

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7			<p>Sustainable Economy Officer comments. No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holiday accommodation is under represented within the SDNP Visitor Economy at 5%. Therefore, more must be done to encourage greater numbers of overnight stays, which inject on average, 75% more into the local economy than a day visitor. From a visitor economy perspective the increased holiday accommodation provision included in this application is welcome. • There is always a slight concern when applications seek to replace existing community assets. Isolated rural communities across the National Park often rely heavily on community facilities such as public houses, meeting places, local shops, cultural buildings and places of worship. It could be argued, the loss of the Queens Hotel, which provides many services to the community of Selborne, could adversely impact the prospects for this community to become sustainable, resilient and prosperous as set out in the SDNPA (2019) PMP. However, the replacement of the public house with a new community space, education facility and retail offer appears to provide suitable alternative and therefore dilutes this concern. 	Consultee comment
7			<p>Landscape objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening of Huckers Lane • The significant width and engineered character of the visibility splay and interruption of the characteristic vegetated boundary to the lane. The reinstated hedgerow serves to accentuate this engineered solution and make what is currently a rural, understated access into something more suburban/urban. • The widening of the access road into the site – losing the hierarchy of routes, so important to conserving landscape character. • The introduction of (concrete) kerbs along Hucker’s Lane and into the site, creates a standardised suburban highway-dominated character, atypical of its distinctive and understated rural qualities. 	Consultee Comment

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The width of the further points of access into the site proper and the private dwelling. <p>Conditions to cover the following are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard and soft landscape including boundary treatments • Planting schedule • Tree protection, plans and section, including an Arb Method Statement • Sustainable Drainage details • Landscape and ecological management plan. • Samples of materials to be agreed on site <p>Officer Comment: Officers feel that landscape concerns can be addressed, in part, by condition. The access alterations into the site, onto Huckers Lane and widening are required due to highway safety guidelines. They have been pared back to the minimum required to reduce impact. The Design Officer recognises the issues above but whilst supporting the Landscape Officers view, is satisfied on balance with the scheme in design terms, subject to conditions.</p>	
7			<p>Requested additional detail regarding GWM tie up and s106 agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWM will have a 99 year lease of the ground floor and an option to break after 5 years (GWM controlled option) • GWM will have control of the holiday apartments with booking priority for events (eg weddings), when not used by the GWM they will be available for hire on Cottages.com by the public. 	General
7		7.26 & 7.29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para refer to replacement rather than refurbishment, the building is to be retained following Conservation Officer comments. 	General
7			<p>Further letters of objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals do not benefit the community. • The Queens did not fall into decline but was purchased and run down • Subsequent efforts to purchase the pub were declined • Investors would purchase the pub at a fair market value. • Noise and disturbance from intensification of weddings associated with the GWM for weddings etc. 	Objection

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
8	41	4.8	<p><i>Officer Comments: The consultation response from South East Water and the further comments from the applicant are set out below in relation to the matter of Water Supply. Whilst the concerns about Water Supply and adequacy or otherwise of original reports are noted, this application would have no greater impact on water supply than that already approved (in that the number of units does not increase). In the event that the application were to be refused, the developer could still implement the earlier approval. A reason for refusal on the adequacy or otherwise of the Water Supply could not therefore be sustained.</i></p> <p>Consultation response received from South East Water – Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2010 SEW confirmed the development could not be accommodated by SEW’s existing network and required off-site mains reinforcement. Estimate of costs was provided at the time. • It is understood that the developer disclosed the report to the LPA as the basis upon which the site would be supplied in the future. However the developer did not make a further application for requisitioning that water supply and reinforcements to meet its planned requirements. • In 2017 CDC investigated the private distribution system at the Estate. CDC felt some of the information given (particularly with regard to sufficiency of supply) was of concern and discussed this with SEW. • Based upon the information provided by the developers, there appeared little clarity regarding terms under which water was supplied to the development leading the Authority to have serious concerns about sufficiency problems as the expansion and occupation of the development progresses. • SEW advised CDC it was unlikely to be able to support continuous pumping without detriment to existing customers. SEW also explained about earlier advice about need for financial contribution towards any newly requisitioned capacity. To date there has been no formal request from the developer to requisition required reinforcements. • SEW continued dialogue with the developer. SEW provided feedback to a report produced by Hydrock for the developer which appeared to form the basis of the developers adequacy of the existing water supply to meet future needs. Conclusion of SEW is that the Hydrock report substantially underestimates the peak demand and likely future requirement of usage of the KE7 site. • Following SEW assessment the view is that the current system cannot be relied upon to meet existing or future water demand. • SEW are aware that the developer is seeking to secure additional water capacity from third parties and SEW continue to cooperate in the hope that a solution can be found. <p>Comments in response from the applicant</p>	Comments

