

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE 15 March 2012**

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

Present:

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

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Pat Aird (Development Management Lead), Michael Scammell (Historic Building Officer), Lewis Oliver (Development Management Officer), David Cranmer (Development Management Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

### **APOLOGIES**

358. Apologies for absence were received from Tom Jones.

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

359. Charles Peck declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 8 as a member of Wealden District Council.
360. Doug Jones declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 5 as he was known personally to a resident within the application site.
361. Jennifer Gray declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 5 as a member of East Hants District Council.
362. Margaret Paren declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 5 as a member of CPRE Hampshire.
363. Neville Harrison declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 5 & 7 as a member of the South Downs Society.
364. Andrew Shaxson declared a personal & prejudicial interest in item 6 as his partner works part time at Rosemary Park Nursing Home.

### **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 16 February 2012**

365. The minutes of the meeting held on 16 February 2012 were agreed as a correct record with one amendment for the inclusion of Doug Jones who had been left off the attendance record

### **URGENT ITEMS**

366. The Chair informed the Committee that Item 9, report PC17/12 had been deferred for consideration at the 12 April 2012 South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Planning Committee meeting. This was to allow the item to be considered concurrently with a recent additional consultation received from Brighton and Hove City Council regarding a planning application for the construction of 684 car parking spaces at the Former Falmer High School in Brighton.

### **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

#### **EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Application No:** SDNP/52418/002  
**Proposal:** 213 Dwellings, 30 bed sheltered accommodation, primary school, community building with associated access, open space and landscaping

**Address: Land at Causeway Farm, Petersfield**

367. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC13/12)
368. The case officer highlighted items on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 14 March including:
- Paragraph 8.25 south-east should read south-west
  - An addition of a 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point in paragraph 10.1 (i) of the recommendation ‘
369. Councillor Philip Aiston spoke against the application, as the East Hampshire District Councillor for Petersfield on behalf of the residents of the Causeway; he spoke about:-
- The site being a Greenfield site
  - Affordable housing needs
  - commuting and increase vehicle movements
  - The application not addressing the issues of previous reasons for refusal
370. Mr Philip Haines spoke against the application, representing 200 members of the Causeway Farm Group and the Petersfield Society; he made reference to:-
- The Petersfield Town Design Statement adopted by East Hants District Council
  - The previous unsuccessful applications
  - Housing waiting lists
  - Significant development along the Causeway, including commercial and affordable housing
  - Concern at increased traffic movements and chaotic traffic congestion
  - The percentage of residents who commute out of the town
  - A village green application with Hampshire County Council
371. Mr Matt Stevens spoke in support of the application, on behalf of the applicant; he referred to:-
- the limited information in the officer report relating to the Petersfield Plan and the work which identifies the need for more homes
  - 665 households needing homes rising to 1,000
  - the provision of a school and open space
  - 50% of houses were affordable
372. The Committee discussed the application, their concerns included;
- Impact on the surrounding roads with increased traffic movements
  - Major development within the National Park and the impact on the landscape
  - SDNPA future Policies in particular a local connections policy and housing need
  - The landscape and visual impact of the proposed development
373. The Committee commented on:
- There was no need for this housing with affordable housing recently constructed in the area
  - The five year land supply
  - The development needs of the local community needing to be addressed through working closely with East Hants District Council and Petersfield Town Council on Neighbourhood Plan
  - PPS7 advising that major development should not take place in National Parks unless there was clear and compelling justification of need, the committee felt that there was no justification of need

- Recognising there would be developments within the Park. The SDNP was unusual and different to other National Parks in that there are large settlements within the Park area and their requirements need to be provided and therefore carefully considered
  - The site was a green finger into the town
  - The National Park's Purposes and Duty
  - People would always move in and out of the Park area for employment and so would always have commuters
374. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation incorporating the amended reason (i) in paragraph 10.1 for application SDNP/52418/002. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
375. **RESOLVED:** that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC13/12 and subject to amended (i):
- (i) Having regard to the following
- that the site is not needed to meet a 5 year land supply requirement;
  - the impact upon the broader landscape of the area;
  - the requirements of PPG7 and the DEFRA Vision and Circular on English National Parks and the Broads to have exceptional circumstances to permit major developments in these areas
  - the emerging EHDC and SDNPA Joint Core Strategy'
- the development of this reserve housing site is inappropriate, pending a comprehensive review by the District Council, jointly with the National Park Authority and local community, of the best options for meeting Petersfield's housing needs and other community needs. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the guidance contained in PPS3, PPS7, the DEFRA Vision and Circular on English National Parks and the Broads and Policy H2 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review.
376. Andrew Shaxson left the Committee table and sat in the public seating. Neville Harrison presided as Chair for the next item

## CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Application No:** 11/02607/FULNP  
**Proposal:** Formation of a car park with staff accommodation and ancillary nursing home accommodation  
**Address:** Rosemary Park Nursing Home, Marley Common, Fernhurst

377. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC14/12).
378. The case officer:
- highlighted items on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 14 March including an additional condition requiring details of external lighting on the site to be submitted to and approved in writing by the SDNPA
  - clarified that the application was not for an increase in patient numbers but for a car park and staff accommodation, the staff living in the proposed accommodation would be there on a permanent basis
  - stated that the design had been amended with the applicant working closely with the SDNPA improving the materials proposed to be used, with the final materials to be agreed by the SDNPA
379. Susan Milan spoke against the application on behalf of herself and Marley Common residents; her concerns included:
- Increased traffic on a single lane with no speed restrictions overburdening the lane
  - The dangers for pedestrians using the lane
  - Vehicles forced to reverse because of large lorries delivering to Rosemary Park

- The possibility that the proposed staff accommodation could be converted for patient use in the future
380. Mr Morgan spoke against the application on behalf of himself and those living close to Rosemary Park; he spoke about:
- The 24 previous applications
  - The road access would not cope with increased traffic serving over 100 local residents and National Trust visitors and hikers
  - The very steep and narrow lane with no passing areas
  - His request to Committee members to prohibit further expansion of the site and to limit patient numbers
381. Christine Duckworth spoke against the application on behalf of Marley common residents; their concerns included:
- Increased traffic movements on a narrow lane with over 100 residents and visitors to the National Trust already frequent users
  - Pot holes and congestion on the lane
  - The movements per day monitored by West Sussex County Council
  - The owners of Rosemary Park stating that their last application in 2009 was the final one
  - The 24 applications in the previous 15 years
  - The large proposed building
  - No public transport servicing the area
  - Previous properties owned by Rosemary Park for staff accommodation had been recently sold
382. Jo Randall spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant; she referenced:
- Rosemary Park was a centre of excellence providing care in a stable secure setting
  - Continuity of staff was important to the patients and referenced the positive impact of this for them
  - The new building would achieve the continuity of staff for patient care
  - The professions such as physiotherapy and occupational therapy would enhance the lives of the patients
  - The centre was full with a waiting list
  - Rosemary Park were a small company in the area
383. Ian Donohue spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant; his comments included:
- There were no plans to remove tree screening
  - Why the proposed site was chosen
  - The new development would cut down the amount of commuting by staff and therefore the pressure on the lane
  - The Highways Authority had no objections
  - There were increased mental health problems and limited facilities to provide the same type of care in this country
384. Andrew Shaxson left the room before the debate
385. The Committee commented:
- Their desire to see Master Plans for these type of developments with a shared view of their aspirations
  - The site had a congested appearance

- the proposed building was visually acceptable with minimal if any visual impact from outside
  - The facility was applauded and much needed in society
  - Further thought to traffic movements within the National Park would be required, getting used to different road use and movements in the future. There are frequent objections on increased traffic movements on applications
  - The lack of dialogue and engagement between the applicant and the local residents
386. In response to the Committee's questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- Condition 4 was in place to ensure that the proposed building was not used for patient accommodation and an additional application would need to be made to amend it
  - Discussions could be entered into with the applicant and the Highways Authority to address matters raised although there would be no guarantees and the HA were not objecting to the proposal
  - Dialogue between the applicant and the residents would be encouraged, and a letter would be sent to the applicant suggesting this
  - The applicant had been encouraged to produce a master plan and officers would be working with the applicant on producing once
387. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation incorporating the additional condition regarding external lighting. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
388. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC14/12 & subject to an additional condition:
- No development shall commence until details of external lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the South Downs National Park Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure the development conserves the character and setting of the South Downs National Park in accordance with policy RE1 of the Chichester District Local Plan 1999.
389. Andrew Shaxson re entered the room joining the Committee table and continued as Chair

