

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 13 June 2011

Held at Cowdray Hall, Midhurst at 10:30am

Present:

Andrew Shaxson - Chair	Barbara Holyome	Neville Harrison	Charles Peck
Ken Bodfish	Jennifer Gray	Minette Palmer	
Margaret Paren (ex officio)			

SDNPA Officers: Jim Redwood (Head of Planning) Pat Aird (Major Applications and Enforcement Lead), Keith Reed (Local Development Framework (LDF) Lead), Claire Potts (Minerals and Waste Lead), Lewis Oliver (Major Applications Support Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) Fiona MacLeod (Member Services Manager)

APOLOGIES

385. Apologies for absence were received from Alun Alesbury and David Jenkins

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

386. Andrew Shaxson declared a personal and prejudicial interest for Agenda item 9 (Stedham Saw Mills, Midhurst) as a public speaker was a friend.
387. Minette Palmer declared a personal and prejudicial interest for Agenda Item 15 (Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan: Addendum Consultation document) as a relation of the family who manage Blackmore Estates, and owners of Rookery Farm that was included as part of Kingsley Quarry. A personal but non prejudicial interest in item 15 was also declared as she was a member of Selbourne Parish Council.
388. Minette Palmer declared a personal but non prejudicial interest at 1.30pm for Agenda item 10 ((Protocols for Joint Working on Lewes and East Hampshire Core Strategies and Minerals & Waste Core Strategies for Hampshire, East Sussex and Brighton & Hove, and West Sussex) as a member of Selbourne Parish Council.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9 May 2011

389. The minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2011 were agreed as a correct record.

URGENT ITEMS

390. With the agreement of the Chair, an urgent item was considered the meeting regarding the proposed temporary car parking at the Falmer football stadium, known locally as the 'Amex Stadium'. The item would enable the views of the Park Authority to be taken into account as the car park was required for the opening of the Stadium by the end of July.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Application No: 10/03287/FUL
Proposal: Residential development following demolition of existing dwelling comprising 7 no. three bedroom and 3 no. two bedroom dwellings with associated carports, parking and landscaping
Address: Townsend, Northend Lane, Droxford, Southampton, Hampshire, SO32 3QN

391. The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning (Report PC26/11). The Committee was advised that, following an appeal for non-determination by the applicant, the

Committee was no longer able to determine the application and a revised recommendation was tabled.

392. Councillor Tony Coates spoke as the local District Councillor against the application.
393. Mr Chris Garrod spoke on behalf of Droxford residents against the application.
394. Rosemary Hoile spoke on behalf of Droxford Parish Council against the application.
395. **RESOLVED** that had the National Park determined the application, it would have refused planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 8.1 of the report subject to the addition of 'appearance' in Condition (ii)

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Application No: 10/03078/FUL
Proposal: Change of use of land from agricultural to leisure use and provision of 6-18 holiday units
Address: Brooks Copse, Brook Lane, Hambledon, Hampshire, PO7 4TF

396. The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning (Report PC 27/11).
397. The Committee were updated with the representation from Hambledon Parish Council against the application and were advised that condition 10 in the Recommendation should refer to condition 9 not condition 10. A further 2 conditions were proposed for the siting and removal of the 18 mobile shepherds huts.
398. Julia Humphrey spoke on behalf of herself and local residents against the application.
399. Alex Evans, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.
400. The application was broadly supported subject to condition 6 strengthened to cover the preservation and improvement of the woodland track.
401. Following discussion on a proposal to apply a three year temporary planning permission, officers clarified that as this was a personal permission this was too restrictive.
402. **RESOLVED** That the Committee grants planning permission subject to
- i) The conditions set out in paragraph 8.1 of the report with the following changes to condition 6 and condition 9

ii) the addition of the following conditions:

Due to the thinness of the tree belt, no mobile units shall be sited in the south eastern corner of the site cross hatched on the site survey plan
Reason: In the interest of the amenities of residents of the surrounding area and to comply with policy DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan (Revised) Review 2006

