

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.