WHITEWATER VALLEY
CONSERVATION SOCIETY

21.11.2026

26/01844/OUT Land At Lodge Farm Hook Road North Warnborough

Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) for the phased construction of up to 100,000 sq. m (GIA) of floorspace for flexible uses within Use Class B2 and/or B8 (including ancillary office space and associated plant and equipment); demolition of existing residential dwelling; associated infrastructure including temporary and permanent services and utilities, earthworks, parking, servicing, landscaping, drainage, and vehicular and pedestrian access (including Public Right of Way diversion) and associated works.

Objection comment from Whitewater Valley Conservation Society

The existing site within Lodge Farm is an open landscape, part of the original Deer Park, which runs from the northern edge of Odiham High Street to the M3.

The four Logistics buildings would destroy the open character of the Whitewater Valley with the mass and height (up to 26 metres, including the finished floor level), since, contrary to the applicant's claims, they would be visible from public footpaths and many locations from south east to southwest as can be illustrated by the views of the site's high level pylons which are clearly visible from more than 2.5 miles away (on the footpath east of Five Lanes End).

The attempts to hide the vast buildings with a 30m width band of trees along the southern and eastern side would take many years to establish and even then, would not conceal the huge bulk of the buildings.

The entire tree planting should be questioned as it would not only fail to conceal the mass but in this water stressed area (as EA defined WRZ4 west), the watering requirement to establish the proposed trees is unsustainable and unjustifiable and is

likely to mean that the screening would either not establish successfully or be very slow to establish, thus reducing further the already inadequate screening effect claimed by the applicant.

The river Whitewater is a designated SINC, and an important chalk stream which flows north into the Thames. As a result of pollution and over abstraction causing low flows and siltation, the river is already classified by the EA as failing to meet the required Good Ecological Status.

The gradient of the site means that the river would inevitably be the recipient of whatever escapes from the site under construction, and then during the entire life of the site when utilised by whomsoever occupies it. The sheer volume of traffic use proposed for this site incurs a substantial risk.

This proposed development would be in close proximity to the River Whitewater, which should not be exposed to the level of risk detailed in the quotes below from the Water Resources, Flood Risk and Drainage Report ES Vol 1, Chapter 13 ("WRFRDR"), whether at construction or completed development stage. The precautionary principal should be applied to all such risks instead of being dismissed as negligible. See detail at Note a)[a] below.

The applicant acknowledges the flood risk on the southern and eastern side of the site, yet assumes that the existing drainage ditches, supplemented by SUDS pools would suffice, without any filtration. An unusual rainfall event (of which we are warned to expect increasing numbers) risks causing the attenuation pools to overflow and pollution of the river would inevitably follow. The applicant's own WRFRDR at page 11 admits uncertainty in the light of future climate change projections.

The 14,000 vehicles forecast to enter and leave the site every day, would result in a level of air pollution, noise, and run-off which would impact the river (which lies only 25 metres from the site) and the remains of the valley.

The presence of important wildlife species, such as bats, and snipe which are known to have been regular visitors to the wetland, have been ignored. Planting a few grass seeds is claimed to represent an ecological gain, whereas the loss of the wet areas of the farmland would result in a significant loss to the ecology of the farm.

The buildings and the camouflage itself would effectively destroy the valley of the Whitewater and urbanise it, as well as creating an unnatural, unsustainable activity in what is regarded by the Environment Agency, Natural England and Hart District Council as a gem in the area, which complements both the North Warnborough and Odiham Conservation Areas.

The extent of screening proposed to try to render the application permissible are an indication that the chosen site is entirely unsuitable for the scale and type of activity

proposed. And yet the heritage assessment fails to consider the effect on the cluster of listed buildings at Poland Lane, in close proximity to the site.

The scale would be harmful to all the listed buildings in close proximity, it would downgrade the pleasure many residents and visitors enjoy and it would destroy the northern end of the 12th century deer park which is still clearly readable in the landscape and whose character remains largely unchanged since its use by King John.

All these statements, as explained above, risk exacerbating existing problems with the water quality of the River Whitewater.

For all these reasons the Whitewater Valley Conservation Society asks Hart District Council to **refuse permission**.

---

[a] Note a)

The Water Resources, Flood Risk and Drainage Report ES Vol 1, Chapter 13 identifies construction risks to ground water, surface water runoff and flooding which would all affect the water quality of the River Whitewater if any came to pass. Should permission be considered, very stringent controls should be put in place to remove all possibility of pollution or contamination, which this report dismissively brushes off as of low impact with minor temporary local effect.

On the completed development, the report takes a similar tack – we quote (in italics):

13.7.9 (Alteration to the Drainage Regime and Baseline Hydrology)
The completed drainage system will permanently alter the way surface water is collected and conveyed and discharged from the site. However the resulting changes to the wider drainage regime are ***expected to be limited*** (our bold) ….
Contamination to Surface Water
13.7.15 *Operational activities have potential to introduce contaminants from hard standing areas including petrochemicals, heavy metals and suspended solids….*
13.7.18 The impact magnitude is assessed as 'low' because the proposed SuDS treatment train ***is intended to reduce*** *pollutants in operational runoff before discharge to the receiving water environment and will be maintained throughout the operational life of the development. The residual risk of contamination is* ***expected to be limited where the drainage system is appropriately operated and maintained***.
Contamination to Surface Water from Foul Water Surcharging
13.7.19 Direct and indirect contamination of surface water drainage infrastructure, overland flow routes or receiving drainage channels ***could occur*** *through surcharging of the foul water network or discharge of untreated foul flows. Such incidents could introduce organic matter, nutrients, pathogens and other contaminants into the receiving water environment,* ***potentially affecting water quality and associated ecological receptors***.
Contamination to Ground Water

*13.7.25 Discharge of contaminated water through soils **could degrade water quality and result in associated ecological effects** …*
Existing and New Foul Drainage Sewer Network 1
3.7.30 *The completed Development will require a new on-Site foul drainage network to collect wastewater and convey it to the existing Thames Water sewer network. The introduction of additional foul flows **has the potential to affect the capacity and performance of the receiving sewer infrastructure**. Flooding and contamination could occur due to foul sewer surcharge or discharge of untreated foul flows.*

Note that this part of North Warnborough has a history of the sewage system being overwhelmed by surface water ingress following persistent rainfall.

Interim Utilities Stage
Generator Use, Refuelling and Storage
13.8.2 The principal risks associated with temporary diesel generators and fuel storage relate to the volume of storage required and the refuelling operations of the fuel storage. … it is only when [fuel storage] tanks are being refuelled will most issues be present.
*13.8.8 On that basis, especially considering the use of bunded tanks and a bunded storage area, there is a precautionary approach and the risks are considered low, as these activities are the same **as any fuel filling station in the UK**.*
13.8.9 The provision of potable water storage within the temporary utilities compound, but separate to, the fuel storage area, will not provide any risks, since any release is only releasing potable water into the environment.
*13.9.9 The development is not anticipated to **materially increase flood risk** within the site.*

Note that all potable water is chlorinated which would indeed harm the river Whitewater.