

PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 November 2012

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

Present:

Andrew Shaxson - Chair

Barbara Holyome

Diana Kershaw

Doug Jones

Neville Harrison - Deputy Chair

Jennifer Gray

Tom Jones

David Jenkins

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Pat Aird (Development Management Lead), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Officer), David Cranmer (Development Management Officer), Lara Southam (Planning Policy Officer) Tim Richings (Planning Policy Lead), Ed Sheath (Lewes District Council), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

APOLOGIES

272. Apologies for absence were received from, Ken Bodfish, Alun Alesbury & Charles Peck

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

273. Tom Jones declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 8 as a member of Lewes District Council.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 October 2012

274. With the correction of:

- to add Diana Kershaw to the list of attendees
- minute 161 to remove the words 'at the request of the applicant'
- minute 177 4th bullet point to read 'the planning assessment indicated no negative impact on the town centre
- a typo in minute 201, 1st bullet point to read 'the objections'

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

275. The Committee was informed that the applications for the South Downs Centre had been approved by the Secretary of State in accordance with the resolutions and conditions agreed at the SDNPA 11 October Planning Committee meeting.

URGENT ITEMS

276. The Committee was informed of 2 development management appeals, Gerston Business Park, Storrington and St Magnus, Marley Lane, Fernhurst. Details of the appeals would be available on the SDNPA Intranet for Members and via the public access system for members of the public.

277. The Chair informed the committee that the applicant had withdrawn the planning application for Agenda Item 6, Land adjoining 10 & 11 Silverdale, Coldwaltham, West Sussex.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/01014/HOUS

Proposal: Conversion of existing garages into a games room and construction of additional garages and a summer house

Address: Stable Cottage Good Batworth Park Crossbush Lane Crossbush Lyminster Arundel West Sussex BN18 9PG

278. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 84/12)

279. The case officer referenced the item on the November 2012 update sheet, which was available on the Authority Website.

280. Mr David Anderson spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he spoke about:-
- The reasons for the new garage
 - Their agricultural use of the leased neighbouring fields
 - The current condition of the private road and private maintenance arrangements
 - Any damage caused to the private road by the development would be repaired by the applicant
 - Deliveries connected to the development would be limited and the manager of Batworth Park would be notified when the development would commence
 - The design of the building would be in keeping with the original buildings and would use the same construction company
281. The Committee commented on:
- A need for the additional garage space
 - The applicant's assertion that he would do his best to mitigate noise and inconvenience to the neighbours
 - Their concerns regarding;
 - The height of the summer house
 - The need for an additional condition to restrict hours of work on the development
282. In response to questions; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- It would not be unreasonable to condition on the hours of work per day
 - It would be appropriate for the management of the private road to remain as a civil matter between the applicant and the Batworth Park Management Committee
283. SDNP/12/01014/HOUS It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including an additional condition restricting the hours of work. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
284. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 84/12 and an additional condition restricting hours of work between 8am – 6pm Monday to Friday.

SDNPA (WEALDEN DISTRICT)

Application No: NP/12/0028/FA
Proposal: Removal of conditions 1 & 2 of NP/2011/0082/F
Address: Birling Gap Car Park, Birling Gap Road, Birling Gap, East Dean
 BN20 0AB

285. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 85/12)
286. The case officer referenced the item from the November 2012 update sheet for an additional condition (7) which was available on the Authority Website and informed the Committee that the National Trust had withdrawn their objection.
287. Mr Holloway spoke against the application on behalf of the Birling Gap Cliff Protection Association; he spoke about:-
- How some visitors preferred to park on the grass areas as it was more welcoming
 - Parking charges would encourage road/street parking
 - Kerbing would be needed to prevent rainwater damaging the field and short posts to discourage motorbikes and shortcuts
 - The need for a refuse bin, notices alerting drivers to pedestrians and double yellow lines
288. The Committee commented on:
- the potential management of the car park by the National Trust