The mobile units shall not be stored on the land between 31 October and 1 March other than in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing

Reason: To prevent the establishment of a permanent residential use in the countryside in compliance with policies SP3 of the South East Plan and H4, CE19 and RT18 of the Winchester District Local Plan (Review) 2006

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: 11/01332/FULNP
Proposal: Change of use of field from agriculture and pheasant shoot to agriculture, pheasant shoot and seasonal camping for up to 10 visitor tents/yurts
Address: Lower Lodge Farm, Vann Road, Fernhurst, GU27 3NH

403. The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning (Report 29/11)
404. The Committee were advised that the change of use had been incorrectly described on the application documents and had not come to light until after the papers had been dispatched for the meeting. The notice of application had been corrected and redisplayed.
405. The Committee felt the application had been well thought out and the site was suitable to accommodate the number of tents and yurts proposed.
406. During discussion, officers clarified the following in response to Members' questions:
- i. the pedestrian access track link for visitors to the camp site from the car park area was not a formally adopted right of way
 - ii. condition 2 strengthened to include a further time period for the construction/removal of the yurts/tents by 1 to 2 weeks
 - iii. condition 3 to include retention of the existing informal feel of the access track to the camp site
 - iv. condition 4 strengthened to include measures in the operational management plan to prevent parking within the camping site
407. **RESOLVED:** that subject to no new material planning issues arising following the re-advertisement of the application, that the Head of Planning is delegated authority to grant planning permission subject to
- i) the reason and conditions set out in paragraph 8.1 of the report with the following changes included:
 - condition 2 to allow a further time period for the construction/removal of the yurts/tents by 1 to 2 weeks
 - condition 3 to include retention of the existing informal feel of the access track into the camp site
 - condition 4 to include measures to prevent parking within the camping site within the operational management plan
 - ii) a further condition in paragraph 3.1 of the supplementary report that no development shall commence until a schedule of the accommodation to be used, which shall include details of size, type and materials of the tents/yurts, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Park Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. *Reason: To ensure the appearance of the development is appropriate to this remote countryside location and to conserve and enhance the natural beauty and wildlife of the South Downs National Park in compliance with Policies CCI of the South East Plan and T1, T3, T4, T7, RE1 and RE4 of the Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999.*

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

Application No: WSCC/099/10/SJ/SDNP
Proposal: Change of use of part of a former sawmill site to a waste transfer and recycling station with ancillary skip hire/skip storage business
Address: Stedham saw Mills, School Lane, Stedham, Midhurst, West Sussex, GU29 0NY

Andrew Shaxson left the meeting table and sat in the public gallery. Neville Harrison presided over the meeting for the item as Chair.

408. The Committee considered a report from the Head of Planning (Report PC 30/11) and the Committee were reminded that this was for a retrospective planning application by Goss Mini Skips Ltd for a permanent change of use as part of the Stedham Saw Mills site.
409. Member's attention was drawn to condition 14 in the report which should read condition 6, not condition 5.

410. Councillor John Cherry spoke as the local District councillor and on behalf of Caroline Brown against the application.

411. Professor David Youlton spoke on behalf of himself against the application.

412. Hayden Morris spoke of behalf of William Knight against the application.

413. Godfrey Dudman, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Andrew Shaxson left the meeting at 12.10 for the duration of the debate on the application

414. The Head of Planning explained to the Committee that the site was in the Chichester District Local Plan as a B1, B2 or B8 use (industrial area). Member's attention was drawn to the fact that the conditions that had not been met related to an adjacent site, and not the site of the application.

415. Members made the following comments:

- concerns regarding the noise and dust levels could be addressed by conditions for daily monitoring
- the application could appear to be contrary to the National Park purposes
- the site may be better managed if the application was approved and all conditions met

416. The Committee was advised that West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) officers would undertake a number of compliance and ad-hoc visits to the site on instructions from the Park Authority. The applicant would also have to apply for a permit to operate the site from the Environment Agency.

