

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 JANUARY 2019

### COMMITTEE UPDATES

#### **Item 3 (a) - Druces Acre, Salisbury Road, Ibsley, Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley (Application 17/11180)**

The applicant confirms their intention to move the mobile home, install a new septic tank and plant the new hedge as required by the Landscape Officer. They point out that this depends on ground conditions being suitable and request that the words 'on or before 29 March 2019' are removed from the recommendation, so that the Council has the flexibility to issue an approval, if necessary, without bringing the application back to the Planning Committee. This is a reasonable request bearing in mind the onset of mid-winter, consequently the recommendation is changed; authorising the Service Manager Planning Development Control to grant permission only following the relocation of the mobile home structure to its revised position on or before 30 April 2019; and subject to the imposition of conditions.

A further objection has been received raising the following concerns:

- A precedent would be set to convert grazing land to a residential use.
- No accounts have been submitted to support that this is a viable business.
- The need for a permanent worker on site is cited as necessary due to the birthing needs of alpacas, however only 3 were born in 2018.
- The number of animals proposed in the applicants business plan is more than the actual numbers and the application appears to be equine based.

#### **Item 3 (b) - Druces Acre, Salisbury Road, Ibsley, Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley (Application 18/10237)**

A further objection has been received raising the following concerns:

- The building consists of 5 loose boxes and a storage area on a concrete base, double the size of the original permission.
- The birthing shelter is used to stable horses and ponies.
- The structure is excessive in light of the number of new born alpacas.
- Objections and comments from residents appear to have been ignored.

**Item 3 (c) - Land of Mountfield, Hythe (Application 18/10838)**

Ecology – the amended plan and additional information do not significantly change the ecological aspects of the proposal

Landscape – concerns over proximity of plot 1 to boundary hedge are not addressed but there are still reservations with regard to the management and maintenance of the remaining land and lack of a footpath connection

An additional objection has been received from a local resident highlighting the same issues raised by the public and consultees. An in depth version of this has also been circulated to Members.

**Item 3(d) - New Forest Water Park, Ringwood Road, Fordingbridge (Application 18/11130)**

An additional letter of support submitted by the applicant's agent has been circulated to all Members of the Committee directly setting out background to application, and merits of the site and suggested design.

**Item 3 (e) - Communications Site at CAT Plantation, Ringwood Road, Hinton, Bransgore (Application 18/11316)**

The New Forest National Park Authority raise no objections.

The Council received additional information from the applicant on 27/12/18, outlining the benefits of the 35m Cat Plantation mast in isolation (excluding the 3 no. additional triangulation masts referred to in the initial submission), which are summarised as follows:

- Increased mast capacity to support other mobile operators;
- Improved broadband coverage for domestic users (over 80 definitively and 100s more potentially) and commercial properties (over 20);
- Improved broadband speed and certainty;
- Enhanced consumer choice;

The Officers consider the benefits of the mast in isolation have demonstrated the very special circumstances warranted to permit inappropriate development in the Green Belt and without a requirement for the applicant to enter into a Section 106 agreement.

The additional information received necessitated a press notice and site notice which will expire before or on 1 February 2019. If Members are minded to grant permission without a Section 106 Agreement, the Service Manager Planning Development Control should be authorised to grant permission, subject to no further substantive comments being received by 1 February 2019, with the imposition of the conditions set out in the report (Item 3 (e)).

**Item 3(g) - Forest Lodge Home Farm, Fawley Road, Hythe (Application 18/11586)**

## **8. COUNCILLOR COMMENTS**

Cllr Mrs A McEvoy – application contravenes assurances given by the company that no screening operations would take place at the site.

My objections are based on

1. Increased noise problems.
2. Increased dust problems.
3. General community disturbance due to exceptionally close proximity to a residential housing estate.
4. An unacceptable adverse public health impact.
5. No availability of any new Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts.
6. No availability of any new noise assessments.
7. Contravention of decision covering plant machinery allowed on site as agreed in original planning application and in contravention of Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013).

I Chair the Liaison Group and at the last meeting, (just three months ago) no indication was given that this further application would be made in spite of noise complaints being raised regarding the existing operations. The Liaison Group doesn't meet again until 1st February by which time the planning decision is likely to have been made. One of the remits of the Liaison Group was to promote communication between the site operator and the local community. In spite of apparent good intentions, this has palpably failed.

It is vital that some detailed noise assessments are carried out on current operations together with proven noise levels of the new piece of equipment (The R155) before this application is considered. The results should be published for the Regulatory Committee before any decision is made.

I do object to this planning application and have offered these comments on the basis of the information currently available to me. If more information becomes available, for example at the Regulatory Committee, I may wish to change my view.

## **10. REPRESENTATIONS**

One letter received from Chair of Netley View Residents Association

- Previous assurances given by company that there would be no screening at the site
- Noise figures are the ones submitted for original application and no new noise figures given
- Residents are concerned that noise on occasion exceeds 55 dB
- Noise from any grading machine especially of the type and size would cause intolerable noise and impact on their health, wellbeing and amenity
- New proposal was not raised at the last liaison panel meeting. Next meeting not until February.
- Insufficient engagement with local community regarding this proposal
- Clay is the local sile type and is well known. Contractor must have known beforehand.

We request the District Council recommends to Hampshire County Council to implement noise monitoring with current operations before this application is dealt with. Investigation and publishing of noise levels of the machine being considered should also be available.

Application should be deferred by HCC Regulatory Committee due to the serious concerns and register the above residents views.

## **14. ASSESSMENT**

New paragraph after 14.3.1

The applicant's agent has been asked a series of questions by the County Planning department case officer relating to the equipment to be used and its location within the site. The agent's response is as follows.

1. The preference for TJ would be to continue with the description of 1x screener. You will appreciate that being tied to one specific screener does not allow an operator any flexibility should the screener break or work inefficiently and they could quickly find themselves in breach of the condition should a replacement screener be required.
2. As detailed within the application for the original noise assessment, noise level data was unable to be sourced from the manufacturer (McCloskey) for the R105 model (of vibrating screen). Therefore noise data was sourced from BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014, based on data for a vibrating screen with a similar power output. The original assessment therefore modelled the screen with a sound pressure level of 81 dB(A) at a distance of 10m (which equates to a sound power level of 109 dB(A), the value referenced within the report). For the updated assessment, the McCloskey model has changed from the R105 to the R155 variant. Fortunately, noise level data for the latter model has been able to be obtained from measurements taken from other assessments, where the sound pressure level from the screener had been measured at a 10m distance either end on (75 dB(A)) or side on (81 dB(A)). Taking the higher value, this shows that the noise level produced by the R155 model matches that originally assumed for the R105 model. Therefore there is no difference in the modelling of the screener from the original to the updated noise assessment. Note that the prediction of noise levels at the receptor would assume that the noise source radiates equally in all directions, which represents a worst case scenario, as the measurements referenced above suggest that noise levels at the receptor would be quieter at times when the unit is facing end on towards the receptor. Notwithstanding the above since the S73 application has been submitted (and pertinent to the point I make in point 1) TJ have informed me that they actually intend to use a 512 Scalping Screener (see Brochure attached) which is a lighter and less powerful unit compared to the McCloskey models, suggestive of lower noise levels.
3. In terms of location for screening, TJ intend to always screen either behind bunds/stockpiles or at depth within the void, away from the road side and the nearest residential receptors. It is worth noting that screening will largely take place on a campaign basis and wouldn't be happening every day. You will appreciate that a fixed location wouldn't work as this would jeopardise the nature of the phased dig and would sterilise certain areas within the site and cause operational difficulties.