

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

Agenda Item 13

PLANNING COMMITTEE 10 May 2012

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

Present:

Andrew Shaxson - Chair	Barbara Holyome	Ken Bodfish	Alun Alesbury
Neville Harrison - Deputy Chair	Jennifer Gray	Charles Peck	David Jenkins
Margaret Paren (ex officio)	Doug Jones		

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Lewis Oliver (Development Management Officer), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Officer), Tim Bettany-Simmons (Development Management Officer), Peter Wilsdon (Minerals and Waste Support Officer), Claire Potts (Minerals and Waste Lead), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

495. The Chair informed the Committee that item 13 on the meeting agenda would be considered after item 11 to allow items 12 & 14 to be considered consecutively.

APOLOGIES

496. Apologies for absence were received from Tom Jones.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

497. Alun Alesbury declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 10 as a member of Stoughton Parish Council and as a neighbour to the application site. He confirmed that he took no part in the discussion when it was considered by the Parish Council. Alun also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in items 12 & 14 as he acted for the applicant in a professional capacity in the past.
498. David Jenkins declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 8 as a member of Horsham District Council Planning Committee.
499. Jennifer Gray declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 12 as a member of East Hampshire District Council (EHDC).
500. Neville Harrison declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 7 as he was personally known to the owners of Springbarn Farm and was involved in a project with them. Neville also declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 6 & 8 as a member of the South Downs Society.
501. Andrew Shaxson declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 10 & 11 as a member of Chichester District Council.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 April 2012

502. The minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

URGENT ITEMS

503. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Application No: 11/02545/SFUL

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

**Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling & garage and erection of 10 new dwellings, revised vehicular access, car parking provision.
Landscaping and replacement front wall**
Address: Townsend, Northend lane, Droxford

504. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 28/12)
505. Dr. Pietro Acciarri spoke against the application representing the 54 local residents in Droxford who wrote letters of objection to this development; he spoke about:-
- Lack of support from local residents regarding the application and the strong objections to the development
 - The development by its size, scale, density and design would have an adverse impact on the landscape of the area and was a consideration and reason for refusal
 - The Special Qualities of the South Downs National Park (SDNP)
 - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) giving more weight to the views of the local community
 - The need to preserve the character of the village
 - The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Duty was to protect the landscape of an area within the SDNP
506. Mr David Neale spoke against the application, on behalf of Droxford Parish Council; he made reference to:-
- The Parish Councils overriding concerns regarding;
 - increased traffic movements and the hazard posed to pedestrians along with parking issues
 - Lack of capacity of the sewage plant to service additional dwellings
 - The proposal was an over development of the site
 - The proposal was against the inspectors decision of 2010 and planning policy statements
507. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that whilst the Public Speakers had referred to planning history of the site, the latest inspectors report carried the most weight as it relates to the same proposal. The previous inspector reports relate to different proposals. ;
508. The Committee commented on:
- The application was identical to the one previously considered
 - The application site was in an attractive village, therefore any development should be sympathetic
 - Their acknowledgement of the need for more housing within the SDNP
 - Development within the SDNPA should be encouraged if the provision for affordable housing and highways was met and the development fitted well within its surroundings
 - The site was prominent and would affect neighbouring properties
 - Their encouragement of applicants working with officers of the SDNPA to ensure a suitable design was submitted
 - Their surprise that affordable housing was not included in the proposal
 - Edge of settlement sites were just as important as centre of settlement sites
509. In response to the Committee's questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that:
- 8.2 and 8.3 of report PC 28/12 clarified the position for reasons for refusal in regard to the recent Localism Act.
 - The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) adopted by Winchester City Council states that up to 10 dwellings could be included, subject to all of the usual constraints

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

- Concerns regarding the capacity of the Sewage plant had been raised previously and could be managed by conditions. The inspectors report had said a solution would be possible
 - There was no design statement for Droxford. The East Winchester design panel had concerns regarding the application.
 - The applicant had not been forthcoming when offered the opportunity to work with SDNPA officers on the design
 - With regard to the rights of an electricity company to undertake works to trees it was confirmed that they would have to notify and carry out the minimum works required for safety and maintenance of the electricity supply.
510. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
511. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 28/12

