

Planning Committee Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
6	11		<p>Officers have been provided with a copy of an e-mail sent to members of the Planning Committee by Cheriton Parish Council suggesting that, in discussions undertaken between the applicants and officers “.....officers might have become too close to the applicants, even to the extent of having joint strategy meetings. This might suggest possible collusion”.</p> <p>Officers have naturally engaged with the applicants in the intervening months since the previous application, knowing that another application would be required for future festivals. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages working proactively with applicants. Officers have acted in good faith throughout this case and have treated all proceedings in this case in the same way as we do with all applications that we deal with.</p> <p>Officers are not responsible for the name that applicants give to pre-application discussions. At all times officers ensure that any discussions and meetings with applicants are focussed on the planning merits or otherwise of any potential scheme.</p> <p>Any change in the number of attendees in the future (or any other change) would require a planning application and would be considered on its merits at the time of determination.</p>	<p>Officer response to e-mail sent by Cheriton Parish Council to Members</p>
6	18		<p>Further Comments in response to Committee Report from Cheriton Parish Council:</p> <p>1. Noted that the applicants have submitted only a draft BLEMP instead of the final version. <i>(Case Officer Comment: The draft status allows any amendments considered necessary by members should they resolve to approve the application to be incorporated in a final document, to be secured by a S106 Agreement).</i></p>	<p>Further comments from Cheriton Parish Council</p>

			<p>2. Noted that formal consultation comments from the Landscape Officer and Ecologist have not been published for public perusal. Report refers to “informal comments and ongoing dialogue” which is considered unsatisfactory. <i>(Case Officer Comment: the ongoing consideration of the application and significant documentation has required continuous dialogue. The report summarises the conclusions of the discussions and sets the consultees position on the scheme.)</i></p> <p>3. In paragraph 7.7, the Duty is mis-represented as “socio-economic” which is different. <i>(Case Officer Comment: Noted)</i>. The comment that “there are clearly economic benefits that accrue in the locality” is an opinion of the officers which is unsupported by any evidence submitted by the applicants. <i>(Case Officer Comment: Para 7.55 of the report refers to economic considerations where it states “IT is recognised that the full extent or otherwise of the benefits that such events bring to the local economy and that of the National Park are always going to be difficult to fully quantify. It is however, considered that economic benefits do accrue in some form”. The scale of numbers attending the festival will inherently provide economic benefits to the local area and the Park.</i></p> <p>4. Under economic considerations in paragraphs 7.55 and 7.56, there is no mention of the Duty. Furthermore in 7.55 it is stated that the staggered opening is a “more recent change”, but this took place via SDNP/18/00939/CND) and is therefore not recent. <i>Case Officer Comment : It is not understood whether this refers to the Duty within the Purposes of the Park or the Duty under S245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. In any event, under Paragraph 8.2 in the conclusion the report confirms that it meets both the purposes and the Duty under the Act).</i></p>	
6	26	5.1	<p>Two Additional letters of support received raising points already covered in the report together with the following matters:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As local supplier always found organisers to be conscientious of neighbours and our conduct before, during and after event. • As part of delivery team for festival (event technology company) involvement represents significant and sustained economic contribution to local area. 	Additional Representations.

			Deliver approximately 360 days of employment over a 45 day operational period in Hampshire. Workforce includes individuals from across the region.	
6	37	7.23	<i>Policy SD2 has the aspiration of ensuring proposals have an overall positive impact on the ability of the natural environment to contribute goods and services. The securing of a fresh Biodiversity Net Gain, Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and Management Plan (BLEMMP) would embrace and address a number of matters to achieve some positive impacts. It is considered that with such a document and actions secured the proposal would accord with Policy SD2.</i>	Amendment
7	62	4.22	Droxford Parish Council – objection. Droxford PC do not raise any new issues and object on the grounds that the volume of soil importation is unnecessary and should be treated as waste disposal and that the applicant has not demonstrated the amount of waste is the minimum necessary amount. The PC also comment that the proposals meet the definition of landfill and would lead to unacceptable HGV movements on rural roads leading to verge failure and conflict with pedestrians, walkers and cyclists and state that the application fails to provide enough information for appropriate assessment and is for the benefit of private members at a cost to the public.	Correction Add Droxfield Parish Council to the list of Parish Council’s objecting to the scheme and summarise original objection.
7	62	4.22	Droxford PC provide some further emphasis on a number of points. These are (summarised) 1) highways and construction impacts – CTMP does not appear sufficient. The level of use by heavy vehicles would result in material deterioration of local rural road network, 2) historically additional holes have been created without need for large scale importation of soils. The applicant has not demonstrated the necessity of importing soils. 3) Previous applications have been refused for reservoir on archaeological grounds. 4) Question the appropriateness of lined irrigation ponds and associated lagoon infrastructure. Appears to conflict with natural processes and warrants further scrutiny.	Update – late additional representation received.
8	88	5.1	Additional representation received from number 9 Rothermead. This raises the same issues as previously raised but also asks for details of the treatment between the proposed site access and the boundary wall of this property – amendments	Late representation received

