

## SDNPA Planning Committee 10 September 2015: Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	8	1.5	Replace the word 'rail' with 'wire'	Correction
7	12	5.1	<p>Additional correspondence has been received relating to the reporting of the representations. In response, paragraph 5.1 is amended to:</p> <p>260 third party representations have been received. These comprise of 13 objections, 155 in support and 92 neutral responses. Every attempt has been made to record and take into consideration the views of individual contributors. <del>Those recorded as being a neutral response predominantly include identical comments which refer to both supporting and objecting to the application. There are also a number of representations which do not appear genuine. The representations raised the following issues: The SDNPA is aware that there was an unfortunate hacking of the supporter's website which resulted in numerous fictional representations being submitted to the Authority. These contained identical content which refers to both supporting and objecting to the application. These representations are the 92 neutral responses. It is considered that there are a genuine 155 representations which support the application and 13 which object. The representations raise the following issues:</del></p>	Amendment/Clarification
7	12	5.2	<p>3 additional third party responses in support have been received which raise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities are exemplary, well run, bring joy to many people.</li> <li>• Supports the rural economy and horses naturally suited to be part of the rural economy.</li> <li>• Secluded area and would cause minimal disturbance</li> <li>• Re-locating the facility would not be an environmental or aesthetic benefit.</li> <li>• Not visible unless visiting the site</li> <li>• Horses complement the character of the area</li> <li>• Would help the UK to rise in rank in the equestrian arena</li> </ul>	Update
7	14	8.2	Amend 'Appendix 1' to 'Appendix 2'	Correction
7	14	8.8	Insert the word 'to' after 'prior'	Correction

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
8	22	4.9	<p>Drainage Officer: Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that the applicant provides details of how the surface water drainage strategy would address the groundwater flood risk at the site. The proposed development should restrict the surface water discharge rate to no more than the existing greenfield runoff rate from the site.</li> <li>• The development proposals show that one of the sports pitches would require the infilling of one of the ditches on site. The infilling could cause water to pool in the severed section of ditch and remain there for long periods due to the aforementioned groundwater issues. Request that the applicant provide details of how they would address this concern.</li> <li>• Request that the issues are resolved by the applicant prior to permission being granted. If the Authority is minded to approve, it is requested that conditions/informatives are imposed/added.</li> </ul>	Update
8	22	4.10	<p>Ecologist: Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further Information is required to assess the potential impacts of the proposed development on biodiversity, and to provide confidence that appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement will be provided.</li> <li>• The application does not provide a detailed description of how biodiversity could be affected by the proposed development and the measures proposed to ensure significant adverse effects are addressed.</li> <li>• The submitted Extended Phase I Habitat Survey report does not include a data research from the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre. The report includes little contextual information about the site and surrounding area and is not based on the most up-to-date, comprehensive or highest resolution information.</li> <li>• There are multiple records of protected and notable species from the local area. No assessment of hedgerows has been made in terms of their potential to support dormice. Apart from a recommended precautionary approach to site clearance for nesting birds and reptiles, the report makes no/unclear recommendations with regards to the potential for other species or the surveys required.</li> <li>• More detailed assessments are required with respect to potential impacts on reptiles, barn owls, badgers, dormice, plants and invertebrates.</li> <li>• The Report incorrectly refers to the National Park as a non-statutory site, and makes no reference to Local Wildlife sites.</li> </ul>	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Phase I habitat survey plan has not been provided.</li> <li>• Paragraph 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005 states “it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decisions”. The above assessment are therefore required before the application is determined.</li> </ul>	
8	22	4.11	<p>Natural England: Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing Advice should be applied</li> </ul>	Update
8	25	7.1	<p>Policy ST12 needs to be deleted: It is not a saved Policy in the Lewes District Local Plan</p>	Deletion
8	25	7.1	<p>Saved Policy CT1 should be included in the list of policies which are relevant to this proposal. The Policy States:</p> <p>CT1 Development will be contained within the Planning Boundaries as shown on the Proposals Map. Planning permission will not be granted for development outside the Planning Boundaries, other than for that specifically referred to in other chapters of the Plan or listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Institutional sites (Policy CT5)</li> <li>b) New residential development in the Countryside (Policy RES6 &amp; RES7)</li> <li>c) Certain tourism proposals (Policies E12,E14, E16,E17)</li> <li>d) Minor development proposals which are essential to meet the needs of local communities and community services</li> <li>e) Affordable homes exceptions sites (Policy RES10)</li> <li>f) Re-use and adaptation of rural buildings (Policy E9)</li> <li>g) Certain forms of sports, recreational and leisure development (Policy RE4)</li> <li>h) Any other development in the countryside for which a specific policy reference is made else-where in the Plan</li> <li>i) Proposals which feature in an adopted minerals or waste disposal local plan</li> <li>j) Provision of essential/service facilities to meet community or environmental needs for which a rural location is required.</li> <li>k) Development which can be shown to be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture or forestry.</li> </ol>	

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			The retention of the open character of the countryside is of heightened importance where it separates settlements and prevents their coalescence. Development referred to above may not be acceptable where its scale would significantly erode the gap between settlements and detract from their separate identities.	
8	27	8.10	<p>Additional Wording (in italics)</p> <p>More generally there are concerns that despite assurances that there will be no built structures and external lighting, this will not always be practical or feasible and that there may be pressure at a later date to introduce further infrastructure. In addition, whilst the applicant has inferred that the rugby posts would be removed over the summer, they would clearly remain for most of the year. In addition, concern is raised that, were the principle of the proposal to be accepted, this would inevitably lead to additional buildings in the future to meet the aspirations of the club, as highlighted by the applicants submitted comments. Such further building(s) infrastructure and revised parking arrangements could potentially further erode the landscape character in this sensitive location <i>however it must be noted that no weight should be given to what potentially could happen and the application must be considered on its own individual merits.</i></p>	Additional information
8	29	10.1	<p>Amended Wording for Proposed Reason for Refusal I (to include reference to Policy CT1)</p> <p>1. The proposal, by virtue of its nature, extent, resultant parking area and associated human/vehicular activity would have an adverse impact on the landscape character area and the adjoining Conservation Area which could not be mitigated by additional landscaping, due to the location of the site and surrounding topography. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Paragraph 115 of the NPPF which affords National Parks the highest status of protection in relation to scenic beauty, Saved Policies ST3, CT1, CT2 and H5 of the Lewes District Local Plan (2003) and Core Policies 8 &amp; 10 of the Emerging Lewes District Local Plan Core Strategy.</p>	Correction
8	29	10.1	<p>Additional Reason for Refusal (following concerns raised by Ecologist)</p> <p>4. It has not been demonstrated, on the basis of the information submitted with the application, that the proposals would not have an adverse impact on protected species which may or may not be present on the site. In the absence of the required information the proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Paragraphs 109 &amp; 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	Additional reason for refusal