

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 June 2012

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

Present:

Andrew Shaxson - Chair	Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones	Tom Jones
Neville Harrison - Deputy Chair	Jennifer Gray	Charles Peck	David Jenkins

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Lewis Oliver (Development Management Officer), Peter Earl (Minerals and Waste Support Officer), David Boyson (Historic Buildings Officer), Michael Scammell (Historic Buildings Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

APOLOGIES

605. Apologies for absence were received from Alun Alesbury, Ken Bodfish & Margaret Paren

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

606. Tom Jones declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 5 as a member of Lewes District Council.
607. Neville Harrison declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 6 as a member of the South Downs Society.
608. Andrew Shaxson declared an interest in item 6 as detailed in minute 626.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 May 2012

609. Minute 572 to be amended, for clarification to read; 'Extant permission – whilst acknowledging the speakers debate, weight had been given to the previous permission and the conditions, all be it they were limited'. The minutes of the meeting held on 10 May 2012 were then agreed as a correct record;

URGENT ITEMS

610. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: LW/12/0393

Proposal: Demolition of existing clubhouse and construction of clubhouse with associated highway works and landscaping and re-cladding of existing greenkeepers shed

Address: Seaford Head Golf Course, Southdown Road, Seaford. East Sussex BN25 4JS

611. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 40/12)
612. The case officer highlighted items from the update sheet, which was available on the Authority Website on Wednesday 13 June, including the additional condition 14.
613. Ms Sam Shippen spoke in support of the application as the Clerk of Seaford Town Council, the applicant; she spoke about:-
- The background and history of the Golf Club
 - The views from the Golf Course

- The practicalities with the existing Golf Club
 - The need to attract younger and female golfers
 - The Golf Course being an attraction within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and how a new Club House could enhance this
614. Cllr Ian White spoke in support of the application, as the Leader of Seaford Town Council, the applicant; he made reference to:-
- The history and previous ownership of the Golf Course, including;
 - How the profits were used to enhance and maintain open spaces
 - The decline in profits over recent years and the need for Seaford Town Council to prevent further decline
 - The wish to attract more society golf, female golfers, young golfers and additional business use
615. Mr Richard Andrews spoke in support of the application from Seaford Head Golf Club on behalf of the club members; he spoke about:-
- How local organisations and local residents used the facilities
 - The unsuitable conditions of the facilities within the existing Club House for a high quality course
 - The club was not an exclusive Members only Club and wished to attract visiting golfers and therefore encouraging economic viability of the area
616. The Committee commented on:
- The existing Club House was outdated and unacceptable for the well maintained course
 - The Club House was the most important part of the course
 - SDNPA officers to be commended for their joint work on the application with the applicant
 - Local objections could be addressed by conditions
 - The existing Club House would be a drain on Council Tax payees if the Club House was not replaced
 - An improved application to the previous one
 - The National Park Purposes and Duty
 - The Golf Course was on an urban fringe and the proposal complementary to the landscape
617. The Committee concerns were:
- The condition of the Groundsmens compound
 - The materials to be used as the surface of the car park
618. In response to the Committee's questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that:
- The following concerns and issues were covered by conditions;
 - Highways & car parking
 - Materials to be used in the construction
 - Increase in functions
 - Landscaping & maintenance
 - Biodiversity
 - External signage and lighting
 - There would be no change of use
 - There would be a S106 agreement regarding the access track
619. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the additional Condition 14. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

620. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 40/12 and subject to:
- (i). completion of a S106 agreement with obligations relating to improvements to the access track to the site and subsequent adoption and maintenance by the Highway Authority ; and
 - (ii). the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of report PC 40/12
 - (iii). Additional condition 14; which was available on the Authority Website on Wednesday 13 June .

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

Application No: WSCC/017/11/EL/SDNP

Proposal: Restoration using imported inert waste material including treatment activities to recover materials for reuse

Address: Duncton Chalk Quarry GU28 0LU

621. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 41/12).
622. Cllr Marie Bracey spoke against the application as Chair of Duncton Parish Council; she spoke about:
- The objections from Duncton parish
 - The already dangerous road inadequate for HGV's
 - Backhauling was unrealistic
 - That quarry sites regenerate naturally
 - No justification for importing inert waste
 - The potential threat to water supplies and issues of contamination
 - The environmental impact
 - The restoration would not be completed for 30 years
 - The SDNP Purposes and Duty
623. Cllr Vivien Gosden spoke against the application on behalf of East Lavington Parish Council; she expressed concerns regarding:
- The threat to the water supplies and the significant risks to local residents
 - Full account needs to be taken of geological fractures in the chalk and flaws in the hydrological risk model relating to flow paths
 - Nearby springs supplying water to the college
 - No confidence in site safety and waste controls
 - Materials were already placed on the site without planning permission
 - No proactive measures to address possible contamination, and the need for monitoring to have regard to concerns that could arise before detection.
624. Mr Toby Mullins spoke against the application as the headmaster of Seaford College: he spoke about:
- The spring was the only water source for many residents as they did not receive supplies from Southern Water and the quarry was above this source
 - The water is high quality spring water filtered through the chalk
 - The unacceptable risks and possible pollution of the aquifer.
 - Inert waste was not easily separated from dangerous waste
625. Mr Gregory Park spoke in support of the application as the applicant: he spoke about:
- The restoration process would be in keeping with the SDNP and provide a beneficial landform and facilities for the Park.