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: LW/11/1529

Proposal: **Erection of two detached dwellings and garages together with ecological enhancements**

Address: **New Pit Depot Mill Road Lewes East Sussex**

512. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC29/12).
513. The case officer highlighted the revised reason for refusal (ii) on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 9 May
514. Cllr John Stockdale spoke against the application as a Ward Councillor; he spoke about:
- The proposed development was in a sensitive area and adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
 - Reserve status was being applied for
 - The housing design was not suitable for the area
 - The site was not a rural exception site
 - Contravention of the current certificates of lawful use
515. Mr Robert Cheesman spoke against the application on behalf of The South Downs Society and The Friends of Lewes; he made reference to:
- The application would;
 - be an unnecessary development that would extend the built up boundary into the countryside
 - adversely affect the Character of the area
 - cause additional light and noise pollution
 - Other Chalk Pits within the area had become part of the landscape
 - The need for housing of the application type within the town although not in the proposed location
516. Councillor Petrina Kingham spoke against the application as a Town Councillor and resident of Mill Road: she spoke about:
- She was a resident of Mill Road
 - The current vehicle access and use
 - The Committee should refuse the application
517. Mr Chris Gargan spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he made reference to:
- The lawful use of the site
 - Vehicle movements

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

- How many operatives and vehicles use the site
 - The 2 years of negotiations with Lewes District Council to find a suitable alternative working site and that they would not oppose in principle of redevelopment of the existing site
 - Complaints of the residents on the access lane from current lawful movements
518. Mr Gary Thompson spoke in support of the application as the architect; he spoke about:
- The contemporary design of the housing and the materials used
 - The visual impact of the development not having an adverse impact on the surroundings
 - The Code 5 high sustainability level of the proposal
519. Mr Dale Mayhew spoke in support of the application as the agent; he made reference to:
- The contamination risk of the site
 - Comments from the Environment Agency
 - The willingness of the applicant to sign a S106 agreement as required by the Highways Authority
 - The current lawful use of the site and the ability to impose conditions on current lawful use
 - The proposal to find suitable alternative use for the site
 - The rear of the site would be returned to chalk grassland with no objection to the scheme by Natural England
 - The contributions to be made by the developer
 - How many local residents found the current lawful use undesirable
520. The Committee commented:
- The application site was in the countryside and outside of the settlement boundary of Lewes
 - The proposal was not an attractive design of housing
 - The site had a high level of value as a conservation area
 - Their credit to the applicant for a proposal containing a high level of sustainable housing
 - The proposal not fulfilling the Purposes and Duty of the SDNP
521. In response to the Committee's questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning proposed that the reason for refusal number (iii) be removed from the officer's recommendation in the light of the Environment Agency withdrawing their objection.
522. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation incorporating the revised reason for refusal (ii) and removal of reason (iii). Following a vote the proposal was carried.
523. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
- (i). The proposal would create a form of development which is
 - unjustified in policy terms; and
 - would be an undesirable intrusion of residential development in the countryside by reason of its size, scale, massing, layout and design leading to a urbanising and formal impact which would adversely affect the visual appearance and landscape character of the South Downs National Park.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CT1, ST3, ST4 & ST11 of the Lewes District Local Plan 2003
 - (ii). The access to the site from the B2192 – Ringmer Road is of inadequate width to accommodate safely the additional traffic which the proposed development would generate. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to control access to the site, the further traffic created by this development would interfere with the free flow at the

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

junction with the B2192 by the additional slowing, stopping, turning and reversing traffic which would be created. As such the proposal is likely to have a detrimental impact on highway safety contrary to policies T1 & T14 of the Lewes District Local Plan 2003

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: LW/12/0328/NP

Proposal: Retrospective application for retention of a signboard

Address: Spring Barn Farm, Kingston Road, Lewes, East Sussex, BN7 3ND

524. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 30/12)
525. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
526. **RESOLVED:** That Planning permission be granted for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC30/12.
527. The Chair adjourned the meeting for at comfort break at 11:55am
528. The meeting re convened at 12 midday

