

SDNPA Planning Committee – 14 March 2019

Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	7		<p><u>Planning Application SDNP/18/02170/FUL – Oaklands Farm, Green Street, East Worldham</u></p> <p>The Applicant has contacted the Authority and Withdrawn their planning application. The Application has therefore been withdrawn from the Agenda for consideration.</p> <p>Officers understand that a fresh application will be submitted shortly and the applicant will be endeavouring to address the issues which had been raised.</p>	Update
8	34	5	<p>5 Additional representations received re-iterating comments already in the report and also making the following additional comments. For ease of reference, officers have included some comments in response to the issues raised.</p> <p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue of parking has not been resolved. • The National Trust has not given permission for parking on the open field. • A parking solution has to be found which takes vehicles off the open Downland. • No parking takes place at Crowlink Corner. All parking takes place on National Trust Land. • A small rectangle at the end of the access route is leased from the NT on an annual basis. This can be revoked at any time. Only one car can comfortably fit in this area. Cars regularly park on the open Downland near to Crowlink Corner. <p><u>Officer comment</u></p> <p><i>The proposal does not seek to change existing parking arrangements at the site. It is not considered that the proposal will lead to an increase in the number of vehicles parked at the site.</i></p> <p>Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ESCC Ecologist recommend “gapping up of existing hedgerows and the provision of bat boxes” (04/10/2018). However, the planning agent stated via email (13/02/2018) that “no further landscape impact work is required and no compensatory planting is proposed.” • The replanting of hedgerows and trees would create ecosystem rich in wildlife habitat, for the benefit of wildlife water, soil and landscape. 	Additional Representations received.

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
8 (cont.)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may not be feasible to construct a track (which would involve excavation) and meet the requirements of the Wealden District Council Tree Officer who recommended a number of conditions. <p><u>Officer comment</u> <i>The case officer, applicant, Tree Officer and Ecologist consider the recommended conditions concerning the protection of trees to be necessary and reasonable.</i> <i>Please note: Condition 9 requires details of bird and bat boxes and infilling of existing hedgerow, in line with the Ecologists comments.</i></p> <p>Six Corsican pines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In light of the comments received from the Wealden District Council Tree officer (20/02/2019) the application should be refused. <p><u>Officer comment</u> <i>The Tree Officer has not objected to the application. The Tree Officer initially objected to the application on grounds of insufficient information. The consultation response dated 20th February 2019 confirmed that issues relating to the trees “have been adequately addressed and have no arboricultural objection”.</i> <i>Conditions recommended by the Tree Officer have been included.</i></p> <p>Natural England</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England should be consulted because it has the potential to impact a SSSI. The site forms part of the Seaford to Beachy Head SSSI and Gatefield is part of a SSSI Impact Resistant Zone and is in the Countryside Stewardship Scheme and a Nature Improvement Area with Priority Targeting for species. <p><u>Officer comment</u> <i>The site is not in a SSSI and due to the nature of the proposal officers do not consider that Natural England need to have been consulted on the application. The County Ecologist has been consulted on a regular basis during the progress of the application.</i></p> <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The track would render part of the field useless for the tenant farmer. Concerns relating to disturbance during construction – in particular relating to the removal of spoil and importation of material which could result in damage to the fabric of Crowlink Lane and its verges and wildlife. A construction management plan is needed. <p><u>Officer comment</u> <i>Whilst the tenant farmer would not be able to farm the area of land the track would run, it is likely that the condition of the rest of the field would improve as a result of the track as vehicles would no longer cause</i></p>	