- The sensitive nature of the car park and its impact within the National Park
 - The lack of evidence to demonstrate a need for the car park to be open all year
 - The advantage of the car park in preventing on street parking
 - The need to monitor use of the car park
 - The positive steps the applicant has taken to work with the National Trust
 - The need for the Highways Authority to have regard to the SDNPA Purposes and Duty, partnership working and meaningful dialogue should ensure this
 - The 'low key' fencing already in the car park and permitted development rights could see it replaced with something intrusive to the landscape
 - The assumption that visitors would always want to use the nearest available car park in the first instance and only use the grass area as an overflow
289. In response to Committee questions, the case officer, Senior Solicitor, Development Management Lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified that:
- The Planning Authority could not force separate organisations to work together to produce a Management Plan
 - The Authority had encouraged dialogue between the organisations which included SDNPA Rangers. Those discussions had assisted in proposing the conditions within the Committee report that sought to address the matters previously raised regarding management, charging and visual impact.
 - The National Trust were already committed to working on their Management Plan and therefore could not commit to a date for the hand over of the management of the additional car park. The National Trust would also need to enter into a lease agreement with the applicant
 - The National Trust had agreed their intention to take over the management of the car park in the future
 - Although the car park had temporary conditions granted until 2014, a an application had been received, considered previously and therefore a decision should be taken on the application
 - The Highways Authority had the right to maintain and carry out repairs to land in the public highway at any time and had said that they would not approve grass crete
 - Permission had already been granted for a pay & display machine within the car park
 - It was not best practice to keep granting temporary permissions
 - A condition restricting permitted development rights to erect fencing could be added if it was felt appropriate
 - Enforcement action would be taken if any of the conditions were breached
290. NP/12/0028/FA It was proposed to vote on the officer's recommendation, as it was not seconded the proposal fell.
291. NP/12/0028/FA It was proposed and seconded to refuse the removal of condition 2 of NP/2011/0082/F because there was insufficient proven need for all year round use of the car park. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
292. **RESOLVED:** That the removal of condition 2 of NP/2011/0082/F be refused because there was insufficient proven need for all year round use.
293. NP/12/0028/FA It was proposed and seconded to refuse the removal of condition 1 of NP/2011/0082/F because the works required to enable the car park to operate all year round would be unduly intrusive upon, and not conserve and enhance, the landscape of the South Downs National Park. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
294. **RESOLVED:** That the removal of condition 1 of NP/2011/0082/F be refused because the works required to enable the car park to operate all year round would be unduly intrusive upon, and not conserve and enhance, the landscape of the South Downs National Park

295. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 12:05pm
296. The meeting re convened at 12:15pm

STRATEGY & POLICY

Regulation 19 Consultation on Proposed Joint Lewes District Core Strategy

297. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 87/12).
298. The lead officer referenced the items from the November 2012 update which was available on the Authority Website.
299. Dr John Kay spoke against the item on behalf of CPRE Sussex Lewes branch; he spoke about:-
- The document did not make reference to agriculture, the maintenance of the landscape or biodiversity
 - There was no policy to protect the countryside and for farming to remain productive
 - The need for affordable housing to be delivered and market housing for young families had been ignored
 - Housing targets were missing for Parishes in certain areas
 - Ringmer Parish was advanced in the production of their Neighbourhood Plan although it had not been mentioned in the document
300. Mr Sy Morse-Brown spoke against the item on behalf of himself; he referenced:-
- The level of work that had been put into the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan and that it had not been referenced within the strategy
 - The Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan had not been taken into account, especially in regard to the proposed strategic sites referred in the strategy
 - There was no evidence regarding the number of houses needed in Ringmer and sites had been selected for a district and not a local need
301. Mr John Jackson spoke against the item on behalf of himself; he spoke about:-
- The infrastructure around the village of Ringmer
 - The development pressures and traffic issues/concerns on surrounding roads and how highways issues were the responsibility of East Sussex County Council
 - The unfinished cycle track between Ringmer and Lewes
 - The oversubscribed Ringmer Primary School
 - The lack of sports facilities within Ringmer and the lack of access to the countryside
302. Mr Robert Cheesman spoke in support of the item on behalf of the South Downs Society and the Friends of Lewes; he spoke about:-
- His congratulations to the officers concerned on producing a good document
 - Welcoming the reference that Old Malling farm was no longer to be proposed as an allocation site although concerns that with the housing demand it may be considered in the future
 - The strategy should propose a higher level of density to meet the housing need
 - Support for the level of affordable housing proposed
 - The South Downs Society would welcome a draft version of the design guidance
 - Improvements were needed at junctions around Lewes such as Earwig Corner
303. The Committee commented on;
- It was pleasing to see an increase from 25% to 40% affordable housing
 - The need to reference that the SDNPA fully support Community Led Plans, including, but not limited to Neighbourhood Plans

