

# SDNPA Planning Committee – 21 January 2021

## Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/ Reason
7	9	Executive Summary	The principle of a new grain store and drier is justified on the need for a modern and larger facility with capacity for 3,000 tonnes of grain., <del>increasing the farm's capacity from its current drier's capacity of 1,500 tonnes.</del> The need for a new grain store and drier is mentioned in the endorsed WEP.	Correction
7	9	1.1	Upper Yard is the main agricultural buildings cluster of Newton Valence Farm. The yard is approximately located in the centre of the 518- <del>acre</del> <u>hectare</u> farm and it is accessed from Selborne Road.	Correction
7	10	1.2	The land falls to the west of Upper Yard, there is a tree backdrop to the east of the site and a series of agricultural buildings, structures and hardstanding areas within the yard. <u>The site is located within a cut in the landform, sitting at a lower level than the land to the east and north of the yard.</u> Some of the existing buildings at Upper Yard are underused or redundant as result of the changes of the farm business from dairy to mainly crop business. The site where the new building is proposed covers an area of hardstanding and underused large agricultural buildings, which would be demolished as part of the development. None of these are of any heritage value. They are in very poor state and, from a site inspection, do not appear structurally stable. <b>Officer comment:</b> Additional text included within the site description regarding site levels.	Correction
7	10	1.6	There are several residential properties nearby. Goldridge Cottages, owned and managed by Newton Valence Farm, sit approximately 120 metres to the west of the site. Woodside, <u>also owned and managed by Newton Valence Farm</u> , is located approximately 120 metres to the north of the site and Derwen and Reed Cottages sit over 140 metres to the south.	Correction
7	11	4.1	<b>Newton Valence Parish Council still objects</b> to the planning application. Their main comments are outlined below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planning application has not clarified the future intentions for the A32 site. <b>Officer comment:</b> The agent has clarified that the existing grain store at the A32 will be retained as a stand by facility until the new grain store is fully functional and a final decision can be made about its future. This is covered in paragraph 8.14 of the report.</li> <li>The noise report does not contain information about noise from vehicle movements and from apertures of the buildings. <b>Officer comment:</b> The site is an existing well-established working yard, leading to associated traffic and noise. The number of vehicular movements associated with the existing operation will not be greatly increased by this development as demonstrated in the submitted documents. Therefore, a noise assessment of vehicle movement is not considered by officers to be necessary.</li> </ul>	Parish Council additional comments

