

Planning Dept.,

Waverley Borough Council,

The Burys,

GODALMING. BY EMAIL

2 February 2018.

Dear Sirs,

Application 2017/0277

Lythe Hill Hotel, Haslemere.

Having read through the significant amount of amended information recently submitted The Haslemere Society makes the following response, which is made relative to the comments in our previous letter dated 5 April 2017 :-

1. Although many new drawings have been submitted these do not provide sufficient information on the external details and type and quality of external building materials to enable a comprehensive assessment of the application to be made. This application is for a major development within a highly protected AONB and AGLV and the applicant has gone to some length to try to persuade the Planning Authority that a ‘’Very Special Case’’ exists to allow its construction. Similar effort should be expended to demonstrate that the quality of the detailed design and materials are commensurate with this protected location. In Local Plan Policy D4 Waverley B C undertakes to ensure that development is of a high quality which integrates well with the site and compliments its surroundings.
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1. The new lighting report whilst recognising previous adverse comments has indicated desirable changes to reduce light pollution in this rural area but the report is only couched in general terms without any detailed information including for example an external lighting layout. We remain unconvinced that light pollution via the fenestration of the buildings will not be significant and undesirable.
2. We are disappointed at the WBC Environmental Health single and meaningless comment - ‘’potentially contaminated land- no action required’’. There is so little, if any, information and details on waste food and other waste storage and disposal facilities on the site and sewerage treatment considerations and it is surprising that E H has not picked up on this.

 We note that the amended Flood Risk Assessment is now based on some soil investigations which, unsurprisingly indicate that the ground infiltration capacity is very poor and that rainwater run off capacity has been increased from 534 cubic metres in the previous assessment to 759 and that a holistic SuDS must be implemented.

We note reference on the architectural drawings to ‘porous tarmac’ but due to the gradients of some parts of the roads and the fact that beneath this there will have to be a consolidated non porous road sub base this will have no benefit to total water run off.

It is also stated that the existing foul sewerage infrastructure needs to be upgraded and new elements incorporated. New foul treatment plant is recommended.

All of this must be comprehensively addressed in the final design, not least because the stream being used for flood relief and run off from the sewage treatment plant flows through a site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) where Local Plan Policy C10 applies. A regular maintenance programme for the sewage treatment plant needs to be in place.

1. The amended Transport Assessment puts forward some welcome road safety suggestions re signage and road markings. The sight line splay information is helpful from the point of view of traffic leaving the site. As public transport will be used by employees and possibly visitors the provision of safe bus stop facilities is important but appears to have been overlooked.
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Whilst a 1m depth of vegetation removal from the north side of the Petworth Road is proposed to increase the vision for east bound traffic we consider this to be insufficient. A greater depth is required and the embankment needs to be reduced to a verge to allow drivers a straight line clear vision from the location of the new warning sign to a vehicle waiting to turn right into the main hotel entrance is required.

Also the proposed road markings will wear out and we query who will be responsible for ensuring these remain in good condition.

As we indicated in our 5 April 2017 letter we have no objection in principle to the proposed development and the amended information goes some way to addressing concerns we previously mentioned. Our further comments are made constructively with the aim of achieving an application which adequately recognises the implications and the privilege of building such a large commercial enterprise in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Great Landscape Value, which is not normally permitted.

Yours faithfully,

John Greer (Vice Chairman,The Haslemere Society)