			have been made to condition 6 (d) (see below) to provide further detail on this matter. The letter also states that daylight/sunlight assessment does not show the Winter Months. It is noted that these are shown as appendix 3 of the Daylight & Sunlight Assessment.	
8	88	5.1	New representation from owner of number 13 Rothermead – objection on the following grounds; too many houses, development should be for 5, the planned houses are too close to numbers 9,11,15 and 17 Rothermead. The proposed new dwellings could impact privacy of existing dwellings. New access is dangerous and will result in noise pollution caused by speed hump or ramp. There is no separate pedestrian access. The proposal fails to meet the design requirements of the SDNP.	Late representation received
8	99	Amended condition 6(d)	d) Location, height and materials/construction technique for all boundary treatments including gates, walls, fencing (to include hedgehog highways) and hedges. For the avoidance of doubt this detail shall also include the treatment between no. 9 Rothermead and the new access road into the development.	Amended as in bold
8	100	Amended condition 7	Additional Criterion xvii for condition 7 (xviii) - requires construction phase surface water management plan.	Added to reflect requested condition from WSP.
8	102	Condition 16	Deleted.	Repeats condition 7 therefore unnecessary.
8	103	Conditions 17-21	Become 16-20.	Amended numbering
8	103	Additional Conditions 21 and 22	Condition 21: The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the	Added to reflect late consultation response from WSP

			<p>development hereby approved and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details in perpetuity. The Local Planning Authority shall be granted access to inspect the sustainable drainage scheme for the lifetime of the development. The details of the scheme to be submitted for approval shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. a timetable for its implementation. II. details of SuDS feature and connecting drainage structures and maintenance requirement for each aspect including a drawing showing where they are located. III. a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. This will include the name and contact details of any appointed management company. <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed for each new dwelling and not increased in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>Condition 22: Prior to the first use of the development, a detailed verification report, (appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the approved construction details and specifications have been implemented in accordance with the surface water drainage scheme), has been submitted to and approved (in writing) by the Local Planning Authority. The verification report shall include a full set of “as built” drawings plus photographs of excavations (including soil profiles/horizons), any installation of any surface water drainage structures and control mechanisms.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed for each new dwelling and not increased in accordance with NPPF.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

9	113	3.2	<p><u>Correction with figures, as follows:</u></p> <p>The size and use of the barns would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grain store – 25m x 30.7m, 10.4m high. (767.5sm) • Workshop barn – 24.6m x 12m, 8m high. (430.5sqm) 295.2sqm <p>Hay store – 24.6m x 17.5m, 9.5m high. (295.2sqm) 430.5sqm</p>	Correction
9	113	3.8	<p><u>Update last sentence, in response to corrected figures above:</u></p> <p>It would be the smallest middle-sized building at 24.6m x 12m, but second highest at 9.5m.</p>	Correction
9	113	3.9	<p><u>Update last sentence, in response to corrected figures above:</u></p> <p>It is the middle-sized smallest building at 24.6m x 12m x 8m high.</p>	Correction
9	115	4.6	<p><u>Additional consultee response:</u></p> <p>Environment Agency: No objection, subject to condition.</p> <p><u>Officer note:</u> The Environment Agency acknowledge the site lies within a Source Protection Zone over a principal aquifer and are satisfied that groundwater risks can be managed. Whilst they note some technical errors in the submitted information, they recommend a condition, which is already reflected in condition 16.</p>	Update
9	116	4.9	<p><u>Update to Lead Local Flood Authority consultee response</u></p> <p>Lead Local Flood Authority: No objection, subject to condition.</p> <p><u>Officer note:</u> This latest response resolves their earlier conflicting advice, as outlined in the committee report. The LLFA's recommended condition relates to agreeing a more detailed appropriate drainage strategy and technical details of the surface water drainage scheme. This requirement is covered by condition 16.</p>	Update

9	128	Condition 16	<p><u>Update, in response to further consultee advice:</u></p> <p>Prior to commencement of the development, detailed designs of a foul and surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted in writing to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority. This shall be in accordance with the approved Drainage Statement by Aqua Callidus, 6th August 2025. The design shall follow the NPPF, PPG Flood risk and coastal change and National Standards for SuDS. The submitted details shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results of detailed infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 in locations where winter groundwater levels show a 1m unsaturated zone from the base of infiltration allows. 2. Provision of surface water attenuation storage, sized and designed to accommodate the volume of water generated in all rainfall events up to and including the critical storm duration for the 3.33% and 1% annual probability rainfall events (both including allowances for climate change). Hydraulic calculations and detailed construction drawings shall be used to demonstrate this. 3. Detailed drainage layout plan, which corresponds with the hydraulic calculations. 4. An exceedance flow routing plan demonstrating no increase in surface water flood risk on or off site. The plan must include proposed levels and flow directions. 5. Evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the four pillars of SuDS/Standard 4-7 of the National Standards for SuDS. 6. Construction method statement for the surface water drainage system. 7. Maintenance and management plan for all elements of the surface water drainage system and any ordinary watercourses/culverts within the phase. 	
---	-----	--------------	--	--

			<p>8. Pollution prevention measures (including storage of pollutants) address Source Protection Zone location.</p> <p>9. Drainage to ground details.</p> <p>10. Source Protection Zone details (updated as required) to be addressed in site risk assessment.</p> <p>11. Accordance with the SUDs Simple Index Approach (CIRIA C753-SUDs Manual).</p> <p>12. Detailed design of the foul drainage scheme.</p> <p>13. Written confirmation, to support the above technical information, of any necessary Environmental Permit for the discharge of waste water to ground.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure an appropriate foul drainage scheme and the surface water drainage design meets the National Standards for SuDS and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--