

PLANNING COMMITTEE 13 December 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
	Charles Peck	Ken Bodfish	

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Pat Aird (Development Management Lead), Tim Bettany-Simmons (Development Management Officer), David Cranmer (Development Management Officer), Michael Scammell (Historic Building Officer), Peter Wilsdon (Minerals & Waste Support Officer), Lara Southam (Planning Policy Officer), Mike Bleakley (Planning Service Development Lead), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

APOLOGIES

307. Apologies for absence were received from Alun Alesbury

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

308. Tom Jones declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 6 as a member of Lewes District Council.
309. Ken Bodfish declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 6, 9 & 10 as a member of the South Downs Society, and in items 9 & 10 as he had met with the applicant in a professional capacity in a previous role with Brighton & Hove City Council.
310. Charles Peck declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 7 & 13 as a member of Wealden District Council.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 8 November 2012

311. The minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

312. The Planning Policy Officer updated the Committee on the progress of the joint Lewes District Core Strategy. The strategy had been approved at the SDNPA November Planning Committee meeting and had been approved at the recent Lewes District full Council meeting; subject to minor amendments including the recognition of the Ringmer Neighbourhood Plan and the inclusion of commercial space in the North Street area of Lewes Town, a 10 week public consultation would commence on 11 January 2013.

URGENT ITEMS

313. An urgent item on the imminent Planning Inspectorate Rampion 'Adequacy of Consultation Statement' consultation was tabled at the meeting and is available on the Authority Website.
314. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC100/12).
315. In response to a question; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- The response to the Planning Inspectorate was a procedural process relating only to the validation of the application and could not impact upon the outcome of the application. Therefore, the response would not need to be made in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair.
316. **RESOLVED:** To delegate authority to the Director of Planning to respond to the Planning Inspectorate 'Adequacy of Consultation Statement' consultation regarding the validation of the Rampion off-shore Windfarm application.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: **SDNP/12/01557/FUL**

Proposal: Construction of 53 residential dwellings (C3) and 2653sqm of commercial (B1) floorspace with associated parking, landscaping and open space

Address: Land at Southdowns Road Lewes East Sussex

317. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 88/12)
318. The case officer referenced the item on the December 2012 update sheet, referring to the additional condition 35, which was available on the Authority Website.
319. Councillor Kent spoke against the application representing constituents and neighbours as a Lewes Town Councillor; he spoke about:
- Their objection to the proposal
 - The comments from the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Design Review Panel and SDNPA Design Officer
 - The land was at risk of flooding
 - The significant impact on local residents and the pressures on local schools
 - Their concern regarding the disturbance of contaminated land and wildlife
 - The impact on the environment and local infrastructure
320. Steve Ankers spoke against the application on behalf of the South Downs Society; he explained:
- The inclusion of Lewes within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) was of great interest to the South Downs Society
 - The Society had no objection in principle for development of the land, although objected to the proposed application and design
 - The height of the proposed buildings were not suitable for the Lewes area
 - The proposed materials did not fit in with the local distinctiveness and characteristics of the area
321. Robert Cheesman spoke against the application on behalf of the Friends of Lewes Society; he spoke about:
- His agreement with the comments from the South Downs Society
 - The acceptance that the site was allocated for development
 - The concern that the proposal included too much office accommodation and no affordable housing
 - The proposed design was not suitable for within a National Park and the applicant should discuss the design with the local community
 - The concern regarding the comments from the SDNPA Design Review Panel
322. Mr Adam King spoke in support of the application as the architect; he spoke about:
- The application site was a Brownfield site, the merits of the design, the previous planning permissions
 - The design of the surrounding buildings and the close location of the site to the town centre
 - SDNPA Purposes & Duty
 - Their involvement with the SDNPA at the pre application stage and, in particular, the evolution of the design
 - The proposal was of appropriate scale and the proportion of residential and commercial properties reflected policy requirements
323. Mr Chris Oakley spoke in support of the application as the Property Surveyor; he spoke about:
- The purchase of the site by the applicant and the financial viability

