

# SDNPA Planning Committee – 14 September 2017

## Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
3	4	606	Amendment of the wording within the resolution at 1a). From 'to triggers within conditions' to read 'of triggers within conditions'.	Typo
8	11	5.1	Additional letter from resident re-iterating concern regarding pedestrian safety with entrance being moved adjacent to the roadway (concern not having been included in main report). <i>Officer Comment: The location of the building is not considered to have an adverse impact on pedestrian safety and no objection has been raised by the Highways Authority in this regard.</i>	Update
8	11	5.1	Letter from member of Petersfield Squash Club explaining that 'alternative proposals' had been presented to SLM/EHDC to relocate the soft play area and thereby enable retention of Squash Court No1 and only a passing comment has been made to this in the Committee Report (Para 8.31)  The resident states that the document with the alternative proposals sets out to assess matters from a users perspective and examines perceived shortcomings with the current proposals and the advantages gained by grouping activities of younger children in a more safe secure environment away from busy pedestrian through traffic.  The alternative proposals (4 different schemes), involve mainly the relocation of the soft play area and seating area to the rear of the existing offices in the reception (this is currently to the rear of the building and is the location of a fire escape and air conditioning units.) (Members will be shown copies of these alternative layouts, but attention is drawn to Para 8.31 and the applicants reasoning for not pursuing these options.	Update

8	11	5.2	<p>Further letter received from Petersfield Squash Club making following comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee report fails to take errors in justification paper into account.</li> <li>• Report is missing data from Sport England that shows despite national declines in squash participation, participation is up by 6% in Hampshire over the last 10 years.</li> <li>• Para 4.4 – EHDC Sports Development Officer indicates England Squash has stated that PSC can run ES programmes on 2 courts but in brackets it confirms that they have written to confirm this is not the case. This should be the headline.</li> <li>• Para 8.8 – Figures showing usage being 16% in 2015 and 13% in 2016 are completely wrong. In fact figures for bookings rose steeply from 2014 to 2015 and currently is flat on year but still more than 10% higher than 2014. Figures for last year show squash usage rate for all 3 courts across all available bookings to be circa 32%, with court 1 at 22%. This is at odds with information provided in the report. When viewing figures more rationally and looking at peak hours when working adults and children are able to play, rates in typical squash season months as high as 50% for all courts together and 40% for Court 1. Also concern about statement that with 2 courts ‘usage can increase’. Usage of those 2 courts may increase, but overall usage will surely fall.</li> <li>• Para 8.26 – Justification for Policy CP4 states that ‘to meet the needs of the younger generation and to ensure the <u>ageing population</u> is encouraged to keep well and active, sport and recreation facility provision needs to be increased and existing facilities upgraded’. This is not happening here.</li> <li>• Policy CP4 states that no loss in sports pitch or facility will be allowed unless there is clear evidence to support the fact that this is appropriate for the town and its population. This is sports specific and makes no reference to leisure or play. It is clear the intent of the words of CP4 should be read as to mean that a development that results in the loss of a sports facility will only be allowed if the development is for an alternative sports facility. It is not intended as a mix and match between sports/recreation/play facilities.</li> <li>• There is already an existing play zone at the Taro.</li> <li>• If the real reason for the move of the play zone is to provide a multi-use space, then why not use squash court 1 for temporary activities?</li> <li>• Justification provided fails to address any of the needs of Policy CP4.</li> <li>• Does not demonstrate that an alternative squash court of equal or better quality can be provided in an equally accessible location within the Petersfield Area. No mention of any intention to provide alternatives within the Petersfield area. Herne Farm is mentioned but can be discounted as it is a private facility only available to non-residents at the whim of the current management committee.</li> <li>• Does not show that Squash Court 1 is surplus to requirements. Facts and figures show that Squash Court 1 is in regular use to the extent that it is viable, generating more than enough income to cover all costs, overheads and maintenance associated with a squash court.</li> </ul>	Update
---	----	-----	---	--------

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not justify the need for the play zone outweighing the loss of a viable well used squash court.</li> <li>Statements to the effect that the courts are underused during the day are irrelevant. The vast majority of adult sports facilities are not used at all during the day. It is true however that during a typical month of the squash season, such as April 17, there are well over 120 bookings for that month for Squash court 1 with over 60 bookings when Squash Court 1 is the only one left.</li> <li>There are approx.. 20800 available squash court bookings throughout the day, all year across courts. Figures for last 3 years are stable at circa 6600 (32%).</li> <li>Statements that young people are not playing squash are not borne out for Hampshire and Petersfield. Petersfield has 40 junior members. Hampshire squash scene is thriving, boasting national individual champions, European junior number one and national team champions.</li> <li>In terms of age, there are fewer 'activity' facilities more age limited than a play zone. PSC have members form 5-75 whereas unlikely to see any one above the age of 12-13 in a play zone. Play Zone is a far less accessible to the vast majority of age ranges than a squash court.</li> </ul>	
8	19		<p><u>Additional Condition</u></p> <p>8. No development shall commence until details of glazing for the building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the dark night skies.</p>	Additional Condition
9	26	4.1	<p><u>Consultee response</u></p> <p><b>Arboriculture:</b> No objection, subject to conditions.</p>	Update
9	27	4.10	<p><u>Consultee response</u></p> <p><b>Flood Authority:</b> No objection, subject to conditions.</p>	Update
9	33	8.11	<p><u>Amend final sentence:</u></p> <p>Considerations about the scale of development are outlined at paragraph <del>8.18</del> <b>8.13</b> onwards.</p>	Correction
9	34	8.23	<p><u>Amend final sentence:</u></p> <p>Condition <del>no.8</del> <b>no.9</b> is recommended to secure these.</p>	Correction

