Background Level (LA90) in accordance with BS4142:2014 at the boundary of the nearest noise sensitive premises. To determine the existing Background Noise Level (LA90) the Background Level (LA90) shall be measured in accordance with BS4142:2104 during the proposed operating hours for both the crematoria and cremators and submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority prior to the use hereby approved commencing.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.

11. To ensure that no adverse impact is caused to light sensitive premises or to the amenity of the area, any lighting scheme proposed at the site shall not exceed the limitations of Zone E2 as stated in Table 2 (Table 2 – Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations – General Observers) in the ‘Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011’ produced by the Institute of Lighting Professionals.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality in relation to light pollution in accordance with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.

Informative Note:

9. The air quality modelling assessment submitted as part of this outline planning application details a number of input parameters, including a stack height (15m) and operational hours of the cremator(s). Should any of the crematoria air quality input parameters change (including the cremator(s) operating hours), the applicant should seek the advice of the local planning authority to determine whether those changes will result in increases in the emissions currently predicted and whether a further air quality modelling assessment is required to be submitted with the subsequent reserved matters application.

In addition condition no. 7 needs to be revised to read as follows:

“ The development hereby approved shall be used for crematorium purposes only and provide no more than eight services daily, without express planning permission first being obtained.”

- Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (Hampshire) – raise concerns over whether the tests for development in a Green Belt have been met i.e. whether the very special circumstances exist to justify permitting what would normally be considered inappropriate development in a Green Belt location, in particular in view of its proximity to the New Forest National Park. Concern is raised about visual impact of the site upon Stem Lane, Sway Road and the residential area to the south and there may be a loss of amenity to nearby footpaths. Should the Council be

mind to approve the application, conditions regarding lighting should be imposed to minimise disruption and pollution to neighbouring residents and to the wider New Forest National Park.

- New Forest National Park Authority – raise concerns over potential light pollution and skyglow visible from the National Park, increase in traffic generated by the facility that could impact on the tranquillity of the National Park and also an increase of the built environment that could affect the setting of the National Park. They consider these matters may be addressed by the full/reserved matters application.

Since the committee report was published the Council has received seventeen additional letters of objection, which do not introduce any new reasons for objection, other than criticism of the timing of the Planning Committee meeting.

A further petition, bearing the names of 255 individuals has been received against the proposal, on grounds of harm to the Green Belt.

One further letter of support has been received.

A further statement has been submitted by Hampshire County Council's Highway Engineer as follows:

The proposals are for the erection of a 100 seat Crematorium at the site, a new vehicular access would be formed onto the highway in Stem Lane, formal on-site parking would be provided for 100 cars together with an overspill car park area for another 50 vehicles.

In respect of parking provision, although the SPD contains no specific guidance, the level of parking would be considered acceptable given the size of the facilities proposed, attendees are likely to share cars and in the rare event that parking might be oversubscribed any shortfall would be considered unlikely to affect the highway given the proposals are located well within the site.

Concerns have been expressed regarding the ability of the local highway network to accommodate traffic generated at the site.

The applicant has provided a Transport Statement (TS) based on a similar operation in Trowbridge which states that the proposals would generate 200 – 2 way daily movements at the site, based on 20 cars attending a maximum of 5 services a day. The Highway Authority would consider that the TS is appropriate and that the local highway network is capable of safely accommodating these additional vehicle movements.

It is however acknowledged that traffic often has to queue at the junctions of Stem Lane with Bashley Cross Road and Gore Road during the AM and PM peak. This is largely associated with the school run and traffic using the Stem lane industrial estate at the beginning and end of the working day.

The applicant has stated that the crematorium would operate between 10.30 and 15.30 on weekdays to avoid the AM and PM peaks and the Highway Authority would wish to see the operating hours and the maximum number of services restricted by condition should LPA be minded to grant permission.

The site is located approximately 1.5 miles from the primary highway network on the A35 at the junction with the B3058. The Highway Authority would wish to see any facilities signposted from the A35 at this junction to encourage vehicles arriving from the north and the wider area to approach by this route.

The Highway Authority had initial concerns over the visibility and access arrangements at the new access onto the highway and also the priority arrangements where the new access crosses the existing cycleway.

The applicant has since provided additional information indicating that a right hand turn lane would be provided together with suitable visibility splays. These facilities would be delivered at the applicant's expense via a S278 agreement with the Highway Authority. Should any of the works, including any provision of the visibility splays, be on land not currently forming part of the highway then such land should be transferred to the Highway Authority by a deed of dedication. The applicant has also indicated that any new access would have priority over the cycleway and staggered barriers would be provided at the cycleway either side of the crossing point.