## **ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Application No:** LY/21/11  
**Proposal:** Change of use of land for the siting of a horse ménage, two additional stables and 8 holiday lodges ancillary to an existing equestrian related development  
**Address:** Westland Field, Crossbush, Arundel, West Sussex

390. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 15/12)
391. The case officer highlighted the items on the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 14 March
- Paragraph 1.1 should read south-east and not south—west
  - Clarification to condition 10.1 (i) The proposed development, by reason of its location outside any settlement boundary, lack of association with an established tourist facility and the introduction of eight utilitarian lodges and associated equestrian and domestic paraphernalia, would be harmful to the character of the countryside and the landscape character of the South Downs National Park contrary to Saved Policies DEV5, DEV39 and GEN3 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 and the aims and intentions of PPS7 (Para 39 (i)) and the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism 2006 (Para 5.5).
392. Councillor Richard Wallis spoke against the application, representing Lyminster & Crossbush Parish Council; his concerns included:
- The proposed equestrian use

- The proposal significantly intensifies the use of the site
  - The existing use was not lawful and therefore the proposed use could not be ancillary to the existing use
  - There would be no local economic benefit
  - The existing landscape character was worth preserving
  - Detrimental change to site character
393. Maurice Ashenden-Bax spoke against the application representing himself as a resident of Crossbush village. He referred to:
- The site was a rural area of the National Park
  - The site would have an urbanising effect on the area contrary to PPS7
  - The proposal would cause harm to the site and locality of landscape character
  - The fumes and noise from the nearby recycling plant would impact upon the amenity of those utilising the proposed accommodation
  - The proposal would be detrimental to the landscape due to its poor design
  - Previous applications had been withdrawn on the site to avoid receiving refusals
394. Karen Parsons spoke against the application, representing the local community of Crossbush; her comments included:
- The site was in a rural area outside the village
  - There were B&B, camping and a Comfort Inn already within the village
  - There were several businesses already offering the same services as proposed
  - The nearest bridleway was 1.3km away from the site
  - There was no on site parking for cars/visitors and trailers, so would be forced to park on the highway
  - There was an existing personal licence for the use of riding on the adjacent private land, which would not be extended for business use
  - There was no lawful existing equestrian use on the site
  - The equestrian proposals on site were not large enough to facilitate the proposed equestrian use
395. Mr Martin Taylor spoke in support of the application as agent for the applicant; he made reference to:
- The application was a farm diversification proposal
  - The replacement stables
  - High quality lodges had been approved in other National Park areas (Dartmoor & the Lake District)
  - The landscape assessment stated the area was not an AONB and concluded that there would be no landscape harm
  - There was local need for this type of development
  - The application was not major development and would not have a significant impact upon the National Park
  - The National Park had a duty to foster economic development
  - The site ,on the edge of the National Park boundary
396. The Committee discussed the application; their concerns included;
- The site appeared overgrazed during the recent site visit attended by Committee members
  - A significant proportion of the site would be required for the proposed accommodation and ménage

- Large number of horses and quantity of manure already on site
  - The proposal would introduce a visually harmful development and there is an inadequate screening proposed
  - The need for a consistent approach towards holiday accommodation and facilities in development of policy whether they were yurts, utilitarian lodges or shepherd huts
  - Inadequate parking facilities
397. The Committee commented:
- The site was not the most attractive part of the National Park
  - The site was open countryside and although on the boundary of the Park had been included within it
  - The site was surrounded by ancient and attractive woodland
  - Questioning whether the SDNPA was doing enough to support tourism
  - The developer would determine the viability of a project and take the risk
  - Local Authorities had a different duty to the SDNPA
  - The proposal would not add to the SDNPA Purposes and Duty
  - The need for additional holiday accommodation although the proposed site was not the right place
  - The importance of paragraph 8.3 of the officer's report (PC15/12)
398. In response to questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- In regard to the change of use application; there were conditions attached to previous permissions for the site that restricted the commercial equine use of the site at present and the application should be determined on its merits
  - In regard to the need for consistent policy; the Committee was aware that the Authority was in the process of producing a Management Plan and Core Strategy with subsequent policies following. The issues raised by this application would be addressed to some extent through the formulation of these documents. There may also be the need for additional guidance, but, in the interim, has inherited policies from the relevant LPA's.
399. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the amended reason for refusal. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
400. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC15/12 & subject to clarified reason:
- (i) The proposed development, by reason of its location outside any settlement boundary, lack of association with an established tourist facility and the introduction of eight utilitarian lodges and associated equestrian and domestic paraphernalia, would be harmful to the character of the countryside and the landscape character of the South Downs National Park contrary to Saved Policies DEV5, DEV39 and GEN3 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 and the aims and intentions of PPS7 (Para 39 (i)) and the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism 2006 (Para 5.5)
401. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 12:25pm
402. The meeting re convened at 12:35pm

