

# SDNPA Planning Committee – 13 August 2020

## Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	18	Table: Site 14	A new student/staff accommodation complex providing 40 student bedrooms and <del>4 one-bed staff</del> 8 one-bed staff flats	Correction
7	n/a	n/a	<p><u>Clarification sought from Members as follows:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Occupancy restriction to persons solely or mainly. This is a vague term, why not simply solely or over 50% of their work?</li> <li>2) What is the total number of dedicated student dwellings and total number of student?</li> <li>3) Will bat provisions only be compulsory if bat roosts are found?</li> <li>4) Do we have answers to the questions posed by the Dark Night Skies Officer page 23, para 4.15?</li> </ol> <p><u>Officer response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The term ‘mainly’ has been included so as not to exclude members of staff who may have other roles/employment outside the academic year.</li> <li>2) 91 beds proposed as part of the application bringing total students beds to 294. Total number of students is approx. 3,500.</li> <li>3) Mitigation will also be required for bat activity (foraging/community). Officers and the County Ecologist are confident based on the information provided so far that the likely impacts on bats can be mitigated adequately. Additional autumn surveys required to supplement the spring and summer data along with an ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy prior to permission being granted.</li> <li>4) The lighting detail submitted in an External Lighting Assessment and drawings has been well received by the Dark Night Skies Officer. Details of lighting curfew, timing and smart controls can be secured by a lighting management strategy condition.</li> </ol>	Clarification
7	32	8.49	<p>Additional ecology survey information provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 66% Biodiversity Net Gain confirmed.</li> </ul> <p>Further comments from</p>	Update
7	20	Section 4	<u>Additional consultee response, as follows:</u>	

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<p>ESCC Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summer data generally supports the previous conclusions and provides greater clarity on how different species are using the site and likely impacts of development.</li> <li>• the development is unlikely to have significant impacts on bats roosting within Plumpton Place.</li> <li>• The proposed mitigation will minimise any potential impacts on foraging and commuting bats during construction.</li> <li>• Once the autumn surveys have been completed, the results across the year should be summarised and a mitigation strategy for bats should be clearly set out.</li> <li>• Therefore confident that the likely impacts on bats can be mitigated adequately.</li> </ul>	
8	64	4.8	<p><i>Is the Landscape objection still retained following the reduction in numbers from ‘up to 9’ to ‘up to 7?’</i></p> <p>The landscape objection is retained due to the lack of landscape evidence used to actively inform the numbers proposed. However, this is an outline application, and officers are satisfied that this number could be achieved in principle based on what is already known about settlement pattern and the site’s context (in part due to assessment of the site immediately to the north). Landscape evidence will be necessary at the next stage when matters relating to scale, size, design and final amount of housing would be determined.</p>	Member Query
8	68	8.5	<p><i>Please explain why needing to widen the access to allow 2 vehicles to exit and enter is “not a matter of highway safety”. Without widening the access, there is a strong possibility with 7 houses that a car (A) turning into Pickwick site from the westbound lane could meet a car (B) front on exiting Pickwick and so car A would be forced to halt sideways on in the eastbound lane</i></p> <p>The provision of an access that would allow 2 cars to pass does relate to highway safety, however at this outline stage we are just concerned with the principle of using the proposed access (i.e. its location) and whether a safe design could be achieved at a detailed (Reserved Matters) application. The design of the access, including final width and visibility splay, would be submitted and assessed in terms of highway safety at this later stage.</p> <p>The Highway Authority have no in-principle concerns with the safety of using the proposed access. If the access was say directly onto a busy dual carriageway for example this could have raised in-principle safety concerns that could not be overridden at a later stage, but that is not the case here.</p>	Member Query

