

## **WRITTEN DEPUTATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE**

These written deputations are to be considered in line with the Council's deputation scheme.

### **5. Deputations**

To receive any deputations of which notice has been lodged.

(1) **WRITTEN DEPUTATIONS** (Pages 1 - 2)

**For further information please contact:  
Democratic Services, Civic Offices, Fareham, PO16 7AZ  
Tel:01329 236100  
[democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk)**

## Written Deputation – Tracey Viney – Item 6(2) – Meon Bye Farm

I maintain my **objection** to application **P/23/0944/FP** for the following reasons.

- The significant deterioration in the landscape value of the site due to the loss of the valley floodplain and 250m of stream.
- Mitigation proposed does not offset the loss of the stream,
- The objective of the works was to improve drainage and it has failed to do this, as evidenced by the fact that Posbrook Lane has flooded more than once on this dangerous bend since filling was completed, including on 4 January 2024 when the road was made impassable by 2ft of water, which also flooded into the adjacent residential garden.
- The Flood Risk Assessment is clearly flawed as the road floods because the capacity of the pipe carrying the stream is not adequate to stop severe storm water backing up.

However, if the committee is  **minded to grant consent I would ask** that;

1. Condition 5 which would prohibit the use of the site for grazing be amended to allow for non-food chain grazing (e.g. ponies). This was the original use of the site and permitting this would help with the conservation management of the restored grassland at the site.
2. The period for conservation management stipulated in Condition 5 be extended to a minimum of 80 years, as recommended by Natural England and that this should apply to the whole site not just the southern area.
3. There be a requirement to monitor for 5 years for the decline or death of mature trees along the north and west boundary where the Root Protection Zones have been buried and the Tree Officer confirmed a detrimental impact is likely. If adverse impacts are detected appropriate mitigation/ compensation actions must be agreed with the LPA.
4. The CEMP be updated to;
  - Address the risk of drainage of polluted water to the Canal, NNR & SPA, including silt run off during further works.
  - Remove non-permitted materials from the site surface & soil stockpiles, including plastic, metal, tarmac etc. (*photos previously provided to committee*)
5. The developer should be required to repair damage which occurred to the road edge when tipping was underway, which remains fenced off due to safety concerns by red tape.
6. Inconsistencies previously highlighted in the drawings submitted be addressed so that it is clear as to what is being approved in Condition 1.

## **Written Deputation – Jonathan Warburton – 6(2) – Meon Bye Farm**

As the property owners whose garden is adjacent to the western boundary at the northern end of the site under consideration, we would raise the following points. In order for the Committee to be able to undertake a considered and informed decision regarding the application, it is necessary to have full and accurate information which, unfortunately, is currently not the case.

Prior to making some specific comments to correct factual inaccuracies in the Officer Report dated 22 May 2024, we would strongly dispute that the works undertaken have resulted in improved drainage. Our driveway and garden have never flooded until January 2024 when the new pipe designed to take the water at the northern end of the field was unable to cope with the volume. Consequently, Triangle Lane flooded on the corner of the road adjacent to the field (impassable to cars) and the flood water found an exit through our driveway and back garden causing some damage. Since then, our garden has been saturated with water standing along our eastern boundary (the western boundary of the field) for much of the time. We have NEVER suffered from this problem before.

Regarding the Officer Report, paragraph 3.2 states:

“The changes to the levels have been made to allow the runoff water..... into two conveyancing channels created along the east and west boundaries, which remain at the same levels of the original land, to carry runoff surface water to the pond at the south of the site.”

There is no conveyancing channel on the west boundary (i.e. adjacent to our property) or east. The field has been raised by 88cm (the width of four scaffold boards) at our boundary. To state that a) there is a channel and b) it is at the original height of the field is simply WRONG. There is no channel and the field is significantly higher than the original height. In a desperate attempt to prevent further flooding on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2024 an emergency channel was hastily dug but that is very shallow, incomplete and well above the height of the original field. Paragraph 8.7 repeats this incorrect statement.

Paragraph 8.23 states:

“No trees or hedgerows have been removed.....”.

This is totally incorrect. A mature hedgerow and tree to the south of our property on the western border of the field was removed. Photographs are available if needed.