- His involvement in marketing the land
 - The history of the site and previous uses
 - Small and medium office space was suited to the current economy
 - There was no established office market in Lewes
 - Former household waste land in other areas had been built on
 - Contamination issues
324. Mr Paul Burgess spoke in support of the application as the Planning Consultant; he spoke about:
- The site allocation
 - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and employment sites
 - The flood risk mitigation
 - The reason for a mixed use site
 - Previous planning permissions
 - The land had been identified as suitable for development
 - The local community had requested housing rather than flats
 - The SDNPA Purposes & Duty and how the proposal did not conflict with this
 - The current condition of the site
 - The proposal was a result of pre-application collaboration with the SDNPA & Lewes Town Council
325. The Committee commented on:
- The housing need within Lewes
 - Development would be required within the SDNP
 - Design was subjective
 - The location was appropriate for affordable housing
 - The viability for affordable housing
 - The SDNPA Purposes & Duty
 - Design standards should be raised within a National Park
 - The proposal was in conflict with the views of the SDNPA Design Review Panel and Design Officer
 - Methane gas, if collected, could have a commercial value
 - The eclectic designs of properties within Lewes
326. The Committee discussed their concerns regarding;
- The lack of variation of elevational treatments
 - The comments from the SDNPA Design Review Panel
 - The visual impact of the proposal upon the landscape character of the National Park
 - Lack of affordable housing within the site or s106 contributions for affordable housing elsewhere
 - The proposal only achieving code level 3 for sustainability and lack of solar panels
327. In response to Committee questions, the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- The commercial development would be phased to ensure that an element of the office accommodation is delivered early within the build process but that viability was not compromised
 - The Local Plan stipulates buffer strips to protect residential development from commercial buildings. It was felt appropriate to include this within the proposal

- The Environment Agency had raised no objections regarding the potential flood risk of the site
- The previous planning permission had a higher density of residential property as it was mainly flats. The SDNPA sought a lower height to protect landscape character which has resulted in less density
- The land was currently allocated for commercial space, meaning the proposal could not be in conflict of that. Therefore as much commercial space as was viable must be included in the proposal. The addition of affordable homes would have an impact on the viability of the project and, as such, would be in conflict with the land allocation
- The emerging Joint SDNPA and Lewes Core Strategy includes allocating the land for commercial development
- A viability study had been carried out with all development costs included; the conclusion was that it would not be viable to include more commercial space or a greater s106 contribution.
- To achieve a higher sustainability code level would mean increased costs to the developer in conflict with the results of the viability assessment. However, the inclusion of Solar Panels could be discussed with the applicant
- Design would always raise differences of opinions. The comments of the Design Review Panel should be considered but do require scrutiny to ascertain whether they can be practicably implemented. In addition some comments had been taken on board.
- Conditions were included to ensure the safety of residents in regard to methane gas

328. SDNP/12/01557/FUL It was proposed and seconded to defer the item to allow the applicants the opportunity to address the Committee's concerns regarding the lack of variation of elevational treatments, the incorporation of appropriate sustainability measures and whether an affordable housing contribution was viable. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

329. **RESOLVED:** That the application be deferred to allow the applicants the opportunity to address the Committee's concerns regarding the lack of variation of elevational treatments, the incorporation of appropriate sustainability measures and whether an affordable housing contribution was viable.

330. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 12:20pm

331. The meeting re convened at 12:30pm

WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/01038/FUL

Proposal: Proposed restoration and renovation of the flint barns for a multi-functional use including for seasonal workers accommodation and on site warden's accommodation and for use by the wider community including for visiting school parties, ramblers and other interest groups

Address: Flint Barns Rathfinny Estate Alfriston Polegate BN26 5TU

332. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC89/12)

333. The case officer referenced a late letter sent to Members from the applicant and advised Members that unfortunately the letter had not been seen by Officers and therefore should be disregarded by Members. The case officer referenced the items from the December 2012 update sheet including the additional conditions 14, 15 & 16, which was available on the Authority website.

