

SDNPA Planning Committee 15 March 2012: Updates

Agenda Item	Page No	Paragraph	Update	Source/Reason
5	15	5.5	4 th bullet point should be 'Major' not 'Manor'	Typing error
5	17	6.4	'representation' should read 'consultation'	Typing error
5	22	8.25	'south east' should read 'south-west'	Typing error
5	23	10.1 (i)	Insert 'the consultation on the EHDC and SDNPA Joint Core Strategy' as a 4 th bullet point	
6	26		A number of contributors have expressed concern that they were not given sufficient notice of the application being heard at committee. The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) work in partnership with Chichester District Council to provide the planning service in this area. Chichester District Council do not notify contributors when applications are heard at a Planning Committee, however given the level of interest in this application, the SDNPA have notified contributors of the committee. This publicity is above and beyond that usually provided for planning applications going to committee.	Clarification
6	27	2.6	E.M.C Dementia car should read Electronic Medicines Compendium Dementia care	Typing error
6	26	1.3	The Park House Hospice caters for direct referrals as well as patients from St Magnus Hospital and Rosemary Park Nursing Home	Further information
6	26	1.4	Rosemary Park Nursing Home is registered to care for 78 residents, St Magnus Hospital cares for 40 patients and Park House cares for 18 patients.	Further information
6	27	3.1	The staff living in the proposed accommodation will be there on a permanent basis.	Further information
6	28	5.1	<p>The applicant submitted further information and justification for the development in combination with amended plans for the design of the building. The application was re-publicised to the contributors and subsequently 9 further letters of objection were received making the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amended plans do not overcome our concerns that the expansion of this site will have an adverse visual impact on this sensitive landscape. Would like to re-iterate that a cap on numbers of patients should be placed on the nursing home The submitted information does not overcome our concern over the impact of the development on highway safety of Marley Lane. It is single-track in places, steep in others, and 	Additional responses

Agenda Item	Page No	Paragraph	Update	Source/Reason
			<p>passes through some awkward cuttings. Additional residential staff at Rosemary Park will inevitably lead to an increase in that burden beyond the capacity of this lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timing of the notification for the planning committee is insufficient and we should be given more time. <p>These points have been addressed in the main agenda report.</p>	
6	30	10.1	<p>Given the sensitivity of the site it is considered reasonable and necessary to have a condition requiring details of external lighting on the site to be submitted to and approved in writing by the South Downs National Park Authority. The condition is as follows; No development shall commence until details of external lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the South Downs National Park Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure the development conserves the character and setting of the South Downs National Park in accordance with policy RE1 of the Chichester District Local Plan 1999.</p>	Additional condition
7	35	5.2	<p>Four further third-party representations have been received three of which were letters of objections raising the additional issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate parking provision Impact of the A27 upon the amenity of the proposed lodges Does not accord with the Warningcamp Village Plan <p>The other third-party representation was from Angmering Park Estate which, whilst not objecting to the proposal, sought to make the SDNPA aware that access to their private forestry tracks were by licence and the owners of the application site currently have a one year licence "for a local horse rider and not to form part of a wider development scheme".</p>	Additional responses
7	38	10.1	<p>A clarification to the reason for refusal is required to include explicit reference to design (rather than the previous inferred reference) as follows:</p> <p>(i). The proposed development, by reason of its location outside any settlement boundary, lack of association with an established tourist facility and the introduction of eight poorly designed lodges and associated equestrian and domestic paraphernalia, would be harmful to the character of the countryside and the landscape character of the South Downs National Park contrary to Saved Policies DEV5, DEV39 and GEN3 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 and the aims and intentions of PPS7 (Para 39 (i)) and the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism 2006 (Para 5.5).</p>	Clarification
9	48		<p>Item No. 9 has been deferred for consideration at the 12th April 2012 SDNPA planning committee. This is to allow the item to be considered concurrently with a recent additional consultation received</p>	

Agenda Item	Page No	Paragraph	Update	Source/Reason
			from Brighton and Hove City Council regarding a planning application for the construction of 684 car parking spaces at the Former Falmer High School in Brighton	
10	56	4.1	This appraisal was initially undertaken by Chichester District Council and costs of preparation and public consultation have been borne by them. There are costs involved in the implementation of the proposed action points in Part 2, the Management Proposals, but the majority of these will be absorbed within existing budgets for the Planning Service. In instances where costs cannot be so contained, efforts will be made to secure external funding and the action point will be reviewed if this is not forthcoming.	Clarification
11	60	2.1	A further 2 responses have been received since the report was published	Additional responses
11	60	3.3	A further response has suggested that the requirement should be only where traffic is significantly increased	Additional responses
11	61	3.4	A further response suggests that it should only be required where affordable housing is proposed	Additional responses
11	61	3.5	A further 2 responses consider the approach disproportionate and one response refers to internal works to a listed building or change of use. In the light of these responses it is proposed to clarify that applications for internal works to listed buildings are excluded from this requirement	Additional responses
11	62	Appendix 2	Revised – additional comments added in italics and change in no of responses in disagreement emboldened	Additional responses
12	77	Appendix 3 footnote NB	Change 'Councillor' to 'Member on both occurrences	Typing mistake