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: DC/11/2466

Proposal: Continued temporary use of land and buildings on west side of A283 (south part) for purposes falling within use classes B1, B2 and B8 (business, industry and storage) including residential security caravan (renewal of DC/09/2031)

Address: Shoreham Cement Works, Shoreham Road, Upper Beeding, West Sussex

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: AWDM/0992/11

Proposal: Continued temporary use of land and buildings on west side of A283 (south part) for purposes falling within use classes B1, B2 and B8 (business, industry and storage) including residential security caravan (renewal of ADC/0424/09)

Address: Shoreham Cement Works, (west side), Steyning Road, Upper Beeding, Shoreham by sea, West Sussex

529. The Chair informed the committee and members of the public that as there were 2 applications on the agenda for Shoreham Cement works which were associated, they would hear from the case officer on both before any public speakers for the applications. The Committee would then discuss and debate the applications together before reaching a view on each separately.
530. The Committee considered the reports by the Director of Planning (Report PC 31/12 & PC 32/12)
531. Robert Cheesman spoke on the application on behalf of The South Downs Society (SDS); He commented:
- Application site DC/11/2466 was an untidy eyesore to the SDNP, visible from many vantage points of the SDNP
 - The applications were an opportunity for the Committee to demonstrate what the National Park wished to achieve for the future
 - A need to be strict on a resolution to control waste, and remove paraphernalia
 - 3 years was too long for a temporary permission with 18 months preferable
 - Horsham part of the site more visible and no attempt to remove/tidy site

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

- Application site AWDM/0992/11 was not as visible therefore the SDS did not have an objection
532. The Committee commented:
- It was a significant site within the SDNP and what happens on the site in the future is very important
 - The site was large and although not all of the site was visible from the main road, it was in need of tidying up
 - The types of business uses the site attracted would need to be accommodated somewhere, even in the SDNP
 - The timescale proposed.
 - Buildings within the site were of poor repair and had a graffiti issue
 - There was an opportunity for the SDNPA to work jointly with the Owner and other Authorities to find a solution for a suitable use for the site
533. In response to questions; the Director of Planning clarified that;
- The reason for recommendation 10.1 (i) was in regard to the re development and restoration to enable long term restoration & landscaping; and was different to condition 4, which was for tidying up the site after the 3 year period should no long term restoration plan be in place
 - Condition 5 requires the applicant to provide a Management Plan within one month of permission although 2 calendar months could be acceptable.
534. Application DC/11/2466 It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the amendment to Condition 5 to read '2 calendar months'. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
535. **RESOLVED:** That Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 32/12 with the amendment of condition 5 to read from the start 'Within 2 calendar months' .
536. Application AWDM/0992/11 It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the amendment to Condition 5 to read '2 calendar months'. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
537. **RESOLVED:** That Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 32/12 with the amendment of condition 5 to read from the start 'Within 2 calendar months' .

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: 11/05289/FULNP
Proposal: Construction of new lake in park land
Address: Watergate House, Locksash Lane, West Marden, Chichester, West Sussex

538. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 33/12)
539. Mr Chris Palmer spoke against the application on behalf of himself as a neighbour; he spoke about:
- He was a neighbour living adjacent to the proposed lake
 - The area was sensitive to flooding
 - His concerns if the lake overflowed, his property might be at risk from flooding
 - The ditch had been moved from the west to the east side of the driveway. The driveway was previously a barrier, due to this change to the ditch this has increased flooding
 - If the lake were to be used for private fishing there would be increased traffic movements and therefore pollution

