

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee  
SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY  
PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 MARCH 2015**

Held at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:00am.

Present:

Andrew Shaxson (Chair)	Alun Alesbury	Jennifer Gray	Neville Harrison
Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones	Tom Jones	Diana Kershaw
Charles Peck	Ian Phillips		
Margaret Paren (ex officio)	Norman Dingemans (ex officio)		

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Richard Ferguson (Planning Officer), Gareth Giles (CIL Project Manager), Dan Ashe (Planning Policy Officer), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead), Amy Tyler-Jones (Neighbourhood Planning Officer), Rory Moores (Assistant Development Management Officer), Ray Drabble (LDF Policy Manager), (Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

**OPENING REMARKS**

581. The Chair informed all present that item 12 had been withdrawn from the Agenda and would not be considered at the meeting. Items 10 and 13 would be considered before item 7.

**APOLOGIES**

582. David Jenkins.

**DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

583. Charles Peck declared a Public Service interest in item 13 as a member of Wealden District Council, and had purchased tyres from a garage owned by the applicant.

584. Jennifer Gray declared a Public Service interest in item 10 as a member of East Hampshire County Council.

585. Doug Jones declared a Public Service interest in item 10 as the SDNPA representative on the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Group.

586. Norman Dingemans declared a Public Service interest in item 11 as a member of Arun District Council.

587. During Item 14, Tom Jones declared a Public Service interest as a member of Lewes District Council, and the Lead Member for Planning, as detailed in minute 634.

**MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 FEBRUARY 2015**

588. With the amendments of:

- Page 1, minute 516, to replace 'identified' with 'reserved'
- Page 6, minute 541 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet from the end to be amended to read 'A Code Level *higher than 3* for Sustainable Homes'

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**MATTERS ARISING**

589. There were none.

**UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

590. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that the applicant for the oil & gas exploration application refused by the Committee in September 2014 had released a press statement confirming they would not be appealing against the decision.

- The primary reason given was due to the recent change in Government direction regarding the approach to conventional and unconventional oil & gas exploration in National Parks.
- The applicant had also withdrawn their appeal against the refusal of an application in Wisborough Green.

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

**URGENT ITEMS**

591. There were none.

**STRATEGY & POLICY**

**PETERSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SUBMISSION VERSION)**

592. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC25/15) and update sheet.

593. The Planning Policy Manager highlighted to the Committee that the SDNPA's representation on the submission version recommended minor modification of wording to ensure conformity of the proposed housing allocation with the East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) Minerals & Waste Plan.

594. The Committee commented:

- Their gratitude to the community for the significant time and work contributed in producing a very successful Neighbourhood Plan.
- Their congratulations to the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering and Project Groups and SDNPA officers for the significant consultation work which led to the success of the Plan.
- The scale and complexity of the project, and the challenge of producing a large locally produced plan within a protected landscape.
- How the National Park had been able to add value throughout process including at submission stage.
- The importance of safeguarding sharp sand and brick-making clay sites which were required for local construction.
- Losing sharp sand and brick-making clay sites could affect other minerals sites within the National Park.
- A summary report could detail the project's successes and lessons learnt and provide a model for other communities wishing to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.
- The Plan could serve to encourage the Lewes community who were at the initial stages of producing a Neighbourhood Plan.
- A letter could be included to the Inspector highlighting the success of the Plan and the process by which it had been produced.

595. In response to questions officers clarified:

- The risk identified in paragraph 6.1 of report PC25/15 had been adequately mitigated through thorough engagement with the Steering Group.
- Larger Neighbourhood Plans for settlements such as Petersfield and Lewes had higher associated examination and referendum costs; however these would balance against the lower costs associated with smaller community plans.
- The risk identified in paragraph 6.1 of report PC25/15 had been adequately mitigated through thorough engagement with the Steering Group.

596. The Director of Planning stated :

- The Plan was a fine example of successful partnership working.
- The Steering Group's adherence to the Plan's clear vision and concepts as laid out in paragraphs 2.3-2.9, relating to the need for compact design and careful use of space and connection to the landscape.
- The importance of applying lessons learnt to the National Park's own emerging Local Plan, and ensuring the Local Plan policies clearly demonstrated the golden thread of landscape.

597. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, subject to the inclusion of a covering letter to the inspector expressing the SDNPA's views regarding the success of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan and the amount of work carried out by the community. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

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

598. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed:

- 1) The Schedule of Issues in Appendix I of Report PC25/15, with the addition of those comments made by the Planning Committee, which will form SDNPA's representation to the independent Examiner, setting out proposed amendments to ensure the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan meets the "Basic Conditions" for Neighbourhood Development Plans
- 2) To include a covering letter to the inspector expressing the SDNPA's views regarding the success of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan and work carried out by the community.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

**SDNPA (WEALDEN)**

**SDNP/14/05569/FUL GIBBYS COTTAGE, FILCHING, POLEGATE, BN26 5QA**

599. The Case Officer presented the application.

600. The Committee heard from Beverley Ferrell, who spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

601. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC28/15), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and commented:

- Their sympathy for the applicant, and the documented difficulty both in sustaining the business by previous owners and selling the business as a going concern.
- The importance of giving strategic consideration to change of use applications for visitor business sites and the potential impact of their loss.
- The proposed new footpath from Polegate leading south towards Filching, and the need to ensure adequate visitor facilities were available for both existing and proposed strategic Rights of Way.
- The duty of the National Park to preserve access sites.
- The importance of considering each application on its own merits.
- The location of the site on the bend of a relatively fast road.
- The competitor businesses identified in the report were a significant distance away especially if travelling on foot or cycle.
- The existing yellow barrier to the car park entrance was not in keeping with the rural setting.
- Replacement of the industrial and unsympathetic car park with a landscaped garden area would enhance the landscape and be more in context with the surrounding settlement.
- The National Park's ability to assist small tourism businesses.
- A landscape proposal could have assisted consideration of the landscape conditions.

602. In response to questions officers clarified:

- There was no saved policy in the 1998 Wealden Local Plan that related to the retention of businesses.
- There was a need to obtain planning permission for signs within the National Park, and pre-application advice was readily available.
- Although a landscape scheme had not yet been submitted, the application for change of use was subject to the landscape Conditions 3 and 4, which were robust and enforceable.
- A 6 month time scale could be added to Condition 6 relating to the permanent closure of the previous access site.

603. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, subject to the amendment of Condition 6 to require completion within 6 months. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

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

604. **SDNP/14/05569/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC28/15, with the exception of Condition 6 which is amended to require completion within 6 months.

**STRATEGY & POLICY**

**PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: GYPSY & TRAVELLER POLICIES**

605. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/15) and update sheet.
606. The officer verbally updated the Committee:
- New age travellers had been included.
  - Members might wish to seek clarification within the policy of the term ‘over concentrated’ and ‘disproportionate’.
607. The Committee commented:
- Their thanks to officers for an excellent and much improved policy.
  - The importance of ensuring new gypsy & traveller sites were located in suitable locations, rather than in areas that were less convenient for other uses.
  - The challenge of finding adequate sites close to large concentrations of need.
  - One member was reluctant to endorse a policy that sought to allocate resources on the basis of ancestry or race.
  - Their preference for keeping the terms ‘over concentrated’ and ‘disproportionate’ as broad terms rather than specify numbers that could prove inappropriate for individual sites.
  - The need for the introduction to provide a clear definition of sites, plots and pitches in order to fully consider potential over-concentration of sites.
  - The need to clarify the relationship between Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) sites and the proposed number of vehicles, units and associated facilities.
  - The onus on applicants to find alternative suitable sites in the case of a safeguarded site becoming unavailable.
608. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Legislation and government guidance required local planning authorities to identify, understand and address the accommodation needs of all travellers through the Local Plan process.
  - The GTAA assessment had been based on projected household formation rates as well as site waiting lists.
  - The Brighton & Hove City Council’s (BHCC) GTAA published in December 2014 referred to the level of provision at Horsdean, and the acute need for new sites.
  - Sites had not been allocated in the draft policy as evidence based research was still being undertaken with Local Authority partners, including the consideration of:
    - The duty to cooperate.
    - The recent permissions given for a number of Gypsy & Traveller sites and how these related to the overall need.
    - The awaited results and remits of the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Planning and Travellers consultation, which could include guidelines on whether Gypsy & Traveller sites in sensitive locations should be treated differently.
  - The SDNPA had responded to the DCLG’s Planning and Travellers consultation.
  - Sites of more than 9-15 pitches could be problematic both for users of the site and the existing settled community.