- The area lacked facilities for visitors in this part of the SDNP
 - The scheme had sensitively considered issues and there was support to restore the site
 - The impact of vehicular traffic had been contained by backhauling.
 - The current use of the site and the continuation of activity.
626. Andrew Shaxson declared a personal non prejudicial interest in the item as a member of Chichester District Council.
627. The Committee commented:
- Major development within the SDNP was required to show an exceptional circumstance, for its location there and this had not been shown by the application.
 - Vehicle movements and the suitability of the highway
 - Water issues needed further investigation
 - Lack of engagement with the applicant
 - No explanation of any benefit to the SDNP
 - Application did not address the Purposes and Duty of the SDNP
 - Many issues not addressed by the applicant
 - Concern regarding the ability to manage infilling whilst extracting chalk.
628. In response to the Committee's questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified:
- Information had been requested from the applicant regarding the ability to achieve backhauling of loads thereby reducing vehicle movements. This had not been received and therefore the approach was unsubstantiated and considered unrealistic.
 - In regard to pollution control, the NPPF confirms that the SDNPA should accept the advice from the Environment Agency as the appropriate agency with expertise in this area. Their advice was that the development was acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions as requested.
629. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
630. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 9.1 of report PC 41/12.
631. The chair adjourned the meeting at 12:05pm for a comfort break
632. The meeting re convened at 12:13pm

STRATEGY & POLICY

Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, and Heritage at Risk

633. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 42/12).
634. The Committee commented:
- The document was well written
 - Their concern that the Sustainable Communities Fund (SCF) was the only funding mechanism mentioned, when others were available
 - Their concern that there would be many Community supported documents Parishes may think they need to complete
 - There was an opportunity for Parishes to take responsibility and to become involved in producing documents
 - To amend recommendation (iv) to remove direct reference to the SCF
635. In response to questions; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified:

- Areas that had completed a Conservation Area appraisal would need to be updated in due course to cover a Management Plan.
- Parishes would have support and work jointly with SDNPA officers to complete the document
- In the future there would be a common document where appraisals followed the same format
- The human rights implications (principle and process) were explained to the committee with report PC42/12 identifying a risk although investigation in report PC43/12 confirmed there was no risk
- There was an aspiration to develop a toolkit to issues to parishes to use for completing all documents required by the SDNPA
- Recommendation (iv) could be amended to; *Encourage the submission of applications, as appropriate, that have community support and utilise available funding mechanisms*

636. Committee member David Jenkins left the room at 12:40pm

637. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the amended recommendation (iv). Following a vote the proposal was carried.

638. **RESOLVED:**

1. For the work of the Historic Buildings Officers in producing Conservation Area Character Assessments and Management Plans; The Planning Committee:
 - (i) Agree the methodology set out in paragraph 2.17 and the prioritization as set out in Appendix 1 of this report
 - (ii) Approve the document 'A Guide to Researching and Writing a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans for Parish Councils', included as Appendix 2 of this report
 - (iii) Approve the targets for 2012-13 set out in paragraph 2.18 and with any cost relating to graphics and mapping to be covered from existing budgets for this financial year.
 - (iv) Encourage the submission of applications, as appropriate, that have community support and utilise available funding mechanisms
2. For the work of the Historic Buildings Officers in dealing with Heritage at Risk within the National Park; the Planning Committee
 - (i) Support the commissioning of a Buildings at Risk survey for the entire National Park.
 - (ii) Support the general approach to dealing with buildings at risk set out in paragraphs 3.2 – 3.13 of report PC 42/12 and the specific work being currently undertaken in support of the owner of Castle Goring.
 - (iii) Support discussions with external partners to initiate consideration of the formation of a Building Preservation Trust or similar for the South Downs

639. Committee member Jennifer Gray left the room at 12:59pm

Proposed Extension of Midhurst Conservation Area to incorporate an Article 4 Direction for selected properties

640. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 43/12).

641. The lead officer highlighted the revised recommendation from the update sheet, which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 13 June

642. The Committee commented:

- Commending Michael Scammell for his work in public relations by consulting with the community

643. In response to questions; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified:

- Not all householders issued with green forms responded

- Permission previously granted for demolition within the Conservation Area would need to be re applied for, if buildings were not already demolished
- No other areas of Midhurst Conservation areas had Article 4's

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

645. **RESOLVED:** The Committee

1. Approve the adoption of the Midhurst Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, prepared by Chichester District Council in 2011, as further amended and attached at Appendix 1 of report PC 43/12. That the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee be authorised to agree any further minor changes
2. Approve an extension to the Midhurst Conservation Area as shown on map 1, attached at Appendix 3 to report PC43/12
3. Raise an Article 4 Direction to cover specified houses in the extension of the Midhurst Conservation Area, identified within Character Area 7 in the Character Appraisal.

CHAIR

Meeting closed at 1:19pm