

Planning Committee Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
6	19	5.1	<p><u>Further letter of representation (objection) received from Petersfield Climate Action Network (PeCAN), as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have examined the revised plans and our previous concerns have not been addressed.</li> </ul>	Update
6	21	5.1	<p><u>Letter of representation (support) received from Hampshire Chamber of Commerce as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal would be of significant benefit to SDNP in regard to provision of recreational facilities, to assist with further tourism, job creation for the area, as well as additional income for the local economy.</li> <li>• Welcome the focus on sustainability, aim to increase biodiversity, on-site renewable energy, EV charging points, provision of activities and facilities to assist with health and wellbeing in outstanding surroundings.</li> <li>• Urge that transport needs and requirements are recognised to ensure that public transport is fully accessible with sufficient traffic management.</li> </ul>	Update

6	23	7.5	<p><u>Update to Other Relevant Policy Documents:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buriton Village Design Statement 2017</li> </ul>	Correction
7	43	Recommendation (front page) and paragraph 8.1	<p>1) That planning permission be granted subject to:</p> <p>i) A S106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, <del>in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee</del>, to secure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 x 2bed Affordable Housing Units</li> <li>Informal public open space management scheme</li> <li>BNG enhancement scheme</li> </ul> <p>ii) The conditions set out in paragraph 9 of the report <b>and update sheet</b></p> <p>2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse Planning Permission, with appropriate reasons, if the legal agreement is not completed, or insufficient progress made, within six months of the 11 April 2024 Planning Committee meeting.</p>	Update
7	45	Paragraph 1.1	<p>1.1 The site is situated within the settlement boundary of Steep. It is broadly square in shape and extends to approximately 0.57 ha. <b>The red line boundary of the application site does not form the whole site allocation – as referred to in point 2 of the executive summary.</b></p>	Bold text inserted for clarity
7	46	Paragraph 2.1	<p>The site is allocated as SD89 in the Local Plan and pre application discussions occurred under references SDNP/21/05912/PRE (withdrawn) and SDNP/22/05378/PRE (written advice issued). The executive summary of the pre application response advised that; <del>the principle of residential development for 9 dwellings on the site (redline boundary the same as this application) was acceptable and the level of community engagement was noted, but that a successful proposal must be compliant with policy.</del> <b>The principle of residential development is acceptable given the site's allocation in</b></p>	Precis of pre application advice deleted and full executive summary of pre application advice provided.

			<p><b>the Local Plan, however officers are concerned that the development of the proposal does not show evidence of a landscape-led scheme that responds to site-specific or local characteristics. Furthermore, the size and mix of dwellings proposed would not satisfactorily address Local Plan Policies. The quality of design, particularly in terms of layout and coverage over the site, needs to be fully informed by the landscape context of the site and how the proposals can conserve and enhance landscape /townscape character along with delivering other multiple benefits in regard to meaningful green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain and sustainable drainage. It is acknowledged that you have expended considerable effort in undertaking community consultation, and have endeavoured to reflect the aspirations of those residents of Steep that participated and responded to the consultation. However, a successful proposal must be compliant with policy, as expressed in the South Downs Local Plan which should be considered as a whole; relevant Supplementary Planning Documents; and national policy.</b></p>	
7	49	Paragraph 5.2	<p>I neutral comment that raises questions regarding community and applicant <del>corporation</del> <b>cooperation</b></p>	Typo Correction
7	49	Paragraph 5.3	<p>At the time of writing 23 letters of objection have been received. <b>An additional 11 letters of objection have been received since the publication of the committee report, including a Barristers Opinion from Steep Together. These letters can be reviewed here; <a href="https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/SDNP/23/03766/FUL">SDNP/23/03766/FUL   Land South of Church Road Steep Petersfield Hampshire (southdowns.gov.uk)</a></b></p>	Update
7	51	Paragraph 6.3	<p><u>Most relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Section 12: Achieving well designed and beautiful places</u></li> </ul>	Correction