## **WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Application No:** NP/2011/0026/F  
**Proposal:** Proposed new farm office and staff facilities  
**Address:** Rathfinny Wine Estate Alfriston

403. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC16/12)

404. Mr Adrian Moore from Parker Dann spoke in support of the application representing the applicants; he made reference to:
- The application had significantly changed following discussions with SDNPA officers
  - The building was important to the estate as it grew
405. Mr Martin Swatton, from Martin Swatton designs spoke in support of the application representing the applicants; he made reference to:
- The close discussions held with the SDNPA
  - The building was re considered following advice and had better screening
  - They would use local and recycled materials
406. Ms Liz o' Neil from Rathfinny estate, spoke in support of the application representing the applicants; she referred to:
- The need for suitable office space for up to 12 meetings a week and team meetings
  - The need for suitable facilities for full and part time employees
  - The importance of the proposed location to minimise cross site traffic
407. The Committee commented:
- The estate had the support of the local community and the applicants had worked in partnership with the SDNPA on the development
  - The longer term plan might, in the future, have an effect on traffic movements
  - There should not be a presumption regarding opposition to modern buildings as modern designs were sometimes appropriate
  - National Parks by definition contained landscape that should be protected and enhanced, and the applicants were commended on their efforts, on this occasion, to minimise landscape impact, with an important development, within a sensitive landscape
408. In response to questions; the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- With regard to roof lights, light pollution and reflective windows, the roof lights were small and it was unlikely that employees would be working late into the night. Conditions 6 & 7 of the officer's report (PC16/12) covered materials for windows & doors and external lighting
  - With regard to modern design, there was no in principle objection to modern design within the SDNP but a modern design would not be appropriate for this location in the context of the existing buildings on site, the landscape and the architecture for the area
  - With regard to retail wine sales it had been proposed that they would be a from a shop in Alfriston
409. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
410. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for the reason and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 9.1 of report PC16/12

## CONSULTATIONS

### Consultation to vary conditions at the AMEX Stadium Falmer relating to capacity & parking provision

411. This item had been deferred for consideration at the 12th April 2012 SDNPA Planning Committee meeting for the reasons stated in minute 366.,

## STRATEGY & POLICY

### Midhurst Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan

412. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC18/12).



413. The case officer referred to the update sheet which was available on the Authority website on Wednesday 14 March, which explained:
- The costs involved in the implementation of the recommendation which were different to those associated with the actions, should the Management Plan be approved.
  - Funding for some of the actions recommended were not therefore incorporated into the report. However the actions recommended, such as environmental improvements and heritage walks, could be subject to external bids for funding.
414. The Committee commented:
- Appreciation of Chichester District Council for reviewing Midhurst conservation area
  - Good to see Article 4 direction being suggested and involving the local community
415. In response to a question; the lead officer and the Director of Planning clarified:
- Other Local Planning Authority conservation areas had included Victorian suburbs that had original designs and windows
  - Areas within the proposed extended conservation area, and within the existing Conservation Area, could be considered for Article 4 directions but there would be consultation. Any recommendations would be brought back to the Committee later in the year
  - There were no article 4 directions within areas covered by existing appraisal
  - In regard to financial implications; Chichester District Council had undertaken the work as part of their existing work programme
  - Costs of taking the programme forward were covered by the SDNPA staff budget
  - Other costs would need to be covered by other mechanisms such as S106, or Community Infrastructure Levy or external funding; the SDNPA would seek how to assist with finding funding but would not be funding themselves
416. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
417. **RESOLVED:** That the Planning Committee:
- 1) Approve the adoption of the Midhurst Conservation Area Character Appraisal prepared by Chichester District Council in 2011, as amended following public consultation and attached at Appendix 1 of report PC18/12
  - 2) Approve extensions to the Midhurst Conservation Area as shown on map 1, attached at Appendix 2 of report PC18/12
  - 3) Approve a removal from the Midhurst Conservation Area of a small area, as shown on map 1, attached at Appendix 2 of report PC18/12
  - 4) Initiate a programme of public and householder consultation to gather opinion on the desirability of an Article 4 Direction to cover specified houses in a possible future extension of the Midhurst Conservation Area, identified within Character Area 7 in the Character Appraisal