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

- Different groups of travellers had different space requirements, and sites could potentially be larger than 9-15 pitches.
  - A pitch was defined as the equivalent of one household, and included 1 mobile home, 1 caravan, and sufficient space for turning, access and egress.
  - The Committee would be able to determine the definition of ‘over concentrated’ and ‘disproportionate’ in relation to individual applications and in conjunction with other policy criteria.
  - Officers would seek to overcome potential ‘over-concentration’ issues during the pre-application process.
  - An example of unacceptable harm as outlined in criterion F could include noise and disturbance.
  - Proposals for the provision of permanent or transit accommodation and existing lawful permanent sites were both part of policy SD21, and would be numbered clearly as i) and ii) in the next iteration of the policy.
  - Criterion c) could be reworded to include provision of adequate social infrastructure including schools and health care.
  - The supporting text of the Dark Skies policy would be checked to ensure gypsy & traveller sites were adequately covered.
  - The Hampshire sites that came forward were a mix of public land and private ownership, and would be safeguarded to maintain the required level of provision.
  - The planning authority in liaison with the police, schools and other groups were responsible for enforcing the 28 day period on temporary stopping sites.
609. The Director of Planning summarised that officers would take forward the following comments into the next draft of the document:
- The distinguishing of Proposals for the Provision of Permanent or Transit Accommodation and Existing Lawful permanent Sites as two limbs of the same policy.
  - Amendment of the supporting text to elaborate on the meaning of the terms ‘over concentrated’ and ‘disproportionate’.
  - The addition of social facilities to criterion c) to include education and healthcare.
  - The addition of wording to clarify that applicants would be required to identify an alternative suitable site, *unless it could be established that the site was no longer required*. Guidance for assessing the viability or requirement of sites would also be included.
610. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
611. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Endorsed the direction of the draft policy as detailed in Appendix 1 of Report PC22/15 for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed.
  - 2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
  - 3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority.
612. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:35pm.
613. The meeting reconvened at 11:45pm.

**PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

614. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/15) and update sheet.
615. The Committee commented:

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

- Their thanks to officers for a comprehensive report.
- The policy was worded positively, and could include reference to landscape policies to ensure against the consideration of sites in undesirable landscape settings.
- The core Landscape policy would clarify matters relating to landscape, and there was no requirement for these to be addressed in all Local Plan policies.
- The need to identify a means by which affordable homes could remain affordable in perpetuity, in view of future potential changes to the Right to Buy scheme.
- The importance of considering the affordable housing policies of other National Parks already in place such as Pembrokeshire Coast and Exmoor who had secured a separate legal agreement to safeguard the in perpetuity clause.
- The preference of some local authorities for a ‘pepper pot’ approach to layout and design, and that housing clusters may not always be appropriate.
- The need to clarify in paragraph 22 whether nearby parishes should be within the National Park.

616. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- House extensions and replacement dwellings would be covered by Development Management policies.
- Whilst there was a link between the size of dwellings and their relative affordability, the Local Plan Member Working Group could give consideration as to whether house extensions were best dealt with by a socially led policy relating to affordability or a visual landscape policy.
- Although the principle of ‘pepper-potting’ was advocated within Planning, clusters of houses were often more practicable and tended to be preferred by Housing Associations and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) needing to deliver efficient services.
- Flats could be acceptable in larger settlements, and the relevant design policies could be cross referenced in the supporting text.
- Landscape policies would ensure rural exception sites were not sited in highly sensitive areas.
- The need to consider the full Local Plan in context, and the policy’s five criteria related to rural exception sites that had already been deemed acceptable on other terms including landscape.
- As a National Park, the SDNPA could require good evidence for the local need for rural exception sites.
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidance allowed for consideration of some market housing to add viability to housing exception sites.
- The figure of 40% affordable housing had been led by evidence produced by the 2014 Affordable Housing & CIL Viability study, and 50% had been tested and found to be undeliverable other than in highest value areas.
- The figure of 40% combined with a high CIL charge was considered to be a high bar, and open to Member debate.
- Affordable housing levels of higher than 40% would be accepted if forthcoming.
- The National Park had a duty to foster the economic and social well being of local communities, and the word ‘positive’ in criterion 2) of SD20 could be amended to ‘significant’.
- The word ‘effective’ could be added to community engagement in SD20 Criterion 5)

617. The Senior Solicitor advised the Committee of the risk from a legal perspective of including other policies at this early stage of the Local Plan, as adding weight to some policies could potentially weaken others.

