

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	16	4.11	<p><u>Update to Highways Authority consultation response:</u></p> <p>Financial contribution cited has been revised from £75,000 to £62,500 in light of re-considering contributions towards bus service infrastructure (eg. bus shelters) which are already covered within the SDNPA's CIL charging scheme.</p>	Update
7	.	.	<p><u>Further correspondence received from the Applicant's agent:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant progress been made in narrowing the issues concerning design. • Applicant wishes to continue to develop the scheme further with officers. • Disappointed with the recommendation given the work to date, previous officer feedback and that it is an allocated site. • A revised application would not require a new planning fee and would continue with current scheme. • The scheme accords with the allocation policy SD71. <p><u>Sustainable Construction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPD introduces new requirements which go beyond Local Plan policy SD48, contrary to National guidance. The Local Plan should be used to set requirements and not the SPD. Examples- (1) there is no specific requirement for green roofs yet the SPD requires 10% provision; (2) policy does not require an additional 20% reduction in CO2 emissions from renewables. • Applicant accepts the efficiency measures in SD48 and imposition of planning conditions to achieve these. • PV solar panels and electric vehicle charging points will be provided and secured via conditions. <p><u>Affordable housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability Appraisal work still currently being undertaken. • A scheme which provides less than 50% would still be in accordance with the Policy, provided it is supported by evidence. <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A technically sound drainage scheme can be achieved, as supported by consultees, and it includes rain gardens and swales following feedback from officers. <p><u>Highways</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of the internal road network is an acceptable approach. 	Further information

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<u>Materials</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials palette has been informed by a contextual analysis. Do not agree that a larger extent of stonework needs to be included in elevations. <u>Wealden Heaths SPA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incumbent on the Applicant and SDNPA (given it's an allocated site) to agree suitable mitigation and the Applicant is considering how best to achieve this. 	
8	41	10.1 – Condition 8	<p>No development shall begin until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the principles within the Flood Risk Assessment ref: HYG803 V2 dated 12/02/20 has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A technical summary highlighting any changes to the design from that within the approved Flood Risk Assessment. Detailed drainage calculations to demonstrate existing runoff rates and volumes are not exceeded and there is sufficient attenuation for storm events up to and including 1:100 + climate change. Details to include a detailed hydraulic model including information on swale, pipe and pond dimensions used for the modelling. Details of the proposed fill material and demonstration that it will not increase contamination risk. Detailed drainage plans to include type, layout and dimensions of drainage features (swales, pond, pipes, etc.) including references which link it to the drainage calculations. Exceedance plans demonstrating the flow paths and areas of ponding in the event of blockages or storms exceeding design criteria. <p><u>Thereafter, all works will be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</u></p> <p>Reason: To ensure satisfactory surface water drainage.</p>	Amended condition wording.
10	123	4.3 2 nd bullet	<p>TNP policy SB1 sets the Settlement Policy Boundary for the parish. As currently proposed the Settlement Policy Boundary excludes two significantly developed areas of the village, namely the Hazeley Enterprise Park and Twyford School. Whilst the TNP has other policies which relate to these sites (BE2 and BE3) it would be appropriate to incorporate these two areas into the Settlement Policy Boundary.</p>	Following discussion with the PC and review of Settlement Policy Boundary methodology this recommendation is deleted

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
10	200	Appendix 2, Policy SBI	<p>As currently drafted Policy SB1, supported by Map 2 exclude two significant developed areas of the parish, namely Hazeley Enterprise Park and Twyford School. The Settlement Boundary Review states that the SDNPA has left decisions on the review of settlement boundaries to the Neighbourhood Planning Group, while suggesting our own review methodology as a model. By placing the two sites outside the settlement boundary they are defined as open countryside under Policy SD25: Development Strategy of the Local Plan. That would mean that any development proposals would need to meet at least one of the exceptional circumstances set out in criterion 2 and both parts of criterion 3 of the Policy. It is recommended that both sites apart from the school playing fields should be included in the settlement boundary so that the NDP is in broad conformity with Policy SD25 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Review the Settlement Policy Boundary to incorporate the Hazeley Enterprise Park and Twyford School. The Twyford School playing fields should not be included within the Settlement Policy Boundary</p>	Following discussion with the PC and review of Settlement Policy Boundary methodology this recommendation is deleted
10	203	Appendix 2 Policy BE2	<p>The SDNPA welcome the designation of the site as a local employment site as per paragraph 7.140 of the SDLP. Northfields Farm is identified as site W1 in the Employment Land Review Update (2017) as both an existing and potential employment site with the following commentary: 'Fully occupied mostly high quality business park for local businesses; adjacent to potential housing site in draft Twyford NDP; protected by draft general safeguarding policy in NDP; part of site permitted for new B uses.'</p> <p>As stated previously, the site should not be excluded from the settlement boundary as this will unduly restrict future development on the site.</p>	Following discussion with the PC and review of Settlement Policy Boundary methodology this recommendation is deleted