Any grant of permission should be conditional on all the above works being delivered to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

Item 3(k) - Land of 2 East View Road, Ringwood (Application 16/10824)

The following additional comments have been submitted by Hampshire County Council's Highway Engineer:

The proposals are for a new 3 bedroom dwelling at the site. A total of 2 on site car parking spaces would be provided for the new dwelling

Although the parking provision is 0.5 spaces under that recommended by the SPD the Highway Authority would consider that refusal based on such under provision would be unlikely to be sustained on appeal.

The Highway Authority would however also wish to see the car and cycle parking conditioned to remain in accordance with the SPD should the LPA be minded to grant approval.

Item 3(m) - 5A Harford Close, Pennington, Lymington (Application 16/10840)

The application here is seeking full planning permission to construct a single dwelling with associated parking at the above location. The proposed dwelling would be served from an existing vehicular access on the A337 Milford Road.

Following a site visit, the Highway Authority originally responded to this application on 3rd August 2016 when concerns were raised in respect to the absence of tracking drawings demonstrating that there was adequate manoeuvring space available within the site. The applicant was required to provide further information at this time in the form of a plan demonstrating a turning car together with the design of the parking arrangement to ensure it

accorded with this Council's Parking Standards SPD. The Highway Authority therefore recommended a holding objection at this time until the further information was provided.

The applicant submitted further information during late August 2016 in order to address the Highway Authority's previous concerns, as outlined above. The applicant submitted a further drawing (RB. 29/08/2016) to show a turning vehicle and the design of the parking spaces. This information was considered sufficient by the Highway Authority who subsequently raised no objection, subject to the imposition of conditions.

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE -
14 SEPTEMBER 2016**

Members Briefing Note

**Planning Application 16/10780 - Single chapel crematorium; parking; landscaping
(Outline application with details only of access)**

Introduction

This is a briefing note for Members to provide further detail on environmental health matters relating to the above planning application.

Air Quality

1. Planning

Air Quality has been assessed by the Environmental Health Officers in terms of both emissions and traffic pollution and is based on the crematoriums operating for 7 hours a day, 5 days per week. .

i. Emissions

The impact of the proposed development on local air quality is assessed against the set UK air quality objectives at locations of relevant exposure. In this case, assessment is at neighbouring residential properties and Ballard School.

The applicant has submitted a detailed air quality modelling assessment for the proposed crematorium which predicts the pollutant concentrations from the process. It then compares these predicted concentrations to the UK air quality objectives and the overall process contribution to pollutant levels. The modelling assessment is considered as the most acceptable method to assess the impact of a proposed process on local air quality. It includes a calculation for the stack height to ensure effective dispersion of pollutants, and considers other input parameters such as weather data, emission data, background pollutant concentrations and stack details.

The air quality assessment submitted demonstrates the proposed crematoria should have negligible impact on local air quality at locations of relevant exposure (in accordance with relevant guidance) and the process contributions to pollutant concentrations are well within the UK air quality objectives.

ii. Traffic

The crematoria will be restricted to 8 services per day by planning condition.

The Transport Assessment states that there will be an average of 40 two way trips per service during the week. This equates to an Annual Average Daily Traffic figure (AADT) (which is calculated over a 7 day period annually) of 229 AADT.

If the AADT is below 500 then an air quality assessment is not required in accordance with current guidance - Land Use Planning and Development Control – Planning for Air Quality-2015.

(Continued overleaf....)

2. Local Authority Pollution and Prevention Control (LAPPC)

In addition to the planning regime, the operator of the crematoria will be required to apply for an Environmental Permit from the Local Authority prior to operating.

The permit is written with regard to the Secretary of State's Process Guidance Notes (produced by DEFRA). It would specify detailed conditions including emission limits at the stack exit point for pollutants such as mercury, hydrogen chloride, total particulate matter, carbon monoxide, organic compounds and dioxins and also monitoring requirements and maintenance schedules which have to be complied with.

Monitoring requirements will include continuous monitoring of certain parameters to ensure burning conditions are maintained and abatement equipment is working correctly. A breach of any condition within a Permit would lead to enforcement action and possible suspension and/or revocation of the Permit which would prevent the process from operating.

The process would be subject to routine inspections from the Environmental Health Officer. The Local Authority would also investigate complaints received concerning the process.

The applicant has acknowledged the need for a Permit should the application be granted consent and have modelled pollutant concentrations on both the planning and LAPPC requirements. This assessment is based on worst case scenario.

All cremators built after 2012 are required to install equipment to abate mercury to the prescribed emission limit.

The permit would also require that the operators of the crematorium have appropriate management systems in place, training and maintenance schemes, with records to demonstrate this.

Date: 12 September 2016

Gary Worsley
Senior Environmental Health Officer
Environmental Protection
Lead officer for LAPPC, Noise and Lighting

Rachel Higgins
Environmental Health Officer
Environmental Protection
Lead officer for Air Quality

This page is intentionally left blank