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

- It was not an acceptable proposal for the SDNP
540. The Committee commented:
- In years with average rainfall there would be water flowing in the ditch
 - Water levels in the location did not cause flooding
 - On the history of Watergate house and the rebuilding following a fire
 - Parkland not a natural landscape and lakes often associated with large estates were not necessary adverse to the landscape
 - Sympathy towards the application
 - A water feature could be an attractive feature and rich in biodiversity but not when stocked with fish
 - On the National Park Purposes and Duty
 - Their agreement with the officers recommendation
541. The Committee discussed their concerns including:
- The contours of the land would not allow the lake to sit comfortably within the landscape. Lakes in nature at the lowest point
 - No historic evidence of a lake therefore a new feature
 - The ability to fill the lake without an extraction licence
 - The lake would not have a natural look unless filled
 - The proposed lake was too large in scale
 - The proposal would not conserve and enhance the landscape or SDNP
542. In response to questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- The Environment Agency had indicated they would be unlikely to grant an extraction licence
 - It was a material consideration as to how the lake would be filled and the impact on the landscape if it was not
543. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
544. **RESOLVED:** That Planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 33/12

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: 12/00418/FULNP

Proposal: Installation of 208 photovoltaic solar modules on the roof of Alitex's main factory unit

Address: Torberry Farm, South Harting, Petersfield, Hampshire, GU31 5RG

545. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 34/12).
546. Mr Nick McAllister spoke in support of the application as the agent representing Alitex Ltd; he commented on:
- The company was a major employer with over 60 employees and commented to being a sustainable business
 - The company's clients included The National Trust
 - The installation of the 50kWh solar panels would provide 30% of their electricity, saving 26.7 tonnes of carbon a year (667.5 tonnes of carbon over the 25 year life span of the installation)
 - When closed on Sundays the electricity would off set carbon emissions of neighbouring households by providing green energy
 - Instillation would be permitted development if the panels were moved 70cm

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

- Views into the site restricted by trees
 - The environmental benefits would outweigh any impact on the landscape
 - Satisfied with suggested conditions
547. The Committee commented on:
- Their concern that there should be no loss of trees
 - Their concern that the materials used would need to be a matt finish as would be seen from the nearby footpath
 - The need for installation of solar panels within the SDNP to be assessed on a case by case basis as would not be appropriate for all areas within the SDNP where they would cause visual harm
 - The application site was appropriate for this type of development
 - Leaving a 1m gap to the edge of the roof (as required by permitted development) would be an improvement
 - Their support of renewable energy in reducing carbon emissions
548. In response to questions; the Director of Planning clarified:
- Condition 3 covered the type of materials to be used
 - Have to consider submitted scheme, the gap from the installation to the edge of the roof would not be discernable due to scale of building and screening
 - Trees outside of the application line cannot be controlled although an informative could be added to request that existing trees within and outside the application site and within the control of the applicant remain
549. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officers recommendation including an informative regarding the retention of trees. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
550. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 34/12 and the inclusion of an informative note regarding trees.
551. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:06pm for lunch
552. The meeting re convened at 1:44pm

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT APPEALS

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: H/1/12
Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement eco-friendly detached house and basement garage,
Address: The Bungalow Houghton Arundel West Sussex BN18 9LW
Purpose: To Consider the grounds of appeal and SDNPA response

553. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 36/12).
554. Mr Wood spoke against the application on behalf of himself as a neighbour; he spoke about:
- The proposed development would be out of character with the village setting
 - The materials proposed to be used
 - The plot being of modest size and not suitable for a 4 bedroom house which would fill the area without green space
 - The proposed development would be higher than the original dwelling overlooking his property and reducing privacy
 - the artists impressions detailed mature trees that did not exist
555. Mr Harrison spoke against the application on behalf of himself as a neighbour; he spoke about:

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

- The existing bungalow was of modest size
 - The proposal would be a major increase in the size of the dwelling and would engulf the modest plot size
 - The underground parking would site the house higher on the plot than the existing property
 - The proposed building would be overbearing and would be intrusive to his privacy
 - The design should be re thought to minimise impact on neighbours and surrounding area
556. Mr Ian Butters spoke in support of the application as the agent; he clarified:
- There would be no spiral staircase
 - Mature trees would be planted
 - The height of the proposed development would be only 2ft higher than the existing property
 - The proposal was similar to the neighbouring development
 - Arun District Council had recommended for approval before the application was called in by the SDNPA
 - All Consultees approved the proposal
557. Mr Mike Crosby spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he commented on:
- The property would be code level 5 for sustainability which would be difficult to achieve with a traditional built home
558. Ms Jane Cutting spoke in support of the application as the applicant; she commented on:
- Time and care had been invested in an appropriate design to have as little impact on the environment and intrusion on neighbouring properties
559. The Committee commented:
- Houghton was an attractive village of significant cultural heritage with the site sited just outside of the conservation area
 - The proposed replacement dwelling would:
 - be in an altered position than the existing building
 - be dominant in relation to its neighbours
 - suggested design and materials would not be appropriate within the context of a traditional village and near to a conservation area
 - need to be sympathetic to the landscape
 - They were not apposed to contemporary designs where appropriate and where the design conserved and enhanced the area
 - On the Purposes and Duty of the SDNPA
 - Their encouragement to see code level 5 sustainability within applications
 - The group of 3 houses had character differences to those within the village of Houghton
560. In response to questions; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified:
- Arun District council did not have a policy on replacement dwellings
 - There was no village design statement although there was a conservation area appraisal for Houghton
 - The proposed property would be visible from the South Downs Way, it would be seen within the context of the village of Houghton and would be out of keeping
 - A section of the stone wall would be removed
 - The scale and siting, exacerbated by design would have an adverse affect on the setting and location

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

561. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
562. **RESOLVED:** That the SDNPA response to the Planning Inspectorate is that Planning Permission would have been refused for the reasons outlined in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 36/12.
563. The Senior Solicitor explained that there were 2 items on the agenda associated with development at Selborne Brickworks because the development crosses the Hampshire / SDNPA boundary. It was decided to progress the planning applications in line with the administrative boundaries.
- Report PC 35/12, application 20661/049 deals with development within the SDNPA and therefore the SDNPA is the determining planning authority. It was important that the application was considered on its merits. It was the impact of the haul road works on the SDNP that were key.
 - Report PC 37/12, application 20661/048 deals with the larger part of the development which is the Anaerobic Digester plant which is within Hampshire County Council. The role of the SDNPA was as consultee.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Application No: 20661/049

Proposal: Change of use of farm track to access land at Selborne Brickworks

Address: Selborne Brickworks, Honey Lane, Selborne, Alton GU34 3BS

564. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 35/12).
565. The case officer highlighted:
- items from the update sheet including amended conditions, which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 9 May
 - the applicants wish for vehicles to be controlled by tonnage rather than numerical limits
566. Cllr Mark Kemp-Gee spoke against the application as a Hampshire County Councillor; he declared an interest in both applications, as follows:
- He disclosed a personal interest in this item, in relation to his involvement with issues of development on this site over a period of seven years. However, he wished to reassure those present that his views on the current application had been arrived at after careful consideration of the particular merits of the proposals. On that basis he concluded that his interest in this items were not prejudicial.
- He commented on:
- The viability of the project
 - The confusion if Committee members did not take a firm decision either way
 - Flooding in the area
 - Recycling facilities should be close to sources
 - His comments to the SDNPA report on Landscape assessment
 - Urging Committee members to refuse the application
567. Mr Nick Stewart spoke against the application as an example of local residents objections; he spoke about:
- Previous application consents
 - The damage caused by HGV movements and suitability of surrounding roads
 - The size and height of the access track
 - The underestimation of required vehicle movements by the applicant

