

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 19 January 2012

Held at Cowdray Hall, Easebourne, Midhurst at 10:30am

Present:

Andrew Shaxson - Chair	Barbara Holyome	Ken Bodfish	Charles Peck
Neville Harrison - Deputy Chair	Jennifer Gray	Tom Jones	David Jenkins

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Pat Aird (Major Applications and Enforcement Lead), Claire Potts (Minerals and Waste Lead), Katie Kam (Solicitor) Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer) & Tony Cook (East Sussex County Council).

APOLOGIES

259. Apologies for absence were received from Alun Alesbury & Margaret Paren.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

260. Charles Peck declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 5, as a member of Wealden District Council Planning Committee South.

261. Tom Jones declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 6 & 7 as a member of Lewes District Council.

262. Neville Harrison declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 6,7 & 8 as a member of the South Downs Society and a personal & prejudicial interest in items 6 & 7 as a seasonal employee of Glyndebourne and that he is known to Mr Gus Christie personally.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 December 2011

263. The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2011 were agreed as a correct record.

264. The Chair of the Committee informed the Committee that it had been brought to his attention that a non material amendment should be made to the minutes of the 11 November meeting as there was an omission from minute 169; Mr Stuart Meier had spoken against the KEVII application representing both the Campaign for the Protection for Rural England (CPRE) Sussex and the South Downs Society. With the agreement of the Committee, the Chair amended the minutes, initialled and dated the amendments.

URGENT ITEMS

265. There were no urgent items.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No:	NP/2011/0093/MAJ
Proposal:	Winery and associated car parking and turning areas. Addition of water storage and treatment tanks, solar array (165 panels) plus additional landscaping
Address:	Rathfinny Wine Estate Alfriston

266. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 01/12)

267. The case officer informed the Committee that the height of the winery would be a maximum height of 12.7 metres and not 11 metres as stated in report PC01/12.

268. The case officer highlighted items on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Tuesday 17 January.

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

269. Councillor Nick Bennett spoke in support of the application as the East Sussex County Council Local Member for Alfriston, representing the views of the local residents and the Parish Council including their support of the application. He drew attention to:-
- The benefits of the project and an enhanced landscape
 - Improvements to existing buildings and employment opportunities.
 - The project meeting the Purposes and Duty of the South Downs National Park (SDNP)
 - A great deal of work had gone into the project and application
 - Widespread local eagerness to see the project through to fulfilment.
270. Mr Mark Driver spoke in support of the application as the applicant. He thanked the officers for their comprehensive report and spoke about:
- How he had worked with designers around the world to design the winery to incorporate pressing, bottling and storage facilities
 - How the business would be a large employer in the area and would raise the profile of the South Downs.
 - How the estate had worked closely with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) and the National Trust in opening up trails for walkers.
271. Mr Martin Swatton spoke in support of the application as the design consultant explaining how he had worked on designing a 21st Century facility for wine production whilst being sympathetic to the location and meeting the Purposes and Duty of the SDNP. He spoke of :
- Minimising the impact of vehicle movements
 - How the design of the winery was a result of 8 months of consultation with designers worldwide to have the least impact on the environment.
 - Reducing light pollution, recycling water, the installation of Solar Panels, and using special glass to avoid reflection
 - The use of recycled oak to produce a sustainable and energy efficient build.
 - The roof being planted with heather grass.
272. The Committee discussed the application, their concerns included;
- The substandard entrance and traffic movements associated with the construction period
 - The impact of the large solar panel installation and views of it from the south of the site
 - Increased vehicle movements if grapes from other vineyards were processed on site
 - Future B2 use if the project failed
 - The need for temporary warning signage or alternative methods or slowing traffic at the entrance of the site
 - Parking provision
 - The visual impact of the stakes supporting the growing vines
273. The Committee commented that:
- The application was well thought through and a sensitive enhancement
 - They were supportive of the overall vision and gains for;
 - employment
 - the environment and biodiversity
 - underground cabling
 - The application reflected well the Purposes of the SDNPA and how the Duty would be fulfilled if permission was granted
 - The use as a vineyard would alter the appearance of the landscape but the land use was not irreversible

