

## SDNPA Planning Committee – Thursday 10 April 2025

### Planning Committee Update Sheet

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
6 & 7	.	.	<p><u>Counsel Opinion by Lord Banner KC (dated 30 March) received from the Applicant, which outlines:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot resist approval on grounds that go to the impacts that are already inherent in the grant of Outline Permission.</li> <li>• Cannot require details that are inconsistent with the Design Principles Diagram cited in condition no.5 of the Outline Permission.</li> <li>• The starting point is that development in accordance with the Design Principles Diagram is acceptable in principle, as are the inevitable impacts associated with it.</li> <li>• SDNPA may be highly vulnerable to appeal costs, if the application is determined beyond these considerations.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer response:</u> The Addendum Reports clarify the starting point and scope of the assessments. The assessments then set out the relevant considerations.</p>	Update
6	7	.	<p>A Road Safety Audit has been received from the Applicant. It outlines that the access has been designed with acceptable highway safety.</p> <p>This information has been submitted at short notice to the committee meeting. Further time would be needed to consider it, in consultation with consultees. Therefore, <b>the Recommendation remains unchanged.</b></p>	Further information
6	12	4.6	<p><u>Updated consultee response</u></p> <p>The Lead Local Flood Authority has responded to additional information, as follows:</p>	Update

			<p>Lead Local Flood Authority: <del>Objection, pending further details</del> <b>No objection, subject to condition.</b></p> <p><u>Officer note</u> – The Recommendation already includes condition 8 concerning the surface water drainage scheme which addresses its detailed design.</p>	
7	29	.	<p><u>Further information from the Applicant received, as follows:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Briefing Note</li> <li>2) Letter (4 April)</li> <li>3) Road Safety Audit</li> </ol> <p><u>Summary and officer responses</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Briefing Note</li> </ol> <p>It outlines rebuttal comments to consultee feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petersfield Town Council’s views on design addressed.</li> <li>• Petersfield Society’s views on design addressed.</li> <li>• Have addressed landscape officer views on layout, SUDs, hardstanding, sub-urbanisation, landscaping.</li> <li>• Contradictory ecology advice on conservation and translocation of rush pasture; no requirement to retain it; landscaping around trees acceptable.</li> <li>• Technical detail responding to Lead Local Flood Authority comments.</li> <li>• Housing - 40% discount market sales, 60% market including custom build.</li> <li>• Noise - attenuation barrier not in conflict with definitive PROW.</li> <li>• Highways – officers advised building to adoptable standards impacted the design. Layout therefore accords with Manual for Streets Guidance.</li> </ul>	Further information

			<p><u>Officer response:</u> The main and addendum committee reports summarise and consider consultee feedback.</p> <p>The technical responses regarding highways would require further consultation with relevant consultees and, as such, reasons for refusal remain, apart from no.4 as detailed below. Reference to housing tenure is a separate matter to this application and discussions are ongoing.</p> <p>1) <u>Letter (4 April)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request deferral to address technical issues.</li> <li>• Design Framework document misapplied in the assessment. Outline Permission only conditions the Design Principles Diagram.</li> <li>• Acoustic barrier alongside A3 has a positive effect on PROW amenity.</li> <li>• LLFA comments state only further information required, not an objection.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer response:</u> A full suite of revised plans and information were submitted in February, with the agreed aim to reach the April meeting. Whilst a deferral would allow extra time to address technical reasons for refusal, it would not overcome wider design considerations. The addendum report addresses the criticism of the original assessment regarding the weight given to the Design Framework.</p> <p>2) <u>Road Safety Audit</u></p> <p>Road Safety Audit information outlines that the internal access roads achieve an acceptable highway safety design.</p> <p><u>Officer response:</u> This information has been submitted in short notice to the committee meeting. Further time would be needed to consider the information in consultation with the Highways Authority. Therefore, reason for refusal no.3 remains unchanged.</p>	
7	35	4.2	<p><u>Consultee response received:</u></p> <p><b>Arboriculture:</b> No objection, subject to conditions.</p>	Update

7	29	Recommendation	<p><u>Amendment as follows:</u></p> <p>1) That <del>planning permission</del> <b>Reserved Matters</b> be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 9.1 of this report.</p>	Correction
7	50	9.1	<p>In response to further rebuttal information from the Applicant, the Lead Local Flood Authority no longer raise concerns and recommend conditions.</p> <p>Therefore, reason for refusal no.4 is <b>deleted</b> from the recommendation.</p>	Update
9	147	4.2	<p>Response to SDLPR Regulation 18 consultation from Lewes District Council now received: referring to cross boundary work under the duty to cooperate and making specific comments on SD2, SD4, SD9, SD11, SD23, SD25, SD26, SD33, SD35, SD48, SD51, and SD17,49 &amp; 51.</p>	Update
10	173	3.5	<p>Clarification that Strategic Planning Boards will only be necessary if Hampshire and Sussex are unsuccessful in their proposals to become combined county authorities.</p>	Correction
11	180	2.3	<p>The <b>East Dean and Friston Neighbourhood Development Plan</b> was subject to a Regulation 14 public consultation between September and October 2024, and the submission and Regulation 16 public consultation are anticipated for later in 2025. The parish council formally submitted their Plan to the Authority in April 2025. Authority Officers will carry out a legal compliance check to ensure that the Regulation 16 public consultation can commence in due course.</p>	The report was finalised before the neighbourhood development plan was formally submitted.
11	180-181	2.3	<p><u>The proposed designations of the <b>Ovingdean Neighbourhood Area</b> and <b>Ovingdean Neighbourhood Forum</b> are currently subject to public consultation until 14 May 2025.</u></p>	The report was finalised before the consultation commenced.

11	187	Appendix I	<p><b>Made NDP:</b> <u>Bramshott and Liphook.</u></p> <p><b>District:</b> <u>East Hampshire.</u></p> <p><b>Authority Led:</b> <u>No.</u></p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Area Designated:</b> <u>20/10/2015.</u></p> <p><b>NDP Made:</b> <u>12/12/2024.</u></p> <p><b>NDP Update:</b> <u>-</u></p> <p><b>Referendum Turnout:</b> <u>14.7%</u></p> <p><b>Voted “Yes”:</b> <u>87%</u></p>	Correction
11	189	Appendix I	<p><b>Made NDP:</b> <u>Stedham with Iping</u></p> <p><b>NDP Made:</b> <u>10/06/2017</u></p>	Correction