

## SDNPA Planning Committee 8 December 2016 Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	8	4.1	Parish Council response received: No objection.	Update.
7	9	5.1	<p>1 representation received from the EHDC Ward Councillor with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No objection provided the suggested condition that the office space is used only for the SDNPA is enforced. Would not want to set a precedent for any future use of the whole building.</li> <li>• Include a condition that at the end of the SDNPA's tenure the suggested changes to sever the space from the rest of the dwelling are reversed to restore the building to its former (current) condition.</li> </ul>	Update.
8	18	4.2	<p>Further representations from the SDNPA Landscape Officer have been received, summarised in the comments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revised drawings show an increased amount of existing planting retained and also an additional line of trees and a hedge on the northern side of the verge adjacent to the proposed car park.</li> <li>• The layout of the car park on the western side of the lodges is likely to result in significant visual and experiential impacts to Stanmer Park in terms of exposure to the A27 and traffic on Stony Mere Way. (I accept that there is a lot of traffic close to the boundary of the park and that some degree of aural impact from traffic is already experienced).</li> <li>• Recommend that further consideration is given to the layout of the car park to achieve a greater width of woodland plantation in this area which combines a range of tree and understorey species and planting sizes from the outset to achieve an appropriate screen to the adjacent motorway. In addition the management of this planting may need to allow for the progressive management/replacement of the existing retained planting, subject to review of its success and health etc. following construction.</li> <li>• Additional visual material has been supplied in relation to the proposed access road to the north of Stanmer House. It is likely that the need for directional signage and safety issues on this new junction could result in highway clutter in this sensitive location.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> The current recommendation to Planning Committee is for authority to be given to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to approve the application, subject to the receipt of further information relating to this particular area of the proposed scheme. This recommendation allows for officers to continue to work with the applicant in order to resolve the concerns raised by the Landscape Officer. It is considered there is a solution to this particular concern that does not affect the overall principle of the development.</p>	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			In respect of the concerns regarding highway clutter, this would be partly covered by the hard landscaping and street furniture strategy conditions (5 and 6). Further details of the junction could be further considered prior to the final determination, or through the imposition of a specific condition.	
8	18	4.4	<p>Further representation has been received from Historic England with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of the principle of a car park at the Patchway, but keen to ensure that its large size is clearly justified and that the SDNPA is confident that this fits in with the sustainable travel plans and transport objectives for the site.</li> <li>• Wish to ensure that any harmful impacts from the new access to this car park are minimised and in this respect suggested a number of ways this might be achieved in the previous response.</li> <li>• The SDNPA will need to be satisfied that these alternatives have been adequately addressed by LUC's response. If these are clearly not feasible, we recommend that all ways of designing the new highway infrastructure to be as rural in character as a possible should be pursued by reducing the widths of the access roads and entrance to the minimum required, with minimal lighting, signage and appropriate surface treatment, verges and landscaping.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer Comment</u></p> <p>It is considered that the proposed Patchway car park and new access to it has been fully assessed in paragraphs 8.7, 8.16-8.19 and 8.24-8.26. The measures described in Historic England's original comments regarding minimising the impact of the new access e.g. width of new access and visibility splays reduced, are a matter that could be further considered prior to the final determination, following consultation with the Director of Planning and Chair of the Planning Committee, in accordance with the recommendation.</p>	Update
8	18	5.1	<p>A further 42 letters of representation, objecting to the proposed development, have been received, with the following comments. Officer comments are provided in italics alongside where not discussed in main report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is major development and therefore paragraph 116 of the NPPF is relevant. <i>The NPPF does not provide a definition of what constitutes 'major development'. The Authority has sought legal advice on the definition of major development from James Maurici QC, the most recent guidance being given in October 2014. The Maurici legal opinion provides guidance on the definition of major development within National Parks. The opinion advises that major development is any development which, by reason of its scale, character or nature, has the potential to have a serious adverse impact on the natural beauty, recreational opportunities, wildlife or cultural heritage provided by a National Park. Obviously, the assessment of whether the proposal is major is therefore a matter of judgement based on all the circumstances, including the local context. Whilst the development proposals would have a local impact on Stanmer Park itself, they do not have a significant impact on the National Park, and it is not considered to be major development for the purpose of paragraph 116 of the NPPF.