334. Mr Chris Wojtulewski spoke in support of the application from Parker Dann, the agent; he spoke about:-

- The unique application for the restoration of an 18th Century barn with a multi use for seasonal workers and visitors to the South Downs National Park (SDNP)

- The opportunity for visitors to learn about the SDNP
 - How the barn would be available for the wider community for a minimum of 52 days a year when not in use by the season workers and how the Rathfinny Trail will open up the site throughout the year to the wider community and provide opportunities to learn more about viticulture and the SDNP
 - The close working arrangements with SDNPA officers on the proposal
 - How the Rathfinny Estate had consulted with the local community and Parish and how the Highways Authority had no objections
 - The SDNPA Design Review Panel had welcomed the restoration and how part of the scheme had been amended to reflect comments made by the Panel.
 - The project supported the SDNPA Purposes & Duty
 - The proposal was fundamental to the vineyard business
335. Mr Anthony Sherwin spoke in support of the application as the architect; he spoke about:-
- The purpose of the flint barn
 - The conservation project on the restoration of the barn and how the ASE Historic Building Assessment has informed the conversation approach
 - The endorsement of the SDNPA Design Review Panel and how the scheme had been amended
336. Mr Mark Driver spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he spoke about:-
- The revised plan for the seasonal workers accommodation and the time taken to achieve it
 - The installation of solar panels and how these would help meet energy demands
 - The close involvement with the SDNPA Design Review Panel
 - The restoration project being essential to the Estate and forming a key part of the masterplan
 - The need to provide seasonal worker accommodation for harvesting and winter pruning
 - How the barn would be available for the wider community for a minimum of 52 days a year when not in use by the season workers
 - The opening of the area to visitors to the SDNP and educational groups through the use of the barn and Rathfinny Trail
 - The ongoing work the Estate was undertaking within the local community, the existing HLS and supporting the SDNP
337. The Committee commented on:
- Their support of the SDNPA joint working relationship with the Estate and their involvement within the local community and the level of local support
 - How useful the masterplan for the Estate had been in outlining the programme of works and how the scheme and working relationship with SDNPA officers should be a showcase for other Estates
 - How pleased they were that the comments from the Design Review Panel had been considered and acted upon by the applicant
 - How the restoration works, the Rathfinny Trail and wider community use of the barns would be a huge local gain and benefit
 - The need to ensure that the correct flint and specialist expertise were used on the restoration work
 - The proposal was well thought out and a good example of multi purpose use
 - Their support of undergrounding of cables
 - The need of the glazing to be non-reflective

- How emergency vehicles would access the site
338. In response to Committee questions, the case officer clarified that:
- The glazing would be non reflective and samples/details would be required to be submitted under condition 7
 - Condition 7 could also be amended to include a sample panel of the flint work to be constructed on site prior to the works to the flint barns being carried out
 - The proposal included upgrading of the access track with passing places.
339. SDNP/12/01038/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the additional conditions 14, 15 & 16 and for condition 7 to be amended to include the construction of a sample panel of the flint work on site and for this to be agreed by the SDNPA prior to works being carried out. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
340. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reasons and conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 89/12 including additional conditions 14, 15 & 16 as listed on the December update sheet, and inclusion of a sample panel of the flint to be added to condition 7 and subject to the completion of a s106 agreement with obligations relating to:
- (i) the creation of the Rathfinny Trail
 - (ii) use of the farm cottage solely by the site warden
 - (iii) management scheme for the Rathfinny Trail
 - (iv) the availability of the flint barn for a minimum of 52 days a year for the benefit of the wider community
 - (v) details relating to information boards to be provided

SDNPA (Brighton & Hove and Lewes District)

Application No: SDNP/12/01035/FUL

Proposal: Construction of crushed limestone path width 2.5 metres, depth up to 200mm. The route is an existing permissive bridleway but of unimproved surface. The route will be constructed to provide a surface suitable for walkers of all abilities, cyclists and horse riders.