### **Proposed requirements for planning applications and related consents from 1 April 2012**

418. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/12).
419. The case officer updated the committee as follows:
- The amendments which were set out on the update sheet and a revised appendix 2 which were available on the Authority website on Wednesday 14 March
  - There were additional responses received on-line after the agenda was printed, changing the figures at appendix 2 as follows:

N=23

Document Type	Agree	Don't agree
Air quality assessment	17	6
Affordable housing statement	11	6
Biodiversity Survey and report	12	5
Geodiversity Survey and report	15	1
Hydrology	18	1
Flood risk assessment	18	1
Foul sewerage and utilities assessment	14	8
Heritage statement	16	2
Land contamination Assessment	13	4
Landscape and visual Impact assessment (including landscaping proposals and photomontages)	11	9
Lighting assessment	12	7
Mineral safeguarding	15	0
Noise assessment	11	6
Open space Assessment	14	0
Parking provision	12	5
Planning Obligation	13	4
Renewable Energy statement	14	6
Restoration and Aftercare Statement	16	0
Statement of how Community has been Involved	15	4
Telecommunications report	15	1
Transport assessment	12	5
Travel Plan	13	4
Tree Survey/ arboricultural assessment	12	4
Ventilation/Extraction equipment report	12	5

- The additional response results would not effect the recommendation
- The Committee might wish to decide to review the planning requirements after a period of time

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

- SDNPA officers would be available to assist applicants fill in application paperwork; Surgeries would be held in areas where the service had been recovered which any applicant could attend
- The consultation was extensive and was sent to all agents that had submitted an application to the SDNPA
- The web pages would be designed to assist applicants, particularly householders, in identifying the documents required
- Landscape advice might be the only item that might require additional assistance
- There could be a separate advice note aimed at householders, to keep the process as simple as possible
- A procedure for pre-application enquiries would be 'rolled out' in June

421. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officers recommendation, with an additional recommendation to review the list within 12 months. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
422. **RESOLVED:** That the Planning Committee
- (A) approve the Local Validation List set out at appendix I of report PC19/12 for a period of 12 months
  - (B) to review the Local Validation List within 12 months

**Determination of Planning and Related Applications: Delegation to Director of Planning by Planning Committee**

423. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/12).
424. The Director of Planning highlighted officer recommendation (A) (iii) where all applications which the Director of Planning was minded to permit and there was a letter of objection from the parish or town council would be referred to the SDNPA Planning Committee for determination. The Parish councils would be encouraged to attend the SDNPA Planning Committee meetings when items they caused to be considered were dealt with.
425. The Committee requested that the process be reviewed after it has been implemented.
426. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officers recommendation, Following a vote the proposal was carried.
427. **RESOLVED:** That the Planning Committee approve that;
- A). from 1 April 2012;
    - (i). all applications within the recovered service areas or called in by the SDNPA for determination with more than 5 letters of representation are referred to the SDNPA planning committee for determination; and
    - (ii).all applications which the Director of Planning is minded to refuse and there is a letter of support from the parish or town council are referred to the SDNPA planning committee for determination; and
    - (iii).all applications which the Director of Planning is minded to permit and there is a letter of objection from the parish or town council are referred to the SDNPA planning committee for determination; and
    - (iv).where a request from a Member has been received within 28 days of notification to that effect an application is referred to the SDNPA planning committee for determination.
  - B). That the process set out in A is reviewed at the end of 6 months

**CHAIR**

Meeting closed at 2:14pm