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/ Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Environmental Health Officer requested additional information regarding low frequency noise. This information has not been provided. <b>Officer comment:</b> The requested information was provided to the SDNPA on the 4<sup>th</sup> of January 2021. Following its review, the Environmental Health Officer said that it addressed concerns satisfactorily.</li> <li>• The Noise Report’s period of operation of the drain drier (24/7 for 4-6 weeks) differs from the planning statement, which explains the intent to increase the number of crops, which will extend the drying periods. <b>Officer comment:</b> Given that the noise levels and proposed attenuation have been found acceptable by the Environmental Health Officer and these are controlled by condition, no concern is raised to an extended period of use.</li> <li>• The Environmental Health Officer has suggested a planning condition to carry out a noise assessment to demonstrate that noise levels meet the criteria in the noise report. What enforcement measures could be implemented? <b>Officer comment:</b> Condition 9 of the report requires a noise assessment to be undertaken and prior the drier is used. This condition is considered to comply with the NPPF test and as it is enforceable. Any use of the drier prior the discharge of condition 9 by the SDNPA, would lead to a breach of the planning permission and consequent enforcement action.</li> <li>• Policy SD19.3 SDLP states “Development proposals must demonstrate the continued safe and efficient operation of the strategic and local road networks”. Approximately 200 HGV movements on Newton Lane will lead to health and safety issues to cars, cyclists, walkers, horse riders, etc. <b>Officer comment:</b> The Local Highways Authority have confirmed that the proposal will not result in any highway/transportation implication. Highways safety matters are covered in paragraph 8.26 of the report.</li> <li>• The applicant has failed to address the impact that HGV movements would cause to historic sunken lanes. HGVs will cause more damage on roads than tractors and trailers would. The proposal is also incompatible with Policy SD21.3 SDLP with regards to giving “priority to the need of pedestrians, users of mobility aids, cyclists and equestrians...” Its supporting text states: “Development proposals should identify whether the roads are historic rural roads and if so, demonstrate that the historical significance, ecological, landscape and recreational value and character of these roads are conserved and enhanced. The integrity of banks, hedges, walls and roadside trees must be maintained”.</li> <li>• The relocation of the grain store to Upper Yard would exacerbate the health and safety issues due to the increase in large vehicle movements as used by the Livery Stables, dog walkers, cyclists and ramblers. <b>Officer comment:</b> This is covered in paragraphs 8.28 and 8.29 of the report.</li> <li>• The historic bridge over Newton Lane has been repaired by Highways England. Highways England cannot vouch for the structural integrity of the bridge nor the impact of HGVs movements under it. <b>Officer comment:</b> The Local Highways Authority has not raised this as a problem in their consultation responses. There is no evidence before the SNDPA to relate any deterioration of the bridge to the ongoing operations of the farm and associated HGVs movements under the bridge.</li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/ Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upper Yard is within the Dark Skies Core and no external lighting should be permitted. The A32 site is outside of the Dark Skies Core. <b>Officer comment:</b> This matter is covered in paragraphs 8.36 and 8.37 of the report.</li> <li>• The applicant mentions that there is risk of flooding at the A32 site. Hampshire Council is undertaking flood mitigation measures along the A32, accordingly, there won't be any surface water flood risk at the existing site. <b>Officer comment:</b> This is covered in paragraph 8.50 of the report.</li> <li>• The need for a new grain store and drier is detailed in the WEP, but the change in location is not.</li> <li>• The WEP states that the A32 site has excellent transport links being situated next to the A32. No valid reason has been given to using this site for replacement.</li> <li>• The Parish Council does not dispute the need for a new grain store and drier, however the proposed relocation is not supported. <b>Officer comment:</b> Irrespective of the WEP, the application has been assessed against Policy SD39 of the Local Plan, which relates to new agricultural buildings, and it has been found in accordance with policy. This is covered in paragraphs 8.9 and 8.10 of the report.</li> <li>• The Village Plan makes clear the concern of residents about the state of the historic sunken lanes, damage done by HGVs and inability to cope with any increase in traffic. <b>Officer comment:</b> The Village Plan's considerations regarding traffic and sunken lanes are acknowledged and considered in the report (paragraph 8.28).</li> </ul>	
7	16	8.1	<p>No other building within Newton Valence Farm could have met the needs of a modern 3,000 tones grain store. The existing <u>two</u> buildings to be demolished <u>at Upper Yard</u> can store up to 500t of grain <u>each, therefore a total of 1,000t</u>. Their structure is failing and do not have a drier. Their modernisation to a larger store and drier facility is unfeasible. There are no other buildings within the farm that are suitable to use or adapt to a modern grain store and drier facility.</p>	Correction
7	21	10.1	<p>It is recommended to grant <del>outline</del> planning permission subject to the conditions below: [...]</p>	Correction
7	22	Condition 9	<p>Prior to the first use of the grain dryer <u>equipment</u>, the applicant shall carry out a noise assessment to demonstrate the noise levels meet the noise criteria given the Ian Sharland Ltd Noise Impact Assessment v4 ref M4873 dated 18 December 2020. The scope of the assessment shall be agreed in advance with the Planning Authority and the results of the assessment submitted for written approval. The grain dryer shall not be used, <u>except for the purposes of carrying out a noise assessment</u>, until it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority that the noise criteria have been achieved.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents living in vicinity of the grain dryer and relative tranquillity.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The amended wording allows testing the noise levels of the installed drying equipment.</p>	Amendment of condition