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is in unusual position of having a substantial and robust water infrastructure in place from its days as a hospital. Also unusual in that it has existing supplies from Southern Water and South East Water. In planning the development the applicant has considered all options for water supply and installed additional monitoring equipment and upgraded where required. Southern Water have not objected to the proposals. • Applicant wrote to SEW setting out an increase in pumping hours in 2015 and in 202 had a verbal agreement to the specialists assumptions and ability of SEW to provide water. SEW only recently changed their position and the applicant has subsequently been in recent discussions, which are yet to be concluded. • Applicant has been relying on an independent consultant who has confirmed that existing supply and system is sufficient to serve the completed development, which is supported by actual use data and recent flow tests. There is a comprehensive water quality plan in place which has been provided to CDC. • Applicant has made applications to SEW and Southern Water through a company to provide water in an area which was previously provided by the water undertaker. • The scheme does not change unit numbers from that already approved and so does not increase water demand on the site. 	
9		5.2	<p>Further letter of objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern re access from small country lane; <p>Disappointment that timing of meeting does not allow working people to attend, and doubts with regard to transparency in the decision making process</p>	Objection comment
10		1.1	<p>2 letters received from Dr Colin Ross on behalf of Protect Coastal England, objecting to the proposed development and raising concerns, including about the impact of the windfarm on views from the National Park and whether the proposal complies with National Policy Statements and Guidance.</p> <p>1 letter received from Littlehampton Society, expressing concerns about the proposed development.</p> <p>Officer Comment: The concerns raised where they relate to the impact on the South Downs National Park are addressed in our draft response before Members.</p>	General
12		See Update box	All references in the report and Appendix I to the “Register” amended to “Self-build Register”.	Clarity

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
12		Executive Summary	<p>Bullet point 1</p> <p>The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Government introduced has a duty to keep a Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Register (the “<u>Self-build Register</u>”) of those seeking to acquire serviced plots of land to build their own home.</p> <p>Bullet point 2</p> <p>The SDNPA Government introduced has a duty to permit sufficient plots to meet the demand evidenced by the a <u>Self-build Register</u>. <u>The Authority will take this into account in the determination of planning applications along with all other material considerations.</u></p> <p>Bullet point 3</p> <p>“...for those applying to be included on the <u>Self-build Register</u> (full details <u>in</u> paragraph 5.8 4.8)”</p> <p>Bullet point 6</p> <p>“The criteria for the proposed test are broadly consistent with those used by housing local authorities within the National Park and by other National Park Authorities that have implemented a local connection for their <u>Self-build Register</u>.”</p>	<p>Clarity</p> <p>Clarity</p> <p>Clarity and Correction</p> <p>Clarity</p>
12		1.1	“...for those seeking to acquire plots of land to build their own home across the whole of the National Park. <u>A Self-build Register is different and distinct from a housing register.</u> ”	Clarity
12		1.2	“ The SDNPA have <u>Government introduced</u> a duty for <u>local planning authorities</u> under the above Act to permit sufficient numbers of building plots for self and custom housebuilding to meet the demand evidenced by the number of entries on a <u>the Self-build Register</u> of people seeking to build their own homes. <u>The Authority will take this into account in the determination of planning applications along with all other material considerations.</u> ”	Clarity
12		2.4	<p>Third sentence.</p> <p>“The SDNPA also have <u>Government introduced</u> a duty for local planning authorities to permit sufficient plots for self-build and custom housebuilding to meet the demand evidenced by those on the <u>Self-build Register</u>.”</p>	Clarity
12		4.2	<p>Second sentence.</p> <p>“As a means of comparison these criteria are also consistent with those widely used in the National Park for determining <u>local connection</u> applicants eligible for a local housing register.”</p>	Clarity