417. The temporary 3 year planning permission proposal was discussed at length and the concept of a legal agreement was suggested to address the need and cost for daily monitoring of the site. The Senior Solicitor advised that this option was restricted by legislation and case law associated with the ability to require an applicant to enter into a Section 106 agreement. Advice given to the Committee was that this would not be reasonable or appropriate in this case.

418. The recommendation to grant planning permission for a temporary period of 3 years, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 8.1 of the report was put to the Committee. Following a split decision, the Chair used his second vote against the approval of the application.

419. Following a question on a point of order, the Senior Solicitor confirmed that voting had been carried out in accordance with Standing Order 15.4. The Head of Planning advised that a motion for a refusal of planning permission could be proposed on the grounds that had previously been discussed. He summarised reasons that had come forward through discussions as follows:

- i) that the proposal does not meet National Park purposes
- ii) that the proposal is contrary to the policies of Chichester District Council saved local plan policies
- iii) that the development is detrimental to the amenities of the area

420. The motion for refusal of planning permission was proposed by Minette Palmer and seconded by Barbara Holyome. Following a split decision, the Chair used his second vote and the motion was carried.

421. **RESOLVED:** that the Committee refuses planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would prejudice the purposes of, and duties under, the National Park designation and has not demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances to justify it being granted planning permission. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 22 of PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004), Paragraphs 21, 29 and ANNEX E of PPS10: Sustainable Waste Management

(2005), policies C2 & W17 of the South East Plan (2009), policies RE1, RE4, BE11 & R4 of the Chichester District Local Plan (1999) (Saved Polices 2007) and the intention behind policy G2 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft (2004).

2. The proposed development is considered unacceptable in that it would authorise a use that would prejudice the implementation of the allocated B land uses at the Stedham Saw Mills site and is therefore contrary to Paragraphs 21, 29 and ANNEX E of PPS10: Sustainable Waste Management (2005) and policy B1 of the Chichester District Local Plan (1999) (Saved Polices 2007).
 3. The proposed development is considered unacceptable in that it would authorise a use that results in adverse impacts upon local amenity and its surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 22 of PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004), Paragraphs 21, 29 and ANNEX E of PPS10: Sustainable Waste Management (2005), Paragraphs 8, 10-11 and Appendix A of PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control, policies NRM9, NRM10, W17 & C2 of the South East Plan (2009) and policies BE11, R4 of Chichester District Local Plan (1999) (Saved Polices 2007) and the intention behind policies G4 & G7 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan Revised Deposit Draft (2004).
422. The Head of Planning advised that the question of enforcement action stood to be considered as the Committee had refused planning permission for an authorised use retrospectively. He suggested that it would be appropriate for authority for enforcement action to be delegated by the Committee to the Head of Planning and if it was subsequently considered that enforcement action was not appropriate, that the matter should at that stage be referred back to the Committee for consideration.
423. **RESOLVED:** that the Head of Planning has delegated authority to consider and institute the appropriate enforcement action and take all necessary action in order to regularise activities on the site.

Andrew Shaxson returned to the meeting at 1pm and presided as Chair. With the agreement of the Chair, the meeting adjourned until 1.30pm

STRATEGY & POLICY

Protocols for Joint Working on Lewes and East Hampshire Core Strategies & Minerals and Waste Core Strategies for Hampshire, East Sussex and Brighton & Hove, and West Sussex

424. The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning. Member's were advised that paragraph 5.1 should read Worthing instead of Woking.
425. The Head of Planning advised that a report on the cross-Park housing assessment would be considered at a future meeting of the Planning Committee
426. **RESOLVED:** that the Committee
 - 1) Recommends to the Authority that LDF Joint Core Strategies be prepared for East Hampshire and Lewes Districts in accordance with the Protocols attached at Appendices 1 and 2 and that the Head of Planning be authorised to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with these two districts on this basis.
 - 2) Recommends to the Authority that Minerals and Waste LDF Joint Core Strategies be prepared for Hampshire (including Southampton, Portsmouth and New Forest), East Sussex (including Brighton and Hove) and West Sussex in accordance with the emerging Protocols attached at Appendices 3, 4 and 5 and that the Head of Planning be authorised to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the relevant authorities on this basis.