618. The Director of Planning summarised that officers would take forward the following comments into the next draft of the document:

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

- The need to look at other National Park models with regard to safeguarding affordable housing in perpetuity.
- The definition of ‘clusters’ and the need to avoid active promotion of the cluster approach.
- The inclusion of cross-references to other policies in the supporting text and not in the main policies.
- The inclusion of the word ‘effective’ community engagement in SD20 Criterion 5)
- The emphasis of a local connection within the National Park in paragraph 23
- Officers would consult with the Government inspector and gauge whether the figure ‘at least 40%’ might be acceptable.
- The rewording of criterion 2) of SD20 to ensure contributions could relate to all sites including small ones.

619. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

620. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- 1) Endorsed the direction of the affordable housing policies, as set out in Appendix I of Report PC23/15, for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed
- 2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
- 3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority.

**PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: TRANSPORT POLICIES**

621. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/15) and update sheet.

622. The Committee commented:

- Their commendation of the draft transport policies which were now very robust.
- The need to include the South Downs Way, and public transport to access it, particularly in the West, and other strategic footpaths.
- Regarding SD14
  - The importance of defining historical rural roads to allow adequate protection against curbing and lighting proposals.
  - The cumulative negative impact on traffic that several small developments could have.
  - Bus shelters in isolated rural areas would be a welcome inclusion.
  - The need for the revised supporting text to be clarified and directed more clearly.
- Regarding SD43
  - The welcome improvements to the public realm and highways.
  - Whether quiet tarmac could add value to developments within the National Park.
  - How the policy might be applied in cases where it conflicted with Highways customs and practice.
  - Highways design could be included in the policy under criterion 3).
- Regarding SD44
  - Criterion 3) could be strengthened to include the requirement for well designed hard and soft landscaping.
  - The importance of aligning the design of new car parks with their surroundings, and the difference between rural and urban car parks could be delineated.

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

623. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The importance of working in partnership with the Highways Authorities, and having regard to their approach and budget restrictions.
  - Highways were required to implement agreed highways works for new developments under S278 agreements.
  - The Roads in the South Downs document being developed in conjunction with external partners would detail how issues outside Planning and the Local Plan could be resolved, including:
    - The use of quiet tarmac
    - Shared space
    - The maintenance of roadside hedgerows for the safety of vulnerable road users.
  - The Roads in the South Downs document would be brought to a future meeting of the NPA, and officers would make best endeavours to bring it to the public domain in time for the Local Plan consultation in September.
  - Paragraph 14 sufficiently defined historic rural roads and further definition could mean some historic rural roads were excluded.
624. The Director of Planning summarised that officers would take forward the following comments into the next draft of the document:
- The inclusion of the South Downs Way and other key Rights of Way including a hierarchy of established links and tributaries.
  - Quiet tarmac could be introduced as an example in the supporting text.
  - Seeking to enhance existing car parks where possible, through enhancement of Natural Capital.
  - The enhancement of public transport infrastructure including bus shelters.
  - Inclusion of highways design in street design and management proposals within protected landscapes.
625. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
626. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Endorsed the direction of the draft policy as detailed in Appendix I of Report PC24/15 and the update sheet for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed.
  - 2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
  - 3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority.
627. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1.20pm.
628. The meeting reconvened at 1:50pm.

**MAKING OF FERRING, ANGMERING AND HURSTPIERPOINT & SAYERS  
COMMON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

629. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC25/15).
630. In response to questions, officers clarified
- There had been approximately 2000 participants in each referendum, which represented around 20-25% of the population.
  - The granting of three Right to Build orders may have contributed to some local opposition for the Ferring Neighbourhood Plan.
  - The Sandford Principle was normally applied in cases where both National Park purposes could not be met.

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

- ‘Quiet Lanes’ was a project aspiration of the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan group.
- When adopted, the Local Plan would review all existing Neighbourhood Plans for areas of conflict, with the most recent policy taking precedence.
- The Neighbourhood Plans would be reviewed as required by Parish Councils.

631. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

632. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- 1) Noted the outcomes of the Angmering, Ferring and Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common neighbourhood plan referendums
- 2) Agreed to make the Angmering Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA’s Development Plan for the part of the designated Angmering neighbourhood area that lies within the South Downs National Park
- 3) Agreed to make the Ferring Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA’s Development Plan for the part of the designated Ferring neighbourhood area that lies within the South Downs National Park
- 4) Agreed to make the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA’s Development Plan for the part of the designated Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common neighbourhood area that lies within the South Downs National Park

**CONSULTATIONS**

**LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**LW/15/0034 LAND ADJACENT TO FISHER TERMINAL EAST QUAY NEWHAVEN EAST SUSSEX**

633. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC29/15).

634. The Committee commented:

- Tom Jones declared a Public Service interest in the item as a member of Lewes District Council, and the Lead Member for Planning. He confirmed that he would not take part in this Committee’s debate and decision taking.
- Their thanks to the officer for a useful report.
- Their concerns regarding:
  - The extreme sensitivity of the development and its surroundings, including the Tide Mills site which lay within the boundary of the National Park.
  - The increased operational requirements and impact of architectural structures on the surrounding landscape.
  - The meaning of the term ‘landscape framework’, and whether Condition 1 could require a detailed landscape design proposal and management plan.
  - The wording of Condition 2, which could be strengthened to:
    - Require the production of an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan.
    - Remove the words ‘in principle’ and align more robustly with the comments submitted by the East Sussex County Council (ESCC) County Ecologist as detailed in Appendix 2.1 of Report PC29/15.
  - The access road which although not part of the application would have an impact on the adjacent Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) wetland area.
  - The security fencing and lighting associated with international ports, and the potential negative impact on the landscape.
  - The loss of three square hectares of significant habitat, and a historic lattice pier.
  - The risk of loss of public access being to footpaths and the SNCI, and how protection of public access related to the National Park’s Purpose 2.
  - The potential impact on longshore drift.

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

- Their reluctance to recommend that Lewes District Council approve the application and their preference for stating the SDNPA had no objection to the approval of the application subject to the conditions being met.
- The SDNPA's Landscape Officer's full report should be submitted with the consultation response.
- The importance of including the views of Newhaven and Seaford Town Councils in the SDNPA's consultation response, and how the local community wished conflicts between issues of economy and development and issues of ecology to be resolved.

635. In response to questions, officers clarified

- Approval for the scheme would also be required from the Crown Estate's Marine Management Organisation.
- Loss of access had been raised as a concern by Newhaven Town Council and other representatives, and Newhaven Port & Properties had confirmed access to the East Pier would be safeguarded.
- Limited modelling had suggested the proposed dredging could result in some interruption to the longshore drift and sediment accumulation to the east of the East Pier, however no significant longshore drift impact was anticipated.
- Lewes District Council had the necessary expertise to discharge the conditions and there was no requirement for the SDNPA to approve these. The SDNPA Link Officer would continue to liaise as normal with Lewes District Council regarding the application.
- A copy of the SDNPA's response would be circulated to Newhaven and Seaford Town Councils.

636. It was proposed and seconded to delegate the SDNPA's consultation response to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to include The SDNPA Landscape Officer's assessment, reference to the Committee's concerns regarding public access to the beach and SNCI, the access road proposals and whether these could be considered at the same time as the main application, the design of the industrial equipment and associated facilities, and if minded to approve the application, to include the conditions outlined in Report PC29/15, with the removal of the requirement for approval by the SDNPA, the amendment of Condition 2 to require the developer to provide an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan, and a further condition to cover lighting. Following a vote, the proposal was carried. It was also proposed that the final response be sent to both Newhaven and Seaford Town Councils.

637. **LW/15/0034 RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed to delegate the SDNPA's response to the consultation to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to include:

- 1) The SDNPA Landscape Officer's assessment
- 2) Regard to
  - i.) Public access to the beach and SNCI
  - ii.) Whether the access road proposals could be considered at the same time as the main application
  - iii.) The design of the industrial equipment and associated facilities
- 3) If minded to approve the application, for Lewes District Council to include the conditions outlined in Report PC29/15, with the removal of the requirement for approval by the SDNPA, and:
  - i.) The amendment of Condition 2 to require the developer to *provide* an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan
  - ii.) A further Condition 5 to cover lighting.
- 4) A copy of the SDNPA's response would be circulated to Newhaven and Seaford Town Councils.

**Chair**

638. The meeting closed at 2.48pm.