

SDNPA Planning Committee 8 August 2013: Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Paragraph	Update	Source/Reason
6	8	Recommendation	<p>Amend recommendation to state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the SDNPA Issue the appended response to the Planning Inspectorate for consideration in the Public Examination 2. That the planning committee agree delegation to the Director of Planning to deal with any matter arising throughout the Examination process 	Additional Information
7	16	4.15	<p>Comments received from EHDC Contract Monitoring Officer – Refuse and Recycling. Made the following comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans for refuse and recycling should be submitted for approval, otherwise be unable to guarantee that contractors will be able to access the development to collect residents domestic waste. 	Additional consultation response
7	16	4.16	<p>Comments received from Natural England: Object due to lack of information on dormice. Made the following comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site close to Selborne Common SSSI, Coombe Wood and The Lythe SSSI. Based on submitted details the development not likely to affect these designated areas. • object due the lack of information on dormice, the submitted details are inadequate to provide advice on the likely impact on the species. Require, as a minimum, a detailed survey. • satisfied appropriate mitigation could be achieved to ensure no impact on bats and newts. Have not accessed badgers, barn owls, breeding birds, water voles or reptiles. • the proposed biodiversity enhancement could be beneficial to wildlife. 	Additional consultation response
7	16	5.2	<p>Comments received from County Councillor Adam Carew: Objecting for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outside the settlement boundary and would have an adverse impact on the SDNP, • contrary to the Selborne Village Community Plan and Village Design Statement, • impact on the setting of grade II listed building, • harm setting of conservation area and village which is internationally recognised due to Gilbert White, • village school is flourishing – do not bus pupils in as claimed, • impact on dark skies, • impact on public right of ways, 	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Paragraph	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inadequate ecology reports, increase traffic. 	
7	17	5.6	9 additional third-party representations received objecting to the application. No additional matters raised.	Update
7	18	5.8	26 additional third-party representations received in support of the application. No additional matters raised.	Update
7	22	8.12	<p>Insert the following wording (in bold) after the third sentence of the paragraph:</p> <p>‘A phase 1 ecology survey has been undertaken which indicates the presence of dormice towards the northern boundary of the site. The applicant acknowledges that a phase 2 survey would be required but argues that the layout, inclusion of the ‘ecology zone’ and retention of northern boundary would prevent a loss of potential dormouse habitat. No phase 2 survey has been completed to support this view Natural England object to the proposed development due to the lack of information provided on the impact on dormice.’</p>	Update
8	28	1.2	The application site area is approximately 2.2 hectares (5.5 acres)	Correction
8	29	3.1	The campsite would be open between 1 April and 31 October.	Additional Information
8	32	10.1	<p>1. The proposed development by virtue of its size, scale, layout and associated camping paraphernalia, exacerbated by the lack of a management plan for the site, would have a significant adverse impact on the appearance and landscape characteristics within this visually sensitive rural landscape of the South Downs National Park. In this respect the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CT1, ST3 and ST11 of the Lewes District Local Plan 2003.</p>	Amended Reason for refusal
10	45	3.4	<p>The applicant has clarified and provided the following information in relation to how the premises is operated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dustbins are stored on site just within the gate to the park. The bin is contractually emptied on Tuesday morning (village waste collection on Monday morning), The Environmental Health report focuses on possible changes to the premises, there are no plans for changes or expansion of the facilities. No changes have been made since the last inspection by Environmental Health 10th April 2012, when the premise was given a ‘4’ rating – (Good). No cooking occurs on the premises. Follow guidelines offered by Environmental Health when serving heated foods that have been pre-cooked. Two delivery vehicles per week. 	Additional information
10	46	4.6	Comments received from the County Highway Authority: No objection and made the following comments:	Additional

Agenda Item	Page No	Paragraph	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no concerns with this retrospective application from a highway safety perspective, • issues have been raised with regards to on-street parking, consideration must be taken of the previous use of the site, the sustainable location and attract mainly locals that live in the area that could walk or cycle, • whilst on-street parking may be an inconvenience, it does ensure speeds are kept to a minimum allowing a safer environment for pedestrians, not amount to a highway safety issue, • advise an area is made available on site for secure and covered cycle parking, to promote sustainable methods of transport. 	consultation response
11	53	5.1	<p>One additional third party representation received objecting to the application which raises the additional points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to 10m as the distance between the properties at paragraph 8.3m is incorrect. The distance between the bay window of no.3 and the wall of no.2 is 6.6m, as measured using a laser distance measurer. <p>The 10m distance referred to at paragraph 8.3 was measured from the submitted ordnance survey plan, but appreciate a measurement from a laser measuring device is more accurate and 6.6m is accepted as the final distance.</p>	Additional response/update
15	73	5.30	<p>A report has been received concerning the draft Neighbourhood Plan from a member of Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (Appendix 3). As a consequence, two options are now proposed for the Syngenta site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Syngenta policy (SA2) should be removed from the Plan as it is premature and considered as part of the options testing for the SDNPA Local Plan. • The SDNPA should engage in discussion with the Parish Council in order to strengthen the robustness of the policy and evidence underpinning it. 	Additional information