- The need to include reference to the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for Ringmer Parish within the strategy
- Their concerns regarding;
 - Lack of encouragement of Community Led Plans within the strategy and supporting parishes to work together
 - The lack of reference to the SDNPA in each core policy
 - The lack of reference to the importance of and significant landscape impact of agriculture and farming and biodiversity within the document
 - The lack of solutions for the surrounding road infrastructure i.e. Earwig Corner and how it was difficult to move from aspiration to resolution

304. In response to Committee questions, the SDNPA Planning Policy officer, SDNPA Planning Policy Lead, LDC Planning Policy officer and the Director of Planning clarified that:

- The primary document was the Core Strategy, the Neighbourhood Plan was a local expression of the strategic issues set by the Core Strategy and does need to be in general conformity with the Core Strategy
- The strategy predicts that there will be a significant need for new homes, but also states that the population is not predicted to increase significantly. It was explained that this is expected to occur as the number of households increase (more, smaller households) rather than through an increase in overall population. Page 22 1st bullet point would be amended to remove the word population
- Ringmer was consulted following the public consultation and housing numbers were then reduced
- Neighbourhood Plans were strategically important to the delivery of the Strategy
- In regard to Model Policy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the SDNPA Local Plan would make the interpretation of the Model Policy wording about the presumption in favour of sustainable development clear, as it relates to and should be applied in a National Park.
- There was an element of risk in regard to housing numbers in the town of Lewes although at 20 per year they were relatively modest. Recent experience has shown that brownfield sites do become available and it was reasonable to expect that this can continue to happen and that the Lewes Plan will be successful
- Each of the joint Core Strategy documents have taken different approaches to policies relating to the National Park. For example in East Hampshire they have stand alone policies relating to the SDNP, whereas in Lewes the purposes and duty are part of the general policies.
- For consistency the Lewes Joint Core Strategy would form part of the evidence base for the SDNPA Local Plan. There may be a need for flexibility and evidence could be revisited and adapted when compiling the SDNPA Local Plan
- Ringmer and Broyleside were classed as 2 separate settlements in the hierarchy, but grouped together in table 5 (planned levels of housing growth) as both settlements are within the same parish that is committed to bringing forward non-strategic allocations through its neighbourhood plan.
- Although there was a target housing density range, density numbers would be decided on the characteristics of individual sites

305. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer recommendation agreeing delegation to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair to incorporate the comments made by the Committee in regard to

- (a).encouragement of Community Led planning
- (b).raising the status of Neighbourhood Plans in reaching Strategic goals
- (c).including additional references to the SDNPA in Core Policies

- (d).to include reference to agriculture and the importance of farming
- (e).Page 22 1st bullet point would be amended to remove the word population.

Following a vote the proposal was carried

306. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- (i). Approve the Joint Lewes District Core Strategy for consultation and subsequent submission to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012
- (ii). Note that the National Park Authority agreed delegation to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair to approve any minor modifications required to the pre-submission version of the Joint Lewes District Core Strategy, prior to submission to the Secretary of State (18/09/2012).

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 1:32pm