

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	9	Recommendation	<p><u>Amend both recommendations as follows (to accord with paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 in the report):</u></p> <p><b>Recommendation for SDNP/17/03850/CND:</b> That planning permission be granted subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation relating to the S106 Agreement associated with planning permission SDNP/16/02767/FUL to secure the requirements of the S106 to the proposed development and an amended affordable housing contribution of £86,250, the final form of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, and the conditions set out in paragraph 11.1 of the report.</p> <p>That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the applications with appropriate reasons if the Deed of Variation is not completed within 3 months of the 18 January 2018.</p> <p><b>Recommendation for SDNP/17/03856/CND:</b> That planning permission be granted subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation relating to the S106 Agreement associated with planning permission SDNP/16/02757/FUL to secure the requirements of the S106 to the proposed development and an amended affordable housing contribution of £86,250, the final form of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, and the conditions set out in paragraph 11.1 of the report.</p> <p>That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the Deed of Variation is not completed within 3 months of the 18 January 2018.</p>	Correction
7	13	9.15 & 9.16	<p><u>Replace paragraphs 9.15 and 9.16 with the following:</u></p> <p>A viability appraisal has been undertaken by Vail Williams for the SDNPA. They were instructed to consider the viability in relation to the retention or demolition of Vernon House and affordable housing contributions.</p> <p>Their advice has considered the previous viability appraisal which was undertaken prior to the development being granted planning permission and the contributions which were secured in the S106 Agreements at that time. Their latest advice considers changes since then in terms of the costs and values in both scenarios and the purchase of the ransom strip. The appraisal also takes into consideration Vernon House being retained in its current form and refurbished versus its demolition.</p> <p>Vail Williams' assessment concludes that if permission is refused there would be a significant impact upon the viability of the development to the extent that no affordable housing contribution would be achievable. The developer would still achieve a profit, but this conclusion is based on accepted industry standards and case law about developers achieving a 20% profit on costs. Conversely, Vail Williams have also advised that should the proposals be granted, an increased affordable housing contribution be achieved.</p>	Update

7	13	9.15 & 9.16 cont...	Officers have considered Vail Williams' advice and consider these sound in either the scenario of permission being granted and Vernon House being retained or if permission is refused and Vernon House is demolished. The developer has raised concern about the values of the new dwellings in the viability appraisal being too high. However, officers do not dispute Vail Williams' opinion. In regard to any potential increased affordable housing contribution, officers are of the view that an additional contribution over and above the original agreed sum of £135,000 could be justified based on Vail Williams' assessment. Vail Williams have recommended a higher figure of £172,500 in total between the two applications as an offsite affordable housing contribution. This contribution would be justified in order to make the planning permission acceptable in planning terms.	
7	13	10.2	Remove last sentence: 'Members will be updated on the viability of the scheme in due course'. And replace with: A viability appraisal has been undertaken. The SDNPA has been advised that affordable housing contributions could not be viable if permission is refused, given the risks and additional expenditure taken by the developer, but alternatively a higher contribution could be feasible if permission is granted, as outlined above.	Update
8	53	9.15 & 9.16	<u>Replace paragraphs 9.15 and 9.16 with the following:</u> A viability appraisal has been undertaken by Vail Williams for the SDNPA. They were instructed to consider the viability in relation to the retention or demolition of Vernon House and affordable housing contributions. Their advice has considered the previous viability appraisal which was undertaken prior to the development being granted planning permission and the contributions which were secured in the S106 Agreements at that time. Their latest advice considers changes since then in terms of the costs and values in both scenarios and the purchase of the ransom strip. The appraisal also takes into consideration Vernon House being retained in its current form and refurbished versus its demolition. Vail Williams' assessment concludes that if permission is refused there would be a significant impact upon the viability of the development to the extent that no affordable housing contribution would be achievable. The developer would still achieve a profit, but this conclusion is based on accepted industry standards and case law about developers achieving a 20% profit on costs. Conversely, Vail Williams have also advised that should the proposals be granted, an increased affordable housing contribution be achieved.	Update