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
9	35	8.26	<p><u>Insert new paragraph after 8.26 in trees and ecology section:</u></p> <p>The arboricultural officer has raised no objection to the proposed tree works, subject to conditions. Condition no.21 addresses their considerations in regard to tree protection measures. A further condition (no.25) is also proposed, in response to their advice, to ensure the works to trees are carried out in accordance with the submitted report which accompanies the application.</p>	Addition
9	35	8.34	<p><u>Insert new paragraph after 8.34 in drainage and flood risk section</u></p> <p>The Flood Authority has not objected to the surface water drainage scheme and conditions have been recommended which relate to its technical aspects. These are proposed to be included within the list of conditions in the recommendation. The long term management of the drainage scheme is proposed as part of condition 13 which relates to a site management plan.</p>	Addition
9	37	10.1	<p><u>Additional condition in response to arboriculturalist's advice:</u></p> <p>25. No arboricultural works shall be carried out to trees other than those specified and in accordance with the Arboricultural Report submitted by Eco Urban Ltd dated 5 August 2016. Any deviation from the approved works shall only be undertaken if agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To preserve trees to be retained in the interests of visual amenity and the character of the area.</p>	Addition
9	37	10.1	<p><u>Additional condition in response to the Flood Authority's advice:</u></p> <p>26. No development shall commence until the detailed proposals for the surface water drainage scheme, including soakage testing to British Research Establishment (BRE) 365 'soakaway design' standards and information on exceedance flows and runoff, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall thereafter be fully implemented.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of surface water drainage within the development.</p>	Addition

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
10	46	1	<p><u>Additional information for Members:</u>            There are currently only two main sites within Ditchling for off-street parking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ditchling Village Hall car park is located approximately 50 metres to the east of the main crossroads/roundabout and has capacity for 43 cars with 3 disabled spaces. This is a free to use public car park managed by East Sussex County Council.</li> <li>• Ditchling Recreation Ground is a private car park situated approximately 700 metres to the east of the main crossroads/roundabout. It is managed by the Parish Council with parking capacity for approximately 30 cars (unmarked spaces).</li> </ul>	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
10	47 & 56	5.5 & Conditions 6 and 7	<p><u>Archaeology</u></p> <p>The County Archaeologist has visited the site and met with the applicant's agent. It is advised that the site, based on previous finds, has significant archaeological potential. It has been highlighted to the applicant that this potential could risk the viability of the project.</p> <p>If planning is to be granted without further consideration on heritage impact, the conditions listed as 6 and 7 of the report are recommended to be amended as follows, in order to give greater control over preserving significant archaeological remains as required by the National Planning Policy Framework:</p> <p>6. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a Written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. A written record of any archaeological works undertaken shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 3 months of the completion of any archaeological investigation unless an alternative timescale for submission of the report is first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The development shall not be brought into use until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment (including provision for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition) has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the County Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of the site is safeguarded and recorded to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>[and]</p> <p>7. Before any works hereby permitted are begun, details of the foundations, piling configurations, drainage and services, to include a detailed design and method statement, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such details to show, where necessary, the preservation of surviving archaeological remains which are to remain in situ.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of the site is safeguarded and recorded to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	Update / Clarification

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
10	55	Condition 3	<p><u>Details required by condition 3</u></p> <p>Amend Condition 3, for further details of gate and height barrier to be submitted as part of the design and landscape condition, as follows:</p> <p>3. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the submitted landscaping plan [Landscape Strategy Plan - Gravel Surface Option HBA6 Rev A] including schedule of plants and materials. No development shall take place until details of the gate and height restriction barrier (including their position), have been submitted to and approved by the LPA, together with a sample of the car park surface material and details of the material for parking space demarcation.</p> <p>Further details shall also be provided in a schedule of landscaping works to be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);</li> <li>ii) planting methods;</li> <li>iii) schedules of plants noting the mix of species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities or seeding where appropriate;</li> <li>iv) retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow and trees;</li> <li>v) manner and treatment of boundaries, watercourses, ditches and banks;</li> <li>vi) a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years include details of the arrangements for its implementation; and</li> <li>vii) a timetable for implementation of the landscaping works</li> </ul> <p>The landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and the approved materials for car park surfacing, gates and barrier shall be used and retained thereafter. Any plant which dies, becomes diseased or is removed within the first five years of planting, shall be replaced with another of similar type and size, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the rural character and amenities of the area and highway safety.</p>	Amendment
13	249	Table of comments	<p>Delete the following comment:</p> <p>“We would recommend use of the term ‘conserve’ rather than ‘preserve’ which is more active but would still relate to actively retaining a façade in its historic form for example.”</p>	Correction