

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS SHEET

Date: 19 December 2023

The following is a list of the additional representations received since the Planning Committee Agenda was published and includes background papers received up to and including the Monday before the meeting.

A general indication of the content is given but it may be necessary to elaborate at the meeting.

| Agenda Item No | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 5c | <p>22/00857/PIP - Land To The Rear Of Cleeve Road, Gretton Road, Gotherington,</p> <p>Committee Update</p> <p>Within Paragraph 9.1 of the conclusion of the report it states 'the appeal' must be determined in accordance with paragraph 11 (d) (ii) of the NPPF, this should say 'the decision' rather than 'the appeal'.</p> |
| 5d | <p>23/00280/FUL- Bushcombe House Farm , Bushcombe Lane, Woodmancote</p> <p>1.0 Late Representation from Councillor Adcock</p> <p>Comment on Water Management Plan for 23/00280/FUL Bushcombe House Farm, Woodmancote - Written by Nigel Adcock as Woodmancote Flood Warden.</p> <p>As of this morning I cannot open the water management part of the plan on the portal.</p> <p>I am becoming increasingly concerned over the cumulative impact of development on the lanes that lead from Cleeve Hill into Woodmancote. Each and every application states that we are not in flood zone 1, insinuating that flooding is not an issue for the village. We are a very long way from a river so in this sense that is correct. However, our particular geology and topography do lead to surface water flooding generated by big rainfall events. These are becoming more common. I have noticed that periods of prolonged rainfall are more frequent, meaning that the limestone hill and the clay upon which much of Woodmancote is built is saturated for longer. Any heavy rainfall event will therefore have a greater impact on the village.</p> <p>Developers often quote the drainage hierarchy in their plans. Often choosing the lowest rungs on the hierarchy as their plan to deal with excess water. The best option for excess water is to let it infiltrate the ground. More paved surface area including rooftops, patios, roads, driveways, paths etc will obviously inhibit this process. So there is more mention of attenuation tanks and hydro brakes with the assumption that they will replicate the behaviour of open ground. This is often followed by the suggestion that any excess water not dealt with by attenuation tanks and hydro brakes will then be allowed to follow our small and often inundated local watercourses. They also site the use of Severn Trent's combined sewer infrastructure as being a possibility. I know from Severn Trent that they do not want storm water entering their already struggling (225mm or</p> |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <p>300mm) combined sewers. These sewers often "lock out " in terms of high rainfall meaning they cannot accept any more water. This weekend we have had raw sewage entering gardens in nearby Chapel Lane. The cause of this hasn't been found yet. It is still being investigated. Excess rainwater must contribute towards this situation amongst a variety of other reasons.</p> <p>I also have concerns over Riparian rights. Surely there is a responsibility not to pass excess water on to roads or downstream neighbours. On Thursday 8th December 2023 significant water was flowing rapidly down both sides and across Bushcombe Lane. This will only be added to by another development in this location.</p> <p>The slope of the lanes also needs to be considered given the steepness and potential instability of soils. I fear this might lead to land slips under certain conditions.</p> <p>Nigel Adcock (Flood Warden, Parish and Borough Councillor) 10th December 2003.</p> <p>2.0 Officer Comments</p> <p>Officers have checked and can assure that all documents are available to view via public access. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such, there are no policy requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.</p> <p>Officers have suggested a drainage condition (Condition 13) which requires the developer to submit detailed drainage information prior to the commencement of any development on the site. The developer is aware of, and has agreed to, this condition. Therefore, notwithstanding Councillor Adcock's comments, it is considered that the development can be made to be acceptable subject to the suggested detailed condition.</p> |
| <p>5e</p> | <p>23/00874/FUL - Part Parcel 8019, Chargrove Lane, Up Hatherley</p> <p>Four additional representations received</p> <p>1. Member of the Public:</p> <p>Existing field gate should continue to be used and widened if necessary</p> <p>Use of existing access will not harm setting of historic South Park gates</p> <p>Complete map of applicant's land has not been supplied</p> <p>Chargrove Lane is a low traffic recreational lane</p> <p>Agricultural justification not established.</p> <p>2. Councillor G M Porter:</p> <p>This application has come before the Committee a third time having had the benefit of a deferment to seek revisions which were still considered unacceptable. This present application has, it is admitted, reduced the size and scale which before were grossly out of proportion; however I still believe this proposed access is unduly harmful without the outweighing benefits which would justify it.</p> <p>It must first be recognised that access to this piece of land already exists and</p> |

has been used for many years without incident. The applicant refers to the moving of cattle and fodder which is apparently difficult with the existing access. I think this is somewhat exaggerated as a key part of this proposal is that the large vehicles which had been proposed on the previous occasion are no longer going to be used.

Adding more access from Chargrove Lane to a piece of land which is already accessible is in my submission severely detrimental to the character of the lane, and detracts from its undeveloped and rural nature. It is true that the applicant has found it difficult to use the existing access when cars have been parked on the lay-by (although how often there are cars parked there is debatable, as I am a frequent walker and only rarely see cars parked there); it is also true that the applicant can and has used the existing access in the past, with surely only minor inconvenience - perhaps the vehicle had to reverse onto the drive at South Park farm. I fail to see how the access proposed will be any easier than what they already do, especially when the majority of their business will be moving hay to and from the site.

I am prepared to admit the applicant suffers some inconvenience and I might be persuaded that this inconvenience will be ameliorated by the proposed access; however, I think far too little weight has been placed to the 60m of well established - indeed ancient - hedgerow which forms the attractive and much loved periphery of this well used road. Chargrove Lane, although lacking formal designation, is a valued walking route which, it is admitted in the report, will suffer from the granting of this application. I do not think the applicant has submitted compelling enough reasons for the destruction of the hedgerow - although replanting is proposed as a condition, we must acknowledge the time it takes for hedges to grow and establish themselves and the possibility that they may fail after the five year maintenance period cannot be ignored. The benefits to the rural economy - which under any reading surely must be considered minor - are, in my view, not sufficient to outweigh these concerns.

I should also point out that the piece of land directly adjacent to this parcel is a designated nature reserve, and one which both Shurdington and Up Hatherley Parish Councils are proud of and are working to improve and preserve. The impact of the works themselves, as well as the intended use of this large access route, will doubtless have a deleterious effect on that reserve, which though dormant for many years has now become a cherished part of the lane.

3. Agent for the applicant:

The agent has highlighted an error in the Committee report. The applicant accepts the visibility splay would be 60m in total; however there is not currently 60m of hedge within the visibility splay, (as the report describes) due to extensive gaps. The Case Officer agrees that reinstatement (albeit in a different position) would result in a net gain of hedge, according to the landscaping plan.

4. Gloucestershire County Council Highways:

The Highways Officer has no objection but requested a condition to secure a highway cleaning management plan, in the event mud is transferred from the field onto the highway.

An additional condition is proposed:

Prior to first use of the access proposed, a highway cleaning management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall not be used other than in accordance with the approved highway cleaning management plan.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway safety.