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
8 (cont.)			<p><i>erosion to the field.</i></p> <p><i>A condition requiring the submission of a construction management plan has been included.</i></p> <p>Crowlink Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 5.3 of the Committee report includes the assertion that “residents of Crowlink Lane built a track to the lower part of Crowlink Lane out of necessity to access their homes approximately 15 years ago. This statement is not true. Repairs were made 15 years ago. <p><u>Officer comment</u></p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>History of the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Crowlink Estate was bought in 1926 from a property developer for the purpose of preserving the landscape in perpetuity for the peaceful enjoyment of the public and for the wildlife and flowers to flourish. Land given to the National Trust in 1931. The SDNPA has statutory responsibilities to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the SDNP. <p><u>Officer comment</u></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p>Landscape Officers advice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ESCC Landscape Architect stated in correspondence that “in order for the track to represent an enhancement in this landscape, there would need to be strict control on the access across the rest of the field, including for parking and turning. <p><u>Officer comment</u></p> <p><i>The Landscape Officer made this statement in response to an email made by the member of the public. The statement needs to be considered in the context of wider correspondence concerning the site. A summary of the Landscape Officer’s comments on the application have been included in the report.</i></p> <p>Turning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be dangerous to livestock, horse riders and walkers if a formal arrangement for vehicle turning is not found. It would also lead to erosion of open Downland. Vehicles should turn on the applicant’s own land. This is supported by the National Trust. <p><u>Officer comment</u></p> <p><i>The proposal does not seek to change the current arrangement for turning. By allowing vehicles to turn anywhere along the track drivers would be able to avoid areas in which livestock/people are located. It is also considered that visibility across the wide extent of the track is such that danger to livestock and people would be minimal in relation to turning.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development may lead to vehicles travelling more quickly which would pose a danger for people and livestock. 	

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
8 (cont.)			<p><u>Officer comment</u> <i>Vehicles may drive more quickly, but this danger is counterbalanced by the benefit and reduced risk of having a defined route (and therefore walkers are more likely to expect a vehicles and there would be a reduced risk of skidding. The Rights of Way Officer has not objected to the application.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disproportionate weight appears to be given to the inputs from the applicant. Greater weight consideration should have been given to the 133 objections to the proposal. The proposal should not be compared to the repair work which was undertaken to Crowlink Lane 15 years ago. Crowlink Lane has been in continuous use for centuries. <p><u>Officer comment</u> <i>All comments have been considered. Issues raised have been summarised and response to matters relevant to the application given in the committee report.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no other tracks across the field. <p><u>Officer comment</u> <i>Noted.</i></p>	
9	66	8.19	<p><u>In response to minor outstanding queries from the County Ecologist:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A gate has been provided to access the reptile mitigation area for maintenance purposes, as indicated on the Landscape Design Plan HLA 299 01 (Rev C). The Reptile Survey Report & Mitigation Report has been amended at para 4.13 to remove reference to the removal of reptiles along the eastern boundary, where the acoustic fence will be provided. 	Further information/clarification
9	69	10.1	<p><u>Condition 11 – Landscape Management Plan</u> should be reworded to read: “...in accordance with the provisions set out in the approved...Reptile Survey Report & Mitigation Report (Corylus, 16 November 2018 11 March 2019)”</p>	Updated report received
9	70	10.1	<p><u>Condition 13 – Ecological Mitigation Measures, criterion i)</u> should be reworded to read: i) “On approved plan HLA 299 01 (Rev B Rev C)”</p>	Updated plan received
9	70	10.1	<p><u>Condition 13 – Ecological Mitigation Measures, criterion iii)</u> should be reworded to read: iii) “Within section 5.0 of the approved Reptile Survey Report & Mitigation Report (Corylus, 16 November 2018 11 March 2019)”</p>	Updated report received
11	85	Applicant Details	Amend the Applicant to solely “The Woolbeding Charity”.	Further Information
11	86 and 91	3.1 and 8.19	Reference to the “Ochard House” should read the “Orchid House”.	Further Information

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
11	86	3.1	The National Trust, who operate Woolbeding Gardens, have confirmed that “we are working closely with The Woolbeding Charity to confirm the long term maintenance and resource costs of the new garden and glasshouse to ensure the intervention is sustainable”.	Further Information