7	51	Paragraph 7.2	<p>The application site is <u>part</u> of site allocation SD89 which states; “Land South of Church Road, Steep is allocated for the development of between 8 and 12 Residential Dwellings (Class C3 use). Planning permission will not be granted for any other use. <b>The application site and the redline boundary only form part of site allocation SD89. The whole site allocation is 0.7 hectares and includes land immediately adjacent to the application site and to the south of the existing Village Hall car park. The application site excludes this area and is 0.57 hectares, or 81% of the site allocation.</b> Detailed proposals that meet the following site-specific development will be permitted”</p>	<p>Underline emphasis added. Italics added. Text in bold added</p>
7	51	Paragraph 7.3	<p><b>Despite the fact that the application site is smaller than the site allocation, it is considered that the development shown within the redline boundary is capable of meeting the policy requirements of SD89 within the reduced area and as set out above.</b> Given <del>the above</del> <b>this</b> the proposals are considered to accord with policy SD1 and SD89 and the principal of development is acceptable, subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the local plan which are discussed further below.</p>	<p>Text added in bold</p>
7	53	Paragraph 7.10	<p>The design officer considers the materials palette to be broadly acceptable, the use of Indian sandstone is concerning because it is neither locally characteristic nor (if from India) sustainable. A materials condition is recommended (Condition Number 3) to ensure a high quality palette is secured. Overall, <b>and taking into account that this is a site allocation which is supported by an extensive and robust evidence base, including a number of studies relating to the first purposes of the National Park (see Paragraph 9.2 of the Local Plan)</b> the proposed scheme is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of this part of Steep. <b>The development will change the landscape character of the existing green field, but this principle has already been considered when the site was allocated for residential</b></p>	<p>Text added in bold</p>

			development. An alternative streetscape, where well designed houses front both the road and a new area of green space will develop as a result of the proposals. The broadly linear form of development proposed, coupled with the detailed design and materials of the proposed properties, will enhance the landscape character of this part of Steep.	
7	55	Third sentence; Paragraph 7.32	Sections of this-site <b>hedge</b> must be	Typo Correction
7	62	Background Documents	National Planning Policy Framework 2023 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/101391/nppf-2023.pdf">National Planning Policy Framework (publishing.service.gov.uk)</a>	Correction
7		Condition 12	site layout plan 22 Rev <b>D</b>	Correction
8	67 & 79	Recommendation (front page) and paragraph 9.1.	<p><u>Update to the Recommendation, as shown:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning, <del>in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee</del>, to grant planning permission subject to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The satisfactory resolution of the issue of nitrate neutrality.</li> <li>ii) A S106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, <del>in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee</del>, to secure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nitrate neutrality mitigation measures (as necessary)</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii) The conditions set out in paragraph 9.2 of the report <b>and update sheet</b> and any amendments or other conditions required to address nitrate neutrality, as necessary.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse Planning Permission, with appropriate reasons, if matters relating to</li> </ol>	Update

			nutrient neutrality have not been resolved, or the legal agreement is not completed, or insufficient progress made, within six months of the 11 April 2024 Planning Committee meeting.	
8	72	4.6	<p><u>Further comments received from Droxford Parish Council, as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecology: especially, but not limited to, the need for protection of all elements of the River Meon; the Mill Leat; and the flora and fauna of the application.</li> <li>• Road safety when entering/leaving the site via the A32; notorious section of road for speeding and accidents; mitigation needs to be considered.</li> <li>• Village access: provision of a footpath from the site to the village, linking with existing pavements/paths, needs to be considered to mitigate road safety concerns whilst connecting the development to village amenities.</li> </ul>	Update
8	72	4.8	<p><u>Response received from the Environment Agency, as follows:</u></p> <p>Environment Agency: No objection, subject to conditions.</p> <p>Conditions to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Piling and other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.</li> </ol> <p>Reason: To ensure that the proposed development, does not harm groundwater resources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The development shall be undertaken in full accordance with the submitted Geo Environmental Investigation (ref: R0191/20, dated May 2020) and the Remediation Strategy Report (ref: IN21638 CL 002, dated December 2021). Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report demonstrating the completion in full</li> </ol>	Update

			<p>of the works set out in the Remediation Strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete.</p> <p>3. If, during the development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented in full as approved.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site.</p>	
8	77	7.18	<p><u>Update to bullet point 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water usage – <b>105L</b>/p/p/d</li> </ul>	Correction
8	82	9.2	<p><u>Update to criterion (c) of condition 12, as follows:</u></p> <p>c) Have a predicated water consumption of no more than <b>105</b> litres per person per day and that the development is water neutral.</p>	Correction

