

Planning Committee Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	19	4.3	<p>A further letter of representation was received by Buriton Parish Council which detailed the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted in correspondence from Applicant that landowner has dictated that all affordable housing must be delivered for local people and a similar provision for private housing too. Parish Council ask whether the normal cascade of local connections will be adjusted to prevent occupancy by anyone without a relevant connection to Buriton, and how will the similar provision for private housing be made, and will this be in perpetuity? <i>Officer Comment: The cascade will not be adjusted. The cascade will follow the usual route, and clearly those with local connections to the area will be at the top of the cascade. The provision for private housing to be delivered for local people is not something that has been put forward as part of the application, or could be legally secured as part of the application process.</i></li> <li>2. Noted that the release of the site is for the greater good of the Buriton community and not for personal financial gain. Are the proceeds from the sale to be retained “for the greater good of the Buriton community?” <i>Officer Comment: The owner’s legal agent merely stated that the release of the land was not for personal financial gain. The Authority does not hold information on the finances involved in the transaction between the owner and the developers. Neither should such information be relevant in the consideration of an application. Irrespective of comments made by the owner’s agent about the profits being used for philanthropic reasons, this would not be a planning consideration.</i></li> <li>3. There still appears to be some misunderstanding by the developers and/or agents as there need be no loss of good quality farming land nor any impacts on animals. <i>Officer Comment: The land owner has mentioned this in discussions and that there could be some conflicts. Irrespective, the land is not available.</i></li> <li>4. Other suitable options were put forward by the Parish Council on the 14<sup>th</sup> February, have these been explored? <i>Officer Comment: The ‘opportunities’ all involve a need for release of the land, which the land owner does not wish to offer.</i></li> </ol>	Further representation

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<p>5. Is it possible to reserve CIL funding to pay for measures to improve safety and amenity along Greenway Lane at some point in the future such as a segregated path or traffic calming measures? <i>Officer Comment: The Authority cannot reserve CIL ahead of bidding, nor secure CIL contributions to a particular project as part of an application. The Parish Council would need to submit a CIL bid and make a good case at the appropriate time, together with a consideration of using their own 'neighbourhood portions' of CIL towards such a project.</i></p> <p>6. A new issue has arisen regarding the 6 foot masonry wall to be built across the back of some of the gardens of Glebe Road. How will the Glebe Road side be maintained, how would access to do this be made? Is it necessary to have a solid wall that is 6 foot high? <i>Officer Comment: This relates to a boundary feature at 2m high, which is a standard height on residential properties in order to protect privacy of local residents. It was a requirement to be a more substantial boundary treatment to prevent lights from cars shining through the boundary treatment to protect the visual amenity of the Glebe Road residents. The addition for planting of the wall was to help join up the landscape buffers on this side of the site and provide a certain level of biodiversity enhancements such as bee bricks (6 in the wall) and foliage. The side facing Glebe Road is to be planted up and this is within the public domain of the site so that the maintenance will fall under the maintenance plan of the development. Condition 12 specifically relates to maintenance.</i></p>	
7	20	5.2	<p>A further two public objections have been made which raise some of the same points as previously addressed in the report under Appendix I. However, there was comments made on the timelines to attend the planning committee and how it does not allow sufficient time to attend the meeting to make a representation. The other new comment was on the fact that the affordable housing has been segregated from the rest of the site. <i>Officer Comment: Notification is sent out to all those who have made a formal representation on the planning application one week prior to Planning Committee and further information on this is detailed on our public website. Regarding the affordable housing location, this is not considered to be contrary to planning policy, they are in a location providing 2/3 of the frontage to Greenway Lane and nestled sufficiently within the site to be fully integrated within the site. The location makes logical sense in terms of the affordable housing maintenance as 3 of the 4 proposed units are for renting.</i></p>	Further representations

