

SDNPA Planning Committee July 11

Item 7: 11/01711/FULNP Amended recommendation

The committee is recommended to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:
Having regard to:

- the substantial harm to the significance of the grade II* Sanatorium and Chapel and the less than substantial harm to the grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden by reason of development which adversely affects their fabric and setting;
- the financial appraisals which have not demonstrated that the enabling development will secure the long term future of the heritage assets and the public benefits will be delivered without the need for further enabling development which will have an unknown impact on the significance of the heritage assets;
- the inherent needs of the heritage asset rather than the circumstances of the present owner or the purchase price paid;
- the lack of evidence to demonstrate there is no alternative to support the heritage assets without the need for enabling development;
- the design and type of development that will harm other public interests;

it is considered that the public benefit of bringing the heritage assets back into use does not outweigh the following disbenefits of departing from the development plan:

1. The proposal in conjunction with the development proposed in application 10/04389/FULNP is for a major development within a remote part of the South Downs National Park where there is a presumption against major development.
2. The proposal in conjunction with the development proposed in application 10/04389/FULNP is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and national planning policy in that it proposes new residential development outside any area allocated in the development plan for that purpose for which there is no proven need which will adversely affect the character and appearance of the landscape and social well being of the community in this part of the SDNP.
3. The development is proposed in an unsustainable location where there is limited access to services and facilities essential for day to day living which will result in an over-reliance on the private car.
4. The activity during construction and when the development is brought into use will adversely affect the tranquillity of this remote area and the quiet enjoyment of the special qualities of the SDNP.
5. The alterations to the A286-Kings Drive junction and to Kings Drive will have an inappropriately urbanising effect on the rural character of the area.
6. There is no provision for affordable housing.
7. There is no provision for transport contributions to mitigate against the use of the private car;
8. There is no provision for a means of securing mitigation for the potential impact on the SSSI from domestic pets consequently there is a risk to protected species of ground nesting birds.

The proposal is therefore contrary to PPS5 policies HE9.1, HE9.2, HE9.3, HE9.4, HE10.1, HE11, national planning policy set out in Circular 20/10, PPS3 PPS4 PPS7, PPS9, PPG13 and the following policies of the development plan: policies C2, CC1, CC4, CC6, H1, H3, BE6 and SP3 of the South East Plan 2006-2026 and policies, BE4, BE5, BE11, BE12, RE1, RE15 and RE28 of the Chichester District Local Plan.