Address: Proposed Bridleway Parallel To Falmer Road Rottingdean Brighton

341. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC90/12)
342. The case officer referenced the item from the December 2012 update sheet which was available on the Authority website, and 2 late letters of support for the proposal
343. The Committee commented on:
- How the project was welcomed and was an exciting opportunity to open up this part of the SDNP to more users of all abilities
 - Their support for the proposal
 - The proposal would provide safety for cyclists and encourage cycle access to the Brighton Universities from Woodingdean and the local area
 - The bridleway would enable access to the wider bridleway and cycle network such as the South Downs Way
 - The good work in getting together the various partners and the adoption and maintenance of the bridleway by East Sussex Highways
 - The importance that no kerbing would be used
 - The site is very open with good views and the need for any signage to be sympathetic to the landscape to avoid clutter

- Their commendation for SDNPA officers working with partners in ensuring the progress of the proposal
344. In response to Committee questions, the Director of Planning clarified that:
- All public bodies had a duty to regard the SDNPA Purposes & Duty
 - A Memorandum of Understanding had been signed and dialogue with the SDNPA would ensure appropriate signage where required although an informative could be added making it clear any signage should be carefully placed and designed to reduce impact in the landscape
345. SDNP/12/01035/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the addition of an informative regarding signage. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
346. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reasons and conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC90/12 including an informative regarding signage.
347. The Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 1:11pm
348. The meeting re convened at 1:38pm

SDNPA (Brighton & Hove)

Application No: BH2012/00717

Proposal: Conversion of existing stable block building to form 7no two bedroom houses and 1no two bedroom flat, with external alterations including additional dormers and replacement doors and windows

Address: Stable Block Stanmer House Stanmer Park Brighton

Application No: BH2012/00718

Proposal: Conversion of existing stable block building to form 7no two bedroom houses and 1no two bedroom flat, with external alterations including additional dormers and replacement doors and windows

Address: Stable Block Stanmer House Stanmer Park Brighton

349. The Committee considered the reports by the director of Planning (Reports PC91/12 & PC 92/12)
350. The Chair advised that as there were 2 applications for the Stable Block, Stanmer House, the Committee would hear from the public speakers for both applications before discussing and debating both applications together. The Committee would then decide each application for decision separately
351. Ms Anne Markwick spoke against the application on behalf of Mrs Jenny Lyon; she spoke about:
- She was a local resident and founder member of the Stanmer Preservation Society
 - The designer of the stables
 - The previous development by the applicant and that this in conjunction with the proposal was almost the same size as the existing village
 - The concerns regarding access and bridleways not designed for use by large lorries
 - The concerns regarding the proposed new road
 - The disruption to local residents & wildlife, especially hedgehogs, badgers and foxes
 - The lack of social housing and employment opportunities
 - The inconvenience to users of the park
352. Ms Sue Craig spoke against the application representing the Stanmer Preservation Society; she spoke about:

- The lack of reference to the recently constructed houses which were still unoccupied therefore the need was not understood
 - The threat to residential amenities for Stanmer village
 - The lack of consideration for alternative uses such as community use and arts and crafts
 - The lack of consultation with the local community
 - The concern regarding unaffordable homes and that there was not a need for another gated community
 - It was not the correct proposal for Stanmer Park
 - The formation of a land trust for Stanmer to investigate other methods of restoration for the derelict stables and the request for the Committee to defer the item until this was known
353. Mr Purvis spoke in support of the application as the agent; he spoke about:
- his 10 year involvement of the restoration of Stanmer House and out buildings
 - The history of the purchase of the lease from Brighton & Hove City Council and the original development restoration
 - How open market residential properties had been independently verified as the only viable way to fund the restoration project for the stables and ensure the preservation of the buildings
 - How no repairs had been carried out on the buildings since 1948
 - The applicant had worked closely with SDNPA officers on the restoration scheme
 - The Nursery on site at Stanmer was regularly accessed by large lorries
354. The Committee commented on:
- The stables were at risk and the need for restoration
 - The difficulty of finding viable options for the restoration of listed buildings, the cost of restoration and that delaying the decision would be unlikely to result in an alternative proposal coming forward
 - The acknowledgement that 100% rise in population would change the dynamic of the village and the applicant should be encouraged to enter into dialogue with the local community to mitigate the impact of construction vehicles
 - It was an appropriate solution for the restoration with enabling development needed for restoration
 - Large lorries and through traffic already used the route past Stanmer House to access the Nursery site, Brighton & Hove & SDNPA offices
355. In response to Committee questions, the case officer & the Director of Planning clarified that:
- Conversion of the building was the first stage of the restoration and maintaining and sustaining the property was the second
 - Community uses do not provide sufficient funding to restore and maintain buildings
 - A condition could be added for a construction Management Plan
 - An informative could be added to introduce a community liaison group
356. BH2012/00717 It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the addition of an informative regarding a liaison group and a construction Management Plan. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
357. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted with the addition of an informative regarding the mitigation of the impact of construction and a community liaison group and for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC91/12 and subject to:
- (i) completion of a S106 agreement with obligations relating to contributions towards sustainable transport and