- 3) Authorises the Head of Planning to prepare a Local Development Scheme on this basis.

Falmer Football Stadium Car Park Consultation

427. The Head of Planning explained that following consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, it was proposed that the matter should be considered by the Planning Committee at this meeting to enable the views of the Park Authority to be taken into account as the car park was required for the opening of the Stadium by the end of July. A draft response to the consultation had been circulated before the meeting. A draft Recommendation was tabled at the meeting.
428. The Chair invited the Case Officer from Lewes District Council, to speak to the Committee on the consent for a temporary car park which was just outside the boundary of the National Park but visible from it.
429. Concerns were expressed regarding the potential for longer term use of the car park, although the land had been earmarked for development, and the requirement from the Environment Agency for a hardstanding surface for the car park.

Jennifer Gray left the meeting at 2.20pm

430. **RESOLVED:** that the Committee provides the following consultation response to Lewes District Council:

Having considered the proposed development against the purposes and duty of the South Downs National Park (SDNP), the car park development would be located adjacent to the football stadium and the stadium coach park and as such would provide this facility within the grouping of the overall development. It would be screened by an existing dense tree/vegetation screen. The tree screen should be retained by the imposition of a condition on any planning permission granted to minimise the visual impact of the car park and as an important contributor to the soft landscape of the area. The preferred location for the car park is the site at Falmer school, as this will remove traffic from the vicinity of the National Park and Falmer village, but as a temporary car parking solution for the stadium is required during the substantive programme of reconstruction of Falmer High School (Academy) the potential conflict with the purposes of the National Park is considered to be outweighed by the need to make provision for the stadium as an interim measure. However, given the potential for additional traffic in the vicinity of the National Park and Falmer village, the Highways Authorities need to ensure that competent measures are taken to ensure that the potential traffic impact on Falmer village and the NP is effectively contained. Any planning permission granted should be:

A) Subject to a condition to ensure that the car park is removed and the land is restored in accordance with a landscaping and biodiversity enhancement scheme to be approved by Lewes DC and implemented at the end of the 3 year period and in accordance with an agreed implementation plan.

B) Subject to, among others, the following planning conditions:

- External lighting in the car park to be agreed
- Retention of tree/vegetation screen
- Landscaping and biodiversity enhancement scheme to be approved by the SDNP Authority in conjunction with the S.106 agreement

In considering this matter, the SDNPA Planning Committee were particularly concerned about the potential impact of the car park on the landscape, and request that the landscaping proposals be reviewed to ensure that the impact of the car park on the landscape of the National Park is effectively mitigated in all seasons.'

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan: Addendum Consultation Document

431. The Committee considered a report from the Head of Planning (Report 36/11) with a revised Recommendation tabled at the meeting. Members were advised that the reference to Oakhanger Parish Council in Appendix 1 should read Selbourne Parish Council.

Minette Palmer left the meeting at 2.37pm and took no further part in the item

432. The Head of Planning referred to an email from a Member of the Park Authority that expressed concerns over the supply of soft sand.

433. The Chair invited (name?), an officer from Hampshire County Council, to speak to the Committee. Revised figures had been received reducing the future requirement of soft sand from 8mt to 5-6mt, and revision for existing sites.

434. Timescales for the Ministry of Defence (MoD) vacating the Whitehill Bordon eco-town site were not clear, but recent reports indicate that this would not take place until at least 2016. The MasterPlan for the eco-town was in place and extraction of soft sand was not included, although there were significant reserves of soft sand available.

435. Concern was raised that the Committee had previously been assured that Kingsley Sandpit would not be considered, and Whitehill Bordon could be considered as a potential site allocation on the grounds of deliverability. It was a prior extraction opportunity only.