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

- They were encouraged to see a good modern design that was not a pastiche and that the applicant was working with the SDNPA Rangers on long-term grassland management
 - Further analysis of the landscape context would have been helpful
274. In response to the Committee's questions; the case officer clarified that;
- There would be a transition period, when the arable farming was phased out and the winery started production, when vehicle movements increased but there would not be an overall increase in traffic movements when the vineyard was completely developed.
 - The winery was classed as an agricultural building and permission for a change of use would need to be submitted if grapes from other vineyards were to be processed on site
 - The stakes required to support the vines would not require planning permission and without the winery building, grapes would have to be transported off site which would generate more vehicle movements
 - The provision of parking was not an issue on this particular application as there would be no impact on the highway due to the size of the estate
 - Regarding the size and potential visual impact of the solar panels; it was for the Committee to consider as part of the application whether they would have a significant impact on the landscape
275. The Director of Planning said, the Highways Authority had no concerns over the use of the access during the construction period, but the SDNPA could enter into dialogue with the applicant regarding temporary caution signs. The solar panels would be seen in the context of a series of buildings within the site. Landscape conditions had been included in the report PC01/12.
276. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officers recommendation subject to the addition of an informative relating to temporary signage at the entrance to the estate during the construction period. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
277. **RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the informative set out in minute 276 and paragraph 9.1 of the report (PC01/12)

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: LW/11/1252/NP
Proposal: Replacement car/coach parking area including new gate in wall
Address: Glyndebourne Opera House, New Road Ringmer BN8 5UU

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: LW/11/1250/NP
Proposal: Replacement car/coach parking area including new gate in wall – Listed Building Consent
Address: Glyndebourne Opera House, New Road Ringmer BN8 5UU

278. Committee member Neville Harrison left the Committee table and sat in the public seating.
279. The Committee Chair explained that the Committee would discuss and debate both applications together before the Committee considered each application for decision separately.
280. The Committee considered the reports by the Director of Planning (Report PC02/12 & PC03/12).
281. The case officer highlighted items on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Tuesday 17 January.
282. Committee member Neville Harrison left the room.
283. Mr Gus Christie spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he spoke about:

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

- The use of the Opera House for the Glyndebourne season, the touring opera and the use by local schools and the community
 - How activities on the site had increased since the new Opera House was build in 1994
 - How the 'drop off' point for disabled visitors, taxis and coaches through the existing archway was at times dangerous and chaotic
 - The need to improve traffic flow whilst keeping the existing route for emergency and disabled access
 - How Glyndebourne wished to encourage visitors to arrive by coach as a greener alternative
 - How Glyndebourne was a place of cultural heritage within the National Park.
284. Mr Craig Noel spoke in support of the application as the agent; his comments included reference to the following:
- The main house was not symmetrical and of irregular plan
 - The reduction of hard standing outside the main house would improve the setting
 - If the impact on the setting of the house was of short duration and therefore did not impact on the setting then the same was true of the impact of the coaches in the 'Wild Garden
 - The public would be invited to enjoy the 'Wild Garden'
 - The Yew trees were 'category B' trees and it was not important to retain them and they limited light to the other trees
 - The removal of the listed wall was not demolition as it would be replaced
 - The wall was comparatively modern
 - The proposal would enable an increase in the use of public transport
 - The proposal improved traffic circulation
285. The Committee discussed the application; their comments and concerns included;
- Whether the officers recommendation showed an understanding of the economics of Glyndebourne?
 - The loss of trees
 - Whether a 1 metre extension of the gates and reduction of the wall would be noticed?
 - Glyndebourne had been a part of the cultural heritage of Sussex since the 1930's and a remarkable private achievement.
 - Parking issues needed addressing
 - The proposal made sense
 - The existing driveway was out of scale with the domestic dwelling
 - The existing gates into the 'Wild Garden' were not 'old' and they would support a new design of gates
 - Concern that the proposed parking area turning areas would not be large enough for coaches and that an additional application would be submitted requiring additional space from the 'Wild Garden' and the removal of more trees
 - Concern that the application would not enhance the setting of the listed building
286. The Director of Planning suggested some conditions that could be applied if the Committee were minded to grant permission relating to;
- Materials and design of the gates
 - Landscaping
 - Design and materials of the gates to be approved by the SDNPA
 - Reduction in width of the drive to the main house

