

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE 11 July 2013**

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

Present:

Andrew Shaxson (Chair)	Barbara Holyome	Charles Peck	Alun Alesbury
Neville Harrison (Deputy Chair)	Ian Phillips	Doug Jones	David Jenkins
Jennifer Gray	Diana Kershaw	Tom Jones	

SDNPA Officers: Trevor Beattie (Chief Executive Officer), Keith Reed (Deputy Director of Planning), Tim Richings (Planning Policy Manager), Roy Little (Link Officer), Veronica Craddock (Landscape Officer), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer) & Andy Biltcliffe (East Hants District Council).

**OPENING REMARKS**

1. The Committee was informed that following new information submitted late on 10 July 2013 and in order to allow officers sufficient time to consider the comments made; Application SDNP/13/00643/FUL, Land opposite Annington House, Annington Lane, Bramber, had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**APOLOGIES**

2. There were none.

**ELECTION OF CHAIR**

3. Andrew Shaxson as the only nomination was duly elected as Chair and presided over the rest of the meeting.
4. The Chair gave a short acceptance speech.

**ELECTION OF DEPUTYCHAIR**

5. Neville Harrison as the only nomination was duly elected as Deputy Chair.

**DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

6. Jennifer Gray declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 12 as a member of East Hampshire District Council and would not take part in the vote on this matter.
7. Doug Jones declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 12 as a member of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Group.

**MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 June 2013**

8. The Minutes of the meeting 13 June 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

**UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

9. There were none.

**URGENT ITEMS**

10. There were none.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

**CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Application No:** SDNP/12/00065/FUL  
**Proposal:** New pressing centre and vineyard building for Nyetimber Ltd to replace existing building  
**Address:** Land at Netherland Vineyard, Tillington, Petworth, GU28 0PG

11. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 61/13).

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee  
Agenda Item 3**

12. The case officer referenced items on the July 2013 update sheet including, the revised condition 8.
13. Cheryl Brown spoke against the application on behalf of her mother, Mrs Louise Holmes, owner of 'The White House'; she spoke about:
  - She was encouraged by the Committee recommendations following the last application regarding the alternative access, although ignored by Nyetimber
  - Nyetimber had not improved conditions for her mother
  - The vast number of vehicle movements would be an inconvenience and a safety issue
  - A dedicated access route to the vineyard was needed across their property and not using public footpaths
  - Case law and the right to a 'good nights sleep'
  - Her mother was elderly and vulnerable with medical conditions.
14. The Committee commented on:
  - Their reservations on the application
  - Their encouragement of the BREAM rating of the proposed building
  - The benefit of additional employment to the rural economy did not outweigh the impact on the local amenity and landscape
  - Their support of the wine industry within national parks
  - The existing barn was unattractive
  - New development within a National Park should be of the highest quality
  - The majority of the wine production was completed outside the SDNP
  - The National Park Purposes and Duty
  - Hard standing surfaces could be of a permeable nature.
15. The Committee debated their concern regarding:
  - The suitability of the location and the vehicle movements around the SDNP during harvest
  - The need for the pressing centre to be within the SDNP
  - The majority of grapes would be grown outside the National Park
  - The impact on the residential amenity of the White House and especially regarding increased traffic
  - The scale of the development within a National Park
  - The impact on the open views of the National Park from the A272
  - The vehicle movements and building's impact on the landscape
  - The proposed building would be much larger than the existing
  - The prominence of the solar panels
  - If the proposal satisfied the NPPF Para 116 criteria