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

- Dumping of waste in the area
 - Noise levels
 - The application not fulfilling the Purposes and Duty of the SDNPA
568. Cllr David Ashcroft spoke against the application as a ward councillor; he spoke about:
- Urging the Committee to refuse the application
 - The need of justification for planning
 - The current access track
 - The applicant underestimating the number of required vehicle movements
 - How hedge planting could not be completed in un natural material
 - The tranquillity of the SDNP
569. Mrs Minette Palmer spoke against the application on behalf of Selbourne Parish Council; she made reference to:
- The Planning Inspectors report
 - No sound justification for an Anaerobic Digester
 - Environmental concerns
 - The effect on the tranquillity of the SDNP and would be a permanent scar on the landscape
 - It was not a sustainable development
570. Mr Patrick Benham-Croswell spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he commented on:
- Only a section of the Haul road was in the proposal
 - The proposal would improve the original track and landscaping
 - Landscaping had been discussed with SDNPA officers
 - The proposal would provide for wildlife and fulfil the Purposes and Duty of the SDNPA
 - It was vital that the Anaerobic Digester had a minimum adverse impact on the SDNP, not only with the route used into the site
571. Committee member Alun Alesbury left the room
572. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that Alison Farmer was very familiar with the site and had visited on many occasions and had good knowledge of the history of the site.
- Possible enforcement issues were not relevant to the decision
 - Extant permission – whilst acknowledging debate, weight had been given and for the purposes of the application, therefore conditions could be mitigated for the greater good
573. The Committee commented:
- The Conditions were rigorous
 - Whilst acknowledging the applicant wishes to improve the landscape, there were limitations to what could be achieved with dead mature trees and high flood waters in the area
 - There were limited details regarding a landscaping scheme
 - To provide reassurance, a landscaping scheme should be submitted that had been independently assessed
574. In response to questions; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified:
- The 10 vehicle movements equated to 5 in and 5 out
 - In regard to a query if both the SDNPA & Hampshire County Council refused the proposal and it was subsequently granted by the Planning Inspector the SDNPA would

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

have an opportunity to comment on proposed conditions through the appeal process, however the final decision would be for the inspector

575. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation incorporating additional wording to condition 6 to require the applicant to seek an independent assessment of the landscaping scheme prior to submission to the planning authority and amendments to Conditions 4, 5 & 6 as detailed in the update sheet that was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 9 May. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
576. **RESOLVED:** That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to:-
1. grant planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 9.4 of report PC 35/12 subject to the conditions as set out in paragraph 9.5 of report PC 35/12 with the following amendments:
 - i. the revisions to conditions 4,5 and 6 set out in the update sheet
 - ii. the incorporation within condition 6 of a requirement on the applicant to seek an independent assessment of the landscaping scheme prior to submission to the planning authority
- Should Application number 200661/048 for an Anaerobic Digester be permitted by Hampshire County Council.
2. refuse planning permission for the reason set out in paragraph 9.6 of report PC35/12 should Application number 200661/048 for an Anaerobic Digester be refused by Hampshire County Council.

CONSULTATIONS

Selborne Brickworks AD

Application No: 20661/048

Proposal: Construction of Anaerobic Digester to convert food waste into biomethane to supply gas requirements of the existing brickworks and extension of an existing haul road by upgrading an existing farm track in order to provide access to provide HGV access

Address: Selborne Brickworks, Honey Lane, Selborne, Alton GU34 3BS

577. Committee member Alun Alesbury re entered the room
578. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 37/12).
579. The case officer highlighted items from the update sheet including amended conditions, which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 9 May
580. Cllr Mark Kemp-Gee spoke against the as a Hampshire County Councillor; he commented on:
- His support of the officer's recommendation
 - Concerns regarding water
 - No mitigation made on views of the brickworks
 - The planning need
 - Carbon footprint, if food stock was transported in, it would increase the Carbon footprint
581. Cllr David Ashcroft spoke against the application as a Ward Councillor; he spoke about:
- Commending the officer's recommendation
 - Vehicle movements
 - Questioning who had agreed to accept waste from the plant and where it would be taken, how far away?