- (ii) the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 report PC91/12
 - (iii) the addition of an informative regarding the mitigation of the impact of construction
358. BH2012/00718 It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
359. **RESOLVED:** That Listed Building Consent be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC92/12

SDNPA (Arun District Council)

Application No: PA/10/12
Proposal: Permanent stationing of residential mobile home for settled gypsy accommodation and use of building for ancillary purposes
Address: The Wood Yard France Lane Patching BN13 3UP

360. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC93/12).
361. The case officer referenced the items from the December 2012 update sheet including the amended conditions 2 & 5 which was available on the Authority Website, and apologised to Patching Parish Council if they felt miss represented in report PC93/12. The full response was available on the Authority Website
362. Mr Fox spoke against the application on behalf of Patching Parish Council; he spoke about:
- His appreciation for the apology from the case officer
 - Previous considerations for the site were rejected for not meeting the criteria and permanent planning permission had been refused by Arun District Council
 - The Parish Council held no animosity towards Mr Doe and his family
 - The restricted covenant to woodyard
 - Previous conditions had not been complied with and the applicant did not reside on the site
363. Mr Doe spoke in support of the application as the applicants father; he spoke about:
- The history of the site and his daughter's business and how she wished to stay within the local community as she had done for the previous 10 years
 - The temporary planning permission
 - Lack of suitable sites for Gypsy & Traveller use and the identified need for this one
 - The site was well screened
364. In response to a Committee question, the case officer clarified that;
- If approved, the site would remain a designated Gypsy & Traveller site even if the present occupier left
365. PA/10/12 It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the amended conditions 2 & 5. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
366. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for the reasons and the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC93/12, subject to amended condition 2 & 5 as set out in the update sheet.

SDNPA (Arun District Council)

Application No: SDNP/12/00071/FUL
Proposal: Development of land for camping and caravan site, together with associated buildings
Address: Stoneyfield Farm Shellbridge Road Slindon West Sussex BN18 0LT

367. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC94/12).

368. The case officer referenced the items from the December 2012 update sheet which was available on the Authority website.
369. Committee member Jennifer Gray left the meeting.
370. Mr D'Heldt spoke against the application on behalf of himself as a neighbour; he spoke about:
- The decrease in wildlife in the area since the neighbouring development
 - The area was unsuitable for development
 - The applicant had enquired about purchasing his land
 - Was pleased to see the area included in the SDNP boundary
 - There would be no enhancement to the area if the development took place
371. Mr Lewis spoke against the application on behalf of himself; he spoke about:
- The planning history for the site, change of uses and works carried out without permission
 - Nearby camping sites
 - The site access difficulties and tree preservation orders
 - Access and Design Statements
372. Councillor Lewis spoke against the application on behalf of Slindon Parish Council; he spoke about:
- The proposal was not appropriate development
 - The site was too close to the main road with fast moving traffic
 - Previous planning permissions and outstanding issues
 - The Parish Councils concerns regarding the impact of the proposals
 - The highways implications
373. Liz Galloway spoke in support the application as the agent; she spoke about:
- The provision for camping
 - The officer's & Ecological report
 - Surrounding footpaths
 - An appropriate use for the site which would not have an adverse effect on wildlife and surrounding woodland would be preserved
 - Any concerns could be controlled by conditions
 - The lack of objection by the Highways Authority
 - The Management Plan would mitigate neighbours concerns
374. The Committee commented on:
- Concerns regarding safety for vehicles and no filter lanes on the main A27
 - Rural sites are generally where camping sites are situated
 - The site was secluded although adjacent to the A27
375. In response to Committee questions, the case officer & the Director of Planning clarified that:
- Wildlife concerns could be mitigated by condition 7
 - A requirement to improve ecology could be added to the Management Plan in condition 7
 - Delegation could be given to the Director of Planning to consult with the Highway Agency regarding safety issues on the A27. West Sussex County Council's response would only deal with roads that were their responsibility. If the Highways Agency response was not acceptable the matter would be reported back to Committee.