436. **RESOLVED:** that the Committee recommends the Authority to

- 1) note the summary of the Have Your Say consultation;
- 2) approve the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan draft 'Addendum Consultation' document for public consultation, subject to the document being clear that:
 - a) the SDNPA agree with the inclusion of the additional suggested site 'Frithend Quarry Extension (Groom's Farm D)' only on the basis that it will meet a proven need and;
 - b) the SDNPA agree that 'Kingsley Quarry Extension' should not be included as a suggested site.
- 3) to authorise the public consultation

Minette Palmer rejoined the meeting at 2.47pm

Winchester City Council "Plans for Places.....after Blueprint" Consultation

437. The Committee considered a report from the Head of Planning (Report PC 35/11).

438. Members made the following comments during discussion:

- a buffer zone was required between the National park boundary and any development
- some affordable housing was needed in small villages such as New Alresford and Bishop Waltham
- the criteria-based approach outlined in paragraph 4.7 of the report could have Park-wide implications by setting a precedent if that argument was followed.
- an overall Park strategy was needed which would not restrict high density housing as being inappropriate within the National Park

439. **RESOLVED:** that the Committee recommends the Authority to approve the "Plans for Places.....after Blueprint" document for consultation purposes

Waverley Borough Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy Preferred Options and Draft Policies

440. The Committee considered a report from the Head of Planning (Report PC 32/11)
441. Members attention was drawn to the potential adverse impact on the National Park of Waverley Borough Council's housing targets not being met, and missed opportunities for interaction with the National Park.
442. **RESOLVED:** that the Committee recommend the Authority makes representation on Waverley Borough Council's LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options and Draft Policies as follows:
- 1) It comments on the need for recognition of the National Park in terms of impact on, links with and benefits from the National Park's proximity to Haslemere and the south of the borough, especially through appropriate amendments to the Spatial Portrait, Issues and Challenges, Sustainable Transport, Employment and Economy, Rural Environment, Biodiversity and Climate Change sections as set out in this report.
 - 2) It opposes the preferred approach to the target for housing on the grounds that it merely replicates land supply and does not meet local housing need, thus potentially putting pressure on adjoining local authorities, including the National Park, which may be to the detriment of National Park purposes.
 - 3) It requests that Waverley Borough Council undertake further work, if necessary on a sub-regional basis, to identify how their housing needs can be met without impacting on the National Park, including a consideration of how the Whitehill Bordon eco-town could contribute to the shortfall

Whitehill Bordon Economic Strategy Consultation

443. The Committee considered a report from the Head of Planning (Report 33/11).
444. The Committee agreed the following changes for inclusion on the draft response:
- the Authority was concerned about the potential impacts of the Whitehill Bordon Eco-Town on the National Park in terms of traffic, tranquillity, biodiversity and landscape and wished to discuss these potential impacts within the context of the East Hampshire Joint LDF Core Strategy and any proposed Area Action Plan.
 - the impact on the biodiversity and other special qualities of adjacent areas needed to be assessed and controlled
 - the height of proposed buildings to be restricted so as to avoid high rise development
 - the cost of impact on the National Park on the green travel hub to be included
 - the Authority supported the economic development of the eco-town in principle
445. **RESOLVED:** that, subject to inclusion of changes proposed during discussion, the Committee recommends the Authority adopts the comments on the draft strategy as its formal response to the Whitehill Bordon Economic Development and Employment Strategy consultation

Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority Revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

446. The Committee considered a report from the Head of Planning (Report 34/11) and the SCI that had been circulated to Committee Members.
447. The Committee was advised that the Park Authority SCI would be considered at the September Planning Committee meeting.

448. **RESOLVED:** that the Committee recommends to the Authority that the Joint Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority Statement of Community Involvement be adopted for the purposes of the Lewes District Council Joint Core Strategy, and for other Local Development Framework documents and development management within the Lewes part of the Park

CHAIR

Meeting closed at 3.55pm