

PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 11 MARCH 2020

UPDATES FOR COMMITTEE

6. COMMITTEE UPDATES

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11 MARCH 2020

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Item 2a - Land Adjacent to Forest Lodge Farm, Fawley Road, Hythe (Application 17/11770)

2 further representations have submitted from local residents, both of whom have made representations previously. The new representations reiterate concerns that are set out in Section 10 of the report.

Item 2b – 25-27 Southampton Road, Ringwood (Application 19/11369)

7. PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Ringwood Town Council

Amended Plans - PAR1 recommend permission but would accept Planning Officer's decision

9. CONSULTEE COMMENTS

NFDC Building Control

Amended plans - no adverse comments

10. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Ringwood Society (original plans) - The design of rear elevation is poor. We recommend a better design with improved articulation and better quality materials.

No comments received on amended plans.

Item 2d - 1 Fulmer Drive, Hythe (Application: 20/10008)

The recommendation should be amended to Prior Approval be approved.

Item 2e - Land off Stem Lane and Great Woar Copse, New Milton (Application 19/11249)

The following comments have been received from a resident of Doe Copse Way and have previously been circulated to Members: I would like to summarise the context my request for an opportunity to address the NFDC Planning Committee in relation to the above planning application. I hope you will agree that my concerns have some legitimacy and that they should be brought before the committee. I have previously expressed my main points in an email to Jim Bennett (11.1.20). I have also had a lengthy conversation with Rachel Higgins (Environmental Protection Team Manager) and I have also corresponded with Anna Li (HCC Senior Road Safety Engineer). Copies of my correspondence to Anna were sent to Jim (24/1/20, 27/1/20, 31/1/20). In a nutshell:

1. There are no explicit statements in the report by the Air Quality Consultants (4 Oct 2019) or by NFDC's Environmental Protection Team Manager (11 Dec 2019) saying that 'there will be no harmful effects to the health of people living next to the crematorium'. There are statements saying that the increase in pollutant concentrations will be 'negligible or 'not significant' but these are technical terms derived from the 'mathematical model' used. Both reports therefore, accept there will be some additional pollutants in the atmosphere. But they do not explicitly say that there will be no adverse impact on human health. This failure to be explicit, in my view, is very worrying. The pollutants are an unnecessary risk, no matter how small, to the families living next door to the site. If I understand Rachel Higgins correctly, when we discussed this on the telephone, it is not possible to give such a guarantee. If this is the case then how can approval be given? Who will monitor the health of people living nearby if approval is given?
2. HCC Highways approval for the proposal was based on no more than a Transport Statement from the contractor. Additional evidence was not sought. In particular, the decision was made without reference to mathematics or science. There has been no simulation of traffic flows. Added to this apparent deficit in methodology is the fact that the contractor's statement is based on only five services a day when they have been given approval for up to 8. Neither did HCC's conclusion consider the impact of large services bringing in up to 200 people with an associated 100 or so traffic movements. The impact of up to 8 slow moving corteges per day was not modelled. All of these points are derived from my correspondence with Anna Li. With respect, I cannot see how HCC Highway Engineers and local councillors can conclude that there will be "no severe impact to the local highway network". The data is not available to predict congestion, waiting times at junctions and delays to residential traffic trying to access Stem Lane.

In response to 1. Above the Environmental Health Section comments are as follows:

The assessment of the likely impact of any proposed development on local air quality, and therefore human health, is undertaken using relevant guidance and appropriate modelling tools taking into account numerous inputs including weather data, current pollutant concentrations, location of relevant receptors and emission data from the proposed development. With regards to the proposed crematorium the submitted air quality assessment follows good practice, is a conservative assessment and is agreed by Environmental Health. Whilst it is noted that the development will increase local pollutant concentrations, the predicted increase in pollutant concentrations, when compared to air quality objectives is determined as not significant at locations of relevant receptors (ie neighbouring residential properties).

Air quality objectives present pollutant concentrations at levels to **protect human health** which are determined by Government (based on European air quality limit values). Therefore the purpose of an air quality assessment is to predict the potential increase in local pollutant concentrations from the proposed development and whether any increases may exceed air quality objectives at relevant locations. With regards to the proposed development, the air quality objectives are not predicted to exceed the air quality objectives and the predicted

increase in local pollutant concentrations from the proposed development is determined as 'not significant'.

The proposed development will also be subject to an operators Permit (and regulated by New Forest DC), which will include the required monitoring of emissions from the site at source.

In response to 2. above HCC's Highways Officer states that the highway aspect of the development proposal has already been approved by the outline application. The assessment carried out by the highway officer for the outline application was thorough and correct. Whilst the assessment wasn't based on the extreme cases when large numbers of people may turn up at a service, it is reasonable and logical to assess the application based on average/ normal sized services. It was concluded there would be no impact upon the highway during peak hours and subsequently did not require traffic models to be carried out.

We disagree with the assumption that a 100 seat crematorium would generate 200 people with 100 vehicles at each service. The number of people/traffic attending services does not correlate with the number of seats within the crematorium. Furthermore, no real evidence was submitted to support the theory. On the contrary, the applicant submitted traffic survey data from a similar operation to derive the likely trips generated by the proposed development and we considered this to be more appropriate.

NFDC Ecologist - The original outline application was supported by an air quality report which identified suitable receptors and correctly mapped these in relation to the proposal. Advice was based on the supporting professional evidence which demonstrated critical loads were not exceeded. Conclusions drawn in the reports showed impacts on ecological receptors were unlikely to be significant, as the conclusions of the air quality work undertaken as part of the Local Plan demonstrated air quality impacts for pollutants such as NOx were generally localised and influenced by land management within designated sites, the conclusions for the application seemed reasonable. In relation to more localised impacts on adjacent woodland, the updated Air Quality work has provided further information on this and there is no reason to question the conclusions drawn.

The applicant has agreed to the proposed conditions, subject to conditions 2 and 7 being prior to development above dpc level. This is acceptable and conditions 2 and 7 are amended to read:

2. Before development proceeds above damp proof course level, samples or exact details of the facing and roofing materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable appearance of the building in accordance with policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park.

7. Before development proceeds above damp proof course level, details of the design of the cycle parking facility including the specification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Before the occupation of any part

of the development hereby approved, the cycle store shall be erected as shown on the approved plans and thereafter retained, maintained and kept available for users of the development at all times.

Reason: To promote sustainable mode of travel.

**Item 3f - Druces Acres, Salisbury Road, Isley, Ellington, Harbridge & Ibsley
(Application: 17/11180)**

One additional comment has been received, querying why NFDC signed off a building work certificate that clearly stated was a cess-pool ,when in fact it was a sewerage treatment plant that in no way fulfilled the requirement of all residential development within the catchment of the Hampshire Avon needs to be "phosphate neutral". This plant should not have been installed in view of the River Avon SAC MOU. As far as I am aware there is no treatment plant or any means of achieving phosphate neutral other than a sealed cesspit.