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

- Details of access to and turning circles within proposed car park
 - Drainage
 - Partial removal and restoration works thereafter of listed wall
 - Lighting
 - Access to the site
287. It was proposed and seconded to grant permission for the application PC02/12, subject to the conditions listed in minute 286, to be delegated to the Director of Planning to draft in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
288. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions listed in minute 285 to be delegated to the Director of Planning to draft in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
289. It was proposed and seconded to grant permission for the application PC03/12 subject to the conditions listed in minute 286 to be delegated to the Director of Planning to draft in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
290. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions listed in minute 285 to be delegated to the Director of Planning to draft in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee
291. Committee Member Neville Harrison returned to the Committee table.
292. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 12:00pm
293. The meeting re convened at 12:05pm

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Application No: 11/00745/SFUL
Proposal: Change of use to training centre (D1 Use)
Address: Marwell Yard, Thompsons Lane, Owslebury, Hampshire

294. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 04/12)
295. The case officer highlighted items on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Tuesday 17 January and reminded the Committee of the location of the site close to the boundary of the National Park.
296. Councillor John Chapman spoke against the application as a resident and representing Owslebury Parish Council; he referred to:
- The Parish Councils concern about the change of use of the site
 - The Parish Council support for job creation but not for an industry which had a detrimental impact on the environment
 - The history of the site and previous usage
 - Concerns regarding noise and disbenefits to the environment, the National Park and the community.
297. The Committee discussed the application; their questions, comments and concerns included;
- Their Interest in hearing about the history of the site from the speaker
 - The need to carefully consider development adjacent to the boundary of the SDNP
 - The importance of enforcement action
 - They could not support an application allowing permission to continue having regard to the site history and local concerns
 - The width of the roads leading to the site
 - The need to consider each application on it's merits and not because of the site history

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

- There may be a need to find locations for training activities of this kind but this was an opportunistic use of the site, which had not carefully considered
298. In response to questions; the case officer said that information on the proportion of practical to theory training was not available. A full investigation would need to assess whether conditions had been breached on previous permissions.
299. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officers recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
300. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 9.2 and that consideration of expediency for enforcement action be delegated to the Director of Planning as set out in paragraph 9.3 of report PC04/12

STRATEGY & POLICY

Proposed Submission Waste and Minerals Plan for East Sussex, South Downs Park and Brighton & Hove

301. The Committee considered the reports by the Director of Planning (Report PC05/12).
302. The case officer highlighted an item on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Tuesday 17 January which set out the change to the consultation date. It was explained to the Committee that a definition of 'major development' had been included as a footnote to policy WMP1
303. The Committee discussed the plan, their comments included;
- Welcomed the footnote on Policy WMP1
 - The Committee were familiar with the document after working jointly with East Sussex County Council & Brighton & Hove in producing the Plan. A great deal of consideration had been given to the document at various workshops and previous Committee meetings and had been a good example of joint working
 - Concern that wording could be stronger in some policies to incorporate 'Could' to 'Should' and 'rather' to 'must'
304. The East Sussex County Council officer said that policies had 'Could' rather than 'Should' as some requirements were not obligatory In response to a question on the restoration policy, He recommended that the current wording should be retained, as flexibility was required with restoration depending on circumstances and that restoration could be many years in the future. Sites would be rigorously monitored and reviewed on a case by case basis, it not always being appropriate to insist upon particular measures or a s106 agreement.
305. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officers recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
306. **RESOLVED:** That
1. the analysis of the response to the consultation on the draft Waste and Minerals Plan (WMP) be noted;
 2. the Proposed Submission Waste and Minerals Plan (PSWMP) for East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton and Hove be approved for publication; consultation on its soundness and subsequent submission to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulations 27 – 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (Amendment) Regulations 2008; and
 3. the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, be authorised to agree any further minor changes to the text of the PSWMP with East Sussex County Council (ESCC) and Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC).

CHAIR

Meeting closed at 12:40pm