

SDNPA Planning Committee – 13 September 2018

Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	12	4.1	<p>Additional Comments from Findon Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following a meeting of the Planning Committee on 6 September 2018, notwithstanding the amended plans recently submitted, Findon Parish Council (FPC) maintains its objections as detailed in its submission dated 27 April 2018, FPC also fully supports the SDNPA officer report PC 55/18 to be taken to the SDNPA Planning Committee on 13 September 2018 which recommends that planning permission be refused. 	Further information
7	12	4.3	<p>Further clarification from Highways Authority in relation to proposed parking provision within site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the plans do not show more than 3 allocated car parking spaces for the stables, the proposal is unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the public highway network as it is not located near to the public highway network (Nepcote Lane). If spaces for parking were not accommodated within the red line boundary it is unlikely visitors would park on Nepcote Lane. A review of the site plan appears to show alternative parking areas could be available on site. Would recommend the LPA ask for a revised plan from the applicant to show alternative overspill parking provision to accommodate the expected number of visitors. Confirmation of the number of horses to be stabled which will be publicly owned would clarify the expected trip generation and demand for parking. It would seem parking might be possible opposite the hay barn, in the stable yard, or on the access road itself. The overall impact of the proposals will be significantly reduced, compared to the existing use of the site. It would not be an intensification of use. 	Further information
7	13	5	<p>3 additional letters of objection raising the following concerns:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the roads are widened the traffic will be disturbing. It is incumbent upon the applicant to demonstrate the amount of development necessary is sufficient to deliver the benefits that arise. The proposal is materially different from the extant approval. The proposal is not in accord with Para 77 of the NPPF. 	Further information

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is major development as defined in the NPPF contrary to Para 172. • No business case has been demonstrated. • Enabling development only applies to securing Heritage Assets. • ‘Landscape First’ is a fundamental approach to assessing proposals • Proposals conflict with Policies Gen3, Gen7 of Arun Plan and BT2 of Neighbourhood Plan. • Character of area has not changed since Appeal decision in 2006. • Damage to Flora and Fauna • Would set a precedent • Footpath would become urbanised. • Potential for a far more intensive commercial enterprise. • Does not meet social housing requirements. • Development should be constrained to the southern part of the site. • Light and noise pollution • Application lacking developer intent, transparency, detail in relation to why large barn required, detail in relation to transport statement, detail in relation to parking provision. 	
13	119	5.1	The list of 347 348 projects to be assessed via Steps 2 and 3 for year’s IBP is set out in Appendix 3.	Correction
13	141	Appendix 3 IBP-236-17	Amend timescale from Long Term to Short Term	Correction
13	169	Appendix 3 IBP-98-17	Delete	Correction - duplication of IBP-44-17
14	185	First row of table	Decision and Method – Dismissed replace with Allowed	Correction