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
8	71	8.23	<p><i>What evidence is there (if any) that the parish council will succeed in moving the 40mph speed limit 100 meters down the Turnpike Rd?</i></p> <p>The Parish Council have advised that they have an aspiration to move the 40mph limit eastwards to control traffic speed past the football field; however, this would require a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which is a difficult process in the current environment and there is currently little prospect of achieving it. Nevertheless there is no formal highway objection and Planning is exhorted not to duplicate other legislation.</p>	Member Query
8	71	8.23	<p>...the applicant understands that the Parish Council are seeking to extend the 40mph zone some 100m <del>westwards</del> eastwards.</p>	Correction
8	71	8.24	<p>A road safety audit would also be required to assess the provision of a footway along Turnpike Road, and a footway to link the site to the playing field to the <del>west</del> east</p>	Correction
8	71	8.25	<p><i>The report states that it would be preferable from the impact on amenity and landscape character for the access to be from the north through what is to be the new development at Strawberry Villas approved by this Committee in January i.e. SDNP/19/04886/FUL. That site will have an exit onto Newlands Gardens and thence into Turnpike Road. How likely is that to be achievable/negotiable given factors like (a) the layout of the Strawberry Villas site which has been finalised, (b) possible opposition from that developer to permitting through traffic from a separate development - or even (c) that for some reason the Strawberry Villas site may not be built out for some years if ever? At present it is just a field. If, subject to your reply, north access is not 100% likely to be achievable within a reasonable time should the Committee be focussing its deliberations on the principle of using the current south access?</i></p> <p>It is the view of officers that it would be preferable from landscape and connectivity perspectives if the access was taken through the neighbouring (northern) site to use the existing Newland Gardens road onto Turnpike Lane. This is not, however, what has been proposed or before Members to determine, and may well not be achievable due to separate land ownership and the timing of development. It would therefore not be reasonable for us to insist on this, unless the proposed access was fundamentally unsafe (which it is not considered to be by the Highways Authority). The only access that should be under consideration is therefore the existing access as proposed.</p>	Member Query
8	74	10.1	<p><b>Condition 11 – Hard and Soft Landscaping</b></p> <p>iv) The provision of a 5m buffer on the <del>western</del> eastern boundary alongside the watercourse, and 2m ecological buffers along the northern, <del>eastern</del> western and southern boundaries;</p>	Correction

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
9	5.1	86	<p><i>There is evidence of another site for playing rugby: Ditchling Recreation Ground. Why can't the Ditchling Rugby Club use that alternative site which seems less controversial?</i></p> <p>The club used to play at the Ditchling Recreation Ground, which for various reasons including size and slope of the land was not suitable for them, hence the move to the new ground in 2017.</p> <p>The temporary permission was granted specifically so that any landscape impacts could be reviewed after a period of use, so this is really the primary consideration when determining whether a permanent use of the site would be acceptable.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised about the old pitch and the historic justifications provided by the club for not using it. This is not, however, a matter that is considered to be material to the determination of the current application which has to be determined on its own merits. There is no requirement for alternative sites to be considered, as there might be for say a rural exception site.</p>	Member Query
10	127	1.1	<p><i>What size are the two dwellings to the west of the application site?</i></p> <p>Lea Cottage and The Old Stable are both three bedroom dwellings.</p>	Member Query
10	128	3.3	<p>The materials would incorporate <del>flint block panelling and brick quoins</del> traditional brick bond elevations</p>	Correction
11	170-171	3.2-3.8	<p><i>The Consultation draft document for Parking refers in detail to the use of the 'Parking Calculator' in arriving at parking solutions. This is of course tied to the implications of the 'landscape led approach' in para 3.2 – 3.8 (pp170-171). Should attention be drawn to the fact that a considerable number of the Policy allocated sites (SD58 – SD92) in the SDLP require "all necessary vehicular parking on site"? This isn't specifically addressed in the text, though it seems implications of it would be addressed by what is stated in para 3.4. Whilst I am aware that if an adopted policy demands a different approach to the issue and implications of parking, the policy takes precedent over the SPD should this be clarified by an extra paragraph, perhaps in the same way as para 3.8 touches on the need to ensure consideration of SD2?</i></p> <p>There is no conflict between the wording in the allocation policies stating 'all necessary vehicle parking on site, or similar', and the guidance of the "Parking SPD". Policies SD58-SD92 leave issues such as the amount of parking or the provision of affordable housing to be determined when a planning application is received for an allocation site. For parking provision on the allocation sites the "Parking SPD" will provide guidance on planning applications to determine the necessary vehicle parking on site.</p> <p>To add to the above, this is the same situation with the use of current parking guidance in relation to planning applications for Local Plan allocation sites.</p>	Member Query

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
11	160	2.5	<p><i>To insert after paragraph 2.5</i></p> <p>The numbers generated by the parking calculator and in table 2 on page 175 are a guide to determining the parking provision that may be suitable for a specific development proposal. They are a starting point and neither a maximum or minimum standard for parking provision, given the landscape-led approach to development as a whole and its provision.</p>	Clarification