

## SDNPA Planning Committee – 12 October 2017

### Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
3	1	Members Present	David Coldwell to be removed from the list of attendees.	Typo
8			Further illustrative plans, demonstrating vehicle tracking around the building have been submitted by the applicant, to address comments made by the SDNPA Design Officer. These provide support for the officer's recommendation and no further changes to the report, or conditions are proposed.	Additional Information
8			A landscape management statement and accompanying plan has been submitted by the applicant, indicating their intentions with planting within the application site and how this would relate to the wider landscaping around Glyndebourne as a whole. This is useful to help understand the proposed direction of travel, however it is considered that the conditions proposed are still required to ensure full details are provided.	Additional Information
9	25	4.6	<p>Additional comments from consultee received</p> <p>County Ecologist: No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An objection was previously raised by the Ecologist due to receipt of insufficient information to satisfactorily demonstrate that there would not be harmful ecological impacts caused from the removal of trees at the site and how this could be appropriately mitigated. In particular, this was in relation to roosting bats, nesting birds and hazel dormice.</li> <li>An addendum to the Ecological Appraisal submitted with the planning application was received on 04.10.2017, which has been assessed by the County Ecologist.</li> <li>The Ecologist is now satisfied with the ecological information received subject to a condition to secure all ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures through the submission of a single site-wide ecological mitigation and management strategy should Members be minded to approve the application.</li> </ul>	Update

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
10 Appendix x 2	121-2	Errata E, Policy/para H7	Major Development – At the pre-submission consultation stage the SDNPA commented that the allocations to the south of Petworth might constitute major development (in line with paragraph 116 of the NPPF) and as a result further analysis would be required, <u>which is currently underway</u> . <del>However, in the light of recent case law the SDNPA will not carry forward its comments which means that it is not necessary for the Submission plan to be supported by a specific evidence based study on major development. This is because recent legal judgements have found that paragraph 116 of the NPPF applies primarily to the consideration of planning applications. This does not mean that the policy is entirely irrelevant for plan making purposes, but that its application must be tempered in a plan making context by the understanding that it is designed for the determination of applications for planning permission.</del>	Update and clarification
10 Appendix x 2	121-2	Errata E, Suggested change	In the supporting text to H7 recognise that the proposals are significant in respect to the National Park and therefore any development should <del>strive to</del> meet part 3 of South Downs Local Plan Policy SD3 or any subsequent revision.	Clarification