- A condition could be included to ensure details of materials of the gated entrance be submitted to the SDNPA
 - A condition could be added to ensure caravans could not be on site for longer than 28 days
 - A condition could be added for restricting seasonal use of the site between 31 March to 31 October
376. SDNP/12/00071/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation that permission be granted subject to conditions, including additional conditions to deal with those issues detailed in minute 375, but that the grant of permission is subject to confirmation from the Highways Agency that the access from the A27 was acceptable. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
377. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC94/12 subject to:
- Amended condition 4 as set out in the Update Sheet
 - A requirement to improve ecology be added to the Management Plan in condition 7
 - An additional condition restricting use to seasonal only between 31 March to 31 October in any year and that individual pitch use is limited to 28 days
 - An additional condition for materials of the gated entrance to be submitted to the SDNPA
 - The Director of Planning receiving confirmation from the Highways Agency that the access from the A27 was acceptable
378. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 3:16pm
379. The meeting re convened at 3.26pm

SDNPA (Wealden District area)

Application No: SDNP/12/02528/HOUS
Proposal: Erection of double garage
Address: Milton Court, Milton Street, Polegate, BN26 5RJ

380. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC95/12).
381. The case officer referenced the items from the December 2012 update sheet, including the revised location map which was available on the Authority website.
382. Ms Amy de la Haye spoke against the application on behalf of Julie del la Haye; she spoke about
- The position of the proposed garage and it's relationship to neighbouring properties and the lack of consideration for neighbours
 - The previous Planning Inspectors report
 - Omissions in the archaeologist response relating to the dovecot and chapel
 - Inaccuracies in the Heritage Statement
 - The history and age of neighbouring properties
 - The inaccuracies and inconsistencies with the officer's report
 - The reference to screening trees
 - The impact on their property
383. Ms Amy de la Haye spoke against the application on behalf of Brian de la Haye; she spoke about
- The residents objections
 - Previous planning applications
 - The location of the proposed garage

- The support received from MP Norman Baker
384. Mrs Susan Santolini spoke against the application on behalf of herself; she spoke about
- Local residents opposition to the proposed garage
 - The footprint of the design
 - The increase in height
 - The visual impact and inappropriate aspect in a rural setting
 - The impact and loss of light on the neighbours and lack of consideration given to them
 - The character of the surrounding buildings
385. Mrs Tezel Bahcheli spoke in support of the application as the agent; she spoke about
- Working and respecting the uniqueness of the surroundings and shown with the materials to be used
 - The design of the proposed garage
 - The applicant would comply with all of the conditions
 - Her understanding that the Parish Council raised no objection
386. The Committee commented on:
- The history of the site and heritage assets
 - The visual impact on the area, neighbouring properties and heritage assets
 - The changes and alterations already made to the historic area
 - The Planning Inspectors report and officers regard for this in the recommendation before the Committee
 - Local planning policies, emerging Joint Core Strategies, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and conflicting policy
387. In response to Committee questions, the case officer & the Director of Planning clarified that:
- The policies listed within the officer's report were the relevant policies to be taken into account
 - There was no planning justification for the removal of existing parking provision
388. SDNP/12/02528/HOUS It was proposed and seconded to refuse permission on the basis of the scale and massing which interrupts the spatial unity of the cohesive group of heritage assets and harm to neighbour amenity. Following a tied vote with one abstention the Chair reopened debate to seek further views and clarification on points raised. Following further debate a further vote took place and the proposal was carried.
389. **RESOLVED:** That permission be refused for the reason that the proposed garage by reason of its scale and massing interrupts the spatial unity of this cohesive group of heritage assets and will harm the historic environment and the amenities of neighbouring properties contrary to policies C2 of the South East Plan, SP02 of the emerging Wealden and SDNPA Joint Core Strategy and EN9, EN27 and DC19 of the Wealden Local Plan and NE8, BE1 and DC17 of the Non-Statutory Wealden Local Plan 2005.

