

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
9	n/a	n/a	<p><u>Clarification sought from Members, as follows:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is there a Master Plan for these treehouse applications? 2) P13 10 treehouses were refused, why are there now 12? 3) Condition 3 P25 can one person stay for 28 days in one go? 4) Is Item 7 at end a live application or refusal for reference? 5) Is there any age or height restrictions of any children? I'm thinking about the height of 7m above the ground. Are there balconies? 6) Also, there are details of dog bins etc, how are the dogs going to access the tree huts? 7) What type of cooking facilities are there gas or electric? 8) Will the treehouses be owned and managed by the Cowdray Estate? 9) Where there is use of metal surfaces on the treehouses, will the insulation be sufficient to muffle the sound of rain? I'm imagining that rainfall on tin roof/sides could be quite loud. <p><u>Officer responses:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is no masterplan for the treehouse application but the applicant has been through a comprehensive Planning Performance Agreement process with officers (4x 3hr workshops and multiple site visits, emails and calls in-between). The work undertaken to inform the design may be viewed here https://planningpublicaccess.southdowns.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=Q30RUMTU0EF00 The application is supported by a comprehensive LVIA, and a draft Landscape and Ecological Management plan 2) The scheme of 10 was located in one of the woodland sites (Lodge Wood), whereas there are now 12 units across two different sites. Lodge Wood now only has five units proposed, so development has been significantly reduced on the site 3) The limitation of stays of no more than 28 days is a standard condition used for tourism accommodation proposals to avoid use of the units for more general residential purposes 4) Appendix 2 is the committee report for the previously refused application for Members' reference. Appendix 3 is the minutes from the meeting where Members refused the application 	Clarification

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<p>5) There is no age restriction and all structures would be subject to the relevant building control and safety requirements. The units would be constructed using natural landform/ground slope so as to be lower off the ground at the front/entrance, and raised off the ground to the back, where there would be a balcony area with appropriate railing (in terms of safety and design/appearance).</p> <p>6) Dogs are permitted on site, and would be required to be on leads at all times. They would access the units via the short steps at the front. Final design details and policy re dogs would be secured via condition (see proposed Conditions 5 and 11)</p> <p>7) The units would be fitted with electric cooking facilities/fully fitted kitchens</p> <p>8) Whilst the sites will remain in the ownership of the Cowdray Estate, the units will be owned and managed by the applicant Tree House Retreat. The applicant currently has a 30 year lease on both sites</p> <p>9) The units and roof spaces will be insulated to building regulations standards, which will muffle noise from rain. Metal roof materials are proposed over the smaller bedroom section of the units at High Field Copse, and over sheltered external balcony areas rather than living space at Lodge Wood. It is anticipated that rainfall would be filtered through the tree canopy, and during discussions with officers the applicant's design team felt that the noise of rainfall could add to the experiential quality of staying in a woodland environment. All external materials would be confirmed through the discharge of the materials condition, so there is an ability to modify these.</p>	
10	58	4.11	<p><u>Additional comments from Natural England:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the principle and welcomes revised proposals for wetland, riparian and wet woodland habitats. • Revised design addresses previous concerns. • Confirm that 4,000kg of nitrates could be removed by the scheme, based on calculations. • An appropriate flow of water through the site could be achieved, subject to some minor amendments to the proposed re-profiling of the land. (Officer note – recommendation includes a condition relating to levels which would cover this.) <p><u>Recommend the following be secured either via condition or legal agreement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure the function of the wetland prior to the occupation of any dwelling relying on the scheme. • Use of the land is changed from agricultural to a wetland function for removing nitrates. • Nitrogen Saving Statement to cover an agreed budget and confirm the catchment that the scheme would be effective for. 	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and management strategy for the lifetime of the development, including appropriate funding, responsibilities and means to secure any remedial works as needed. Protocol for report results of the monitoring. 	
10	59	4.9	Further response from the Landscape Officer on the revised scheme, which re-iterates comments already summarised in the Report.	Update
10	59	Section 4	<p>Additional consultee response, as follows:</p> <p>Lead Flood Authority (Hampshire County Council): No objection (no conditions recommended).</p>	Update
10	n/a	n/a	<p><u>Clarification sought from Members, as follows:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How will the credit scheme work and who will review this? How many schemes for removing nitrates are there along the River Meon? In drought conditions does the water still flow through the site? What is the timeframe for implementing the development? The Ecologist has objected due to the timing of the ecological survey (January), can we require that further survey work at the appropriate time is undertaken, such as a condition? <p><u>Officer responses:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme is based upon the capacity of the wetland to remove nitrates and the specific amount of nitrates each individual development elsewhere needs to off-set. In this instance, the wetland is anticipated to be capable of removing 4,000kg of nitrates per year. If a residential development elsewhere produced 200kg of nitrates per year, for example, this amount would be deducted from the 4,000kg. The 200kg would be a 'credit.' A credit does not equate to a consistent amount of nitrates, rather it depends on what a specific development needs to offset. The scheme would be monitored and administered via the management arrangements secured in the S106, including keeping a record of what development is utilising it. Officers know of 2 other schemes within the River Meon catchment, both are yet to be implemented. Yes, based on the assessment undertaken by Natural England. It is anticipated works would start late summer/early autumn, subject to the completion of the S106 Agreement and the discharge of conditions. The recommendation in the report states that Permission would not be granted until further survey work has been undertaken to the satisfaction of the SDNPA. 	Clarification

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
11	72	new paragraph after para 2.2	<p>A new paragraph to be inserted after para 2.2 of the covering report as follows:</p> <p>The SPD provides further detail on the issue of perpetuity. Policy SD28 states that where feasible affordable housing should remain affordable in perpetuity. The SPD provides further information in regard to shared ownership and staircasing. Policy SD29 requires all affordable housing on rural exception sites to be affordable. The SPD states that all affordable homes provided through Whole Estate Plans should be provided in perpetuity.</p>	For clarity