8	53	9.15 & 9.16 cont...	Officers have considered Vail Williams' advice and consider these sound in either the scenario of permission being granted and Vernon House being retained or if permission is refused and Vernon House is demolished. The developer has raised concern about the values of the new dwellings in the viability appraisal being too high. However, officers do not dispute Vail Williams' opinion. In regard to any potential increased affordable housing contribution, officers are of the view that an additional contribution over and above the original agreed sum of £135,000 could be justified based on Vail Williams' assessment. Vail Williams have recommended a higher figure of £172,500 in total between the two applications as an offsite affordable housing contribution. This contribution would be justified in order to make the planning permission acceptable in planning terms.	
8	53	10.2	Remove last sentence: 'Members will be updated on the viability of the scheme in due course.' And replace with: A viability appraisal has been undertaken. The SDNPA has been advised that affordable housing contributions could not be viable if permission is refused, given the risks and additional expenditure taken by the developer, but alternatively a higher contribution could be feasible if permission is granted, as outlined above..	Update
9	77	Section 5	One further letter of representation has been received from Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Hampshire Branch. They support the principle of the development however they have concerns about landscape impacts. In particular, they consider that the height of new buildings should be restricted so that they do not appear above the tree line, and the tree coverage along the eastern edge of the site should be maintained. Officers do not consider that this letter raises any new issues (as summarised in Section 5 of the report) or alters the conclusions reached under Section 8 of the report.	Update
11	128	3.5	After 3.5 insert: The applicants have confirmed that they own both the application site (outlined in red) and the adjoining field to the rear (accessed via the corner field gate). Therefore the proposed planting as indicated on the submitted site plan can be delivered as part of the proposal and could therefore be enforced by condition.	Clarification
11	128	4.4	WSCC Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer; Comments received (verbally) No objection to application.	Update
11	128	4.5	Consultation should read: WSCC Highways Officer (Not ESCC)	Correction

11	133	8.23	In relation to the question of need for an additional dayroom, the agent has advised the following: “In regards to the dayroom facilities, it is accepted that the gypsy pitch consists of a mobile home, dayroom and touring caravan. The utility/dayroom will provide facilities that enable the occupants of the caravans to minimize the recognised hazards associated with cooking and fire in the close confines of caravans and provide washing facilities. It is still the family’s intention to build a dayroom approved in the original permission. The second dayroom would be used by Mr Hearne’s son and his family who would be occupying the additional caravan”.	Clarification
11	134	8.32	After 8.32 insert: 8.33 It has been highlighted that the proposal also seeks the removal of an existing section of grassed lawn within the site to be replaced with a tarmac surface. Officers consider that the removal of the entire surface and replacement with additional hardstanding could detract from the overall quality of the development and appearance within the site, with a lesser amenity landscape value. Officers consider that there is provision to retain a greater grassed area within the site, whilst also increasing the total number of caravans. Therefore it is recommended that a further condition is imposed (notwithstanding the proposed site plan) for a final scheme of landscaping to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This could set out in more detail the extent of proposed landscaping and enable the Local Planning Authority to agree on a maximum area of additional hardstanding to be provided.	Update
11	135	10.1	Amendment to Condition 3 as follows: 3) The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following: Mr John Hearne and Mrs Georgina Hearne; Mr John Hearne (son) and Savana Hearne; and resident dependants only. Reason: To ensure a proposals which meets the identified need of the Hearne Family, where a separate use by unrelated persons would be inappropriate for the constraints of the site, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.	Update/Amendment
11	136	10.1	Insert condition as follows: 9) No development shall take place (notwithstanding the approved proposed site plan) until a further detailed scheme of soft and hard landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:	

11	136	10.1 cont...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Written planting specification detailing schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes, proposed numbers/densities and soil amelioration where appropriate</li> <li>ii. Planting methods, tree pits and guying methods</li> <li>iii. Retained grassed areas and/or compensatory areas for planting</li> <li>iv. A schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years including details of the arrangements for its implementation;</li> <li>v. Details of all hard surfaces, such as paths, caravan hardstands, access ways and parking spaces including their appearance, depth and permeability;</li> </ul> <p>A timetable for implementation of the soft and hard landscaping works. The scheme of soft and hard landscape works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. A more rural and informal landscape design shall be adopted which should include native species. Any trees or shrubs which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season by others of similar size and species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the approved additional development results in an overall positive contribution to the character and appearance of the site and enhances the character of the development in the interests of visual amenity and the setting of the South Downs National Park.</p>	
----	-----	--------------	---	--