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/02224/CW

Proposal: Amendment of Condition 4 of SDNPA Consent 20661/049 relating to vehicle size, type and no. of movements with no increase in tonnage of food waste and farmyard manure transported to the site from that permitted under Condition 25 of HCC Consent 20661/048

Address: Selborne Brick Works (Access Track) Honey Lane Selborne Hampshire

390. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC96/12).
391. The case officer referenced the items from the December 2012 update sheet, which is available on the Authority website.
392. Councillor Mark Kemp-Gee spoke against the application representing constituents and neighbours as a Hampshire County Councillor; he spoke about
- The previous planning decision
 - The detrimental Impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residential properties
 - The need to consider the SDNPA Purposes & Duty
 - The alternative access routes
 - The impact of Saturday working and the change of plans by the applicant
393. Councillor Aiden Donegan spoke against the application on behalf of Selborne Parish Council. For absolute clarity he read out the full response from Selborne Parish Council (which is available on the Authority website), which had been summarised within the officer's report.
394. Mr Patrick Benham Crosswell spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he spoke about
- Condition 4 preventing release of funding and therefore leaving 20 people without jobs
 - The economic issues
 - The granted permissions from Hampshire County Council
 - The use of larger vehicles would suggest less vehicle movements
 - Balancing job security against the possible impact of a couple of SDNP visitors
395. The Committee commented on:
- The use of articulated vehicles would reduce the amount of vehicles needed for the site
 - Rural areas were used to seeing large agricultural vehicles and grain lorries
 - The economic argument had not been tested independently
 - The need for improved landscaping
 - The figures within the report were often confusing
 - An Anaerobic Digester would need to run 7 days a week
396. In response to Committee questions, the case officer & the Director of Planning clarified that:
- There was a 6 month capacity for storage of waste although a lack of Saturday working would restrict contracts and exclude deliveries from supermarkets that would require to deliver on a Saturday
 - It would be preferable to restrict tonnage to 50% rather than restrict vehicle movements
 - The capacity of the vehicles was unclear as it was unknown who the hauliers were
 - Saturday working arrangements could be monitored
397. SDNP/12/02224/CW It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including a 50% reduction in daily tonnage on Saturdays from 110 tonnes to 55 tonnes and amended conditions 5, 9 & 12. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
398. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reasons and subject to a 50% reduction in daily tonnage on Saturday, amended conditions 5, 9 & 12 and the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC96/12
399. Committee Members Charles Peck and Tom Jones left the room

APPEALS

Townsend, Northend Lane, Droxford, Southampton, Hampshire 11/02545/SFUL)

400. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC97/12).
401. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted report PC97/12
402. Committee Members Charles Peck and Tom Jones returned to the Committee table

STRATEGY & POLICY

Adoption of the Joint Wealden District Core Strategy

403. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC98/12).
404. In response to Committee questions, the Planning Policy Officer and Director of Planning clarified that:
- There would be time for minor amendments to be made before the Strategy would be brought before the full Authority for adoption
 - Wealden District Council officers were aware of the SDNPA meeting timetable. The NPPF would give the document great weight and Wealden District Council as the Planning Authority for 93% of the area had already resolved to adopt the Strategy
405. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried
406. **RESOLVED:** That the Planning Committee recommends to the South Downs National Park Authority that the Wealden District (Incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Core Strategy be adopted.

Planning Performance Update – April to September 2012 (Q1 and Q2)

407. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC99/12).
408. In response to Committee questions, Planning Service Development Lead and Director of Planning clarified that:
- In the early implementation of IDOX, Local Authority performance would have been affected, however results would change once a full year operational year results were available
409. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted performance for the period from 1 April to 30 September 2012.
410. The Director of Planning Informed the Committee that The Old Brickyard in Hawkley, Hampshire, had been protected from unauthorised development by way of a pre-emptive injunction obtained by East Hants District Council. Following notification from the Parish Council and local residents that the land was being prepared for occupation. The aim of the injunction was to prevent a breach of planning control and would give the police power to stop the site being occupied.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 5:11pm