</i></li> <li>• Need for amount of parking at Patchway has not been robustly demonstrated</li> </ul>	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic through Park would have an adverse impact on setting and character</li> <li>Focus should be on better sustainable transport options</li> <li>Green route not wide enough for shared use. <i>Final width and form of green route is still subject to discussion and condition.</i></li> <li>New access to Patchway would not improve setting of Church and village</li> <li>Loss of trees</li> <li>No resurfacing of existing road into Stanmer. <i>It is proposed to repair the route where damaged, although it is not proposed for the whole route to be replaced.</i></li> <li>Tree management plan shouldn't be implemented until further local consultation has been undertaken. <i>The final tree removal plan could either be subject to condition or agreed prior to determination. The SDNPA cannot condition the requirement for further local consultation.</i></li> <li>Church car park should remain open <i>It is proposed to retain this car park and increase the number of spaces from 40 to 43</i></li> <li>Patchway overflow car park should not open all-year round (for events only)</li> <li>Surface water drainage and contamination risk</li> <li>Damage to Upper Lodge car park and surrounding picnic area. <i>This area is outside of the application site.</i></li> <li>Impact of kiosk on neighbour amenity. <i>The kiosk is permitted development and whilst incorporated in the application, could be carried out outside of any grant of planning permission.</i></li> <li>Vehicular access to 37 Lower Lodge obstructed by proposals. <i>Access is retained and not obstructed by proposed parking.</i></li> <li>Viability of existing tea rooms effected by inclusion of kiosk and café. <i>Commercial competition in these circumstances is not a planning consideration.</i></li> <li>No consultation with 37 Lower Lodge regarding proposed use of garden. <i>This is not currently part of the application proposals – it is understood that BHCC will be conducting consultation if this option is considered viable and Officers would expect to see evidence of this to demonstrate the proposal was achievable prior to determination.</i></li> <li>Profits from car parking should be ring-fenced for spending on Park. <i>SDNPA cannot require this.</i></li> <li>Concern regarding the effectiveness of conditions and their monitoring.</li> <li>Intensification of car use would lead to noise and air pollution.</li> </ul> <p>I further neutral representation has also been received, which makes the following comments, as well as others raised above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pleased to see momentum and investment into infrastructure of Park</li> <li>Further consultation with Resident's committee on tree removal plans and repairs to Frankland Monument and Water Catcher</li> <li>Enhancement of cycle lanes within and outside the Park to be secured</li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SDNPA should consider plans for Stanmer Park holistically</li> </ul>	
8	21	8.4	<p>The following additional and amended plans have been provided, which demonstrate further screen planting along the boundary of the Park with Stony Mere Way and the location of existing services to the north:</p> <p>6625 04A (Existing Services)  6625 11F (Demolition and Tree Works – Lower Lodges)  6625 031G (Proposals – Lower Lodges)  6625 061B (Sections – Lower Lodges)</p> <p>Condition 2 (Plans) has been amended to include these drawing numbers, although it is noted that the Landscape Officer has raised concerns regarding the visual and experiential impact these current proposals would have.</p>	Amended and Additional Information
8	26	10.1 Conditions	<p><b>AMENDED CONDITIONS</b></p> <p>Following receipt of initial comments, the SDNPA Woodland Strategic Lead has recommended further wording for conditions regarding tree removal, protection, relocation and the method statement. The wording of these conditions is therefore recommended to be amended as follows:</p> <p><b>12.</b> Prior to any works commencing concerning tree relocation, a method statement providing details of how trees shall be relocated, including any preparatory works, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If a relocated tree(s) dies before the end of the third year following its relocation, it shall be replaced with a suitable sized (heavy standard) alternative, to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the trees would be relocated without causing damage or affecting their health.</p> <p><b>20.</b> The development shall be carried out in accordance with the tree protection measures and method statement contained within the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan by Bosky Trees dated 03 August 2016</li> <li>Tree Management Specifications Appendix 2 by Bosky Trees dated 03 August 2016</li> <li>Tree Protection Plans TPPI, TPP2, TPP3 and TPP4</li> <li>Arboricultural Method Statement dated 03 August 2016</li> </ul> <p>Further the protective fences shall be erected prior to works starting and are clearly marked as being Root Protection Areas and are to remain throughout the construction period.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the retention and maintenance of trees and vegetation which is an important feature of the area.</p>	Amendment

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
8	26	10.1 Conditions	Parking meters and barriers are to be included in the requirements of conditions 5, 6 and 7.	Amendment