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

582. Mr Nick Stewart spoke against the application as an example of local residents objections; he spoke about:
- The issue for residents living near gas canisters with some Authorities having a 250 metre rule
 - The difference between the working days and the proposed number of vehicle movements
 - Concerns for residents living near the site
583. Mrs Minette Palmer spoke against the application on behalf of Selbourne Parish Council; she made reference to:
- The application was in response to an appeal decision and had not addressed inspectors concerns
 - Concerns regarding the viability of the brickworks
 - A risk of and Anaerobic Digester and no working brickworks
584. Mr Patrick Benham-Croswell spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he commented on:
- The benefits of the development
 - The quality of the bricks the brickworks produced and the energy that would be provided from the Anaerobic Digester for this venture
 - Renewable energy
 - Major environmental benefit that would produce good fertilizer
 - There were no planning constraints that waste had to be sourced locally
 - Did not agree with officer's report
 - The development would create jobs in line with the SDNPA Purposes and Duty
585. Committee member Alun Alesbury left the room
586. The Committee commented:
- The need to have a greater degree of certainty regarding the plant before decisions could be made
 - Their concerns regarding many unanswered questions such as;
 - What was contained in spreadable digestate and where would it go?
 - Local needs of residents
 - Was it the most suitable location for an Anaerobic Digester
 - Not enough local clay to support the brickworks
 - If brickworks was not reinstated what would be the point of the fuel resource?
587. In response to questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified:
- A late letter had been received by SDNPA officers regarding a landowner that was willing to accept digestate although there was no certainty as no contract had been signed.
588. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
589. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Advise Hampshire County Council that the South Downs National Park Authority raises an objection to the AD facility for the following reasons:
 - a) Lack of information regarding the source of the feedstock
 - b) The quality of landscaping proposed
 - c) The cumulative impact of the vehicle movements has not been addressed
 - d) Economic viability of further mineral working with the brickworks

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

- e) Lack of detail regarding the ability to spread the digestate
- f) Lack of information regarding impact of water discharge

590. Committee member Alun Alesbury re entered the room
591. The Chair adjourned the meeting for at comfort break at 4:05pm
592. The meeting re convened at 4:12pm

STRATEGY & POLICY

Consideration of Draft Waste Plan for West Sussex & South Downs National Park

593. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 38/12).
594. The lead officer highlighted items from the update sheet, setting out the consultation dates, which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 9 May
595. The Committee commented:
- Reclamation of materials and re usable materials should be included in policy making by the SDNPA
596. In response to questions; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified:
- Resources were explained in paragraph 6.1 of report PC 38/12
 - There should be little impact on transport movements within the SDNP as all sites would serve areas close to them although waste generated within the SDNP would need to be transported out
 - The SDNPA has a responsibility to encourage less waste production through the Minerals & Waste Plans, SDNPA Management Plan and Core Strategy
597. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
598. **RESOLVED:**
- 1). that the draft Joint West Sussex Waste Plan be approved for publication and consultation; and
 - 2). that the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, be authorised to agree any further minor changes to the Joint Draft West Sussex Waste Plan.

Performance Update

599. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 39/12).
600. The lead officer highlighted items from the update sheet including updates on minerals and waste enforcement cases, which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 9 May
601. The Committee noted their appreciation to all SDNPA and Local Authority officers for their efforts, working in partnership since 1 April 2011
602. In response to questions; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified:
- Local Authorities were individually checking existing and emerging policies against the NPPF; their findings would be fed back to SDNPA officers in June 2012
 - The enforcement action Hampshire County Council were taking with Selborne Brickworks would remain until a decision had been reached on the current application
 - Concerns were noted regarding Minsted Sand Pit. The applicant was investigating the possibility of a consolidated application although there would be costs involved in this process
 - Future quarterly reports would contain:
 - The percentage of applications that had been approved or refused
 - The number of dwellings that had been approved

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

- In order to measure that the SDNPA was making a difference a Service Level Agreement would be divided into 3 sections
 - Efficiency – the time involved in decision making
 - Quality – how many times did negotiations affect the outcome
 - Customer Service – the experience of the applicant/agent

603. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

604. **RESOLVED:** The Committee

- 1). notes the various achievements relating to planning activity within the South Downs National Park during 2011/12, its first year of operation as a Planning Authority
- 2). Officers will write to all host Local Authorities to thank them for their commitment & efficiency working in partnership with the SDNPA

The Chair recorded his and the Committee's thanks to the officers in attendance at the days meeting.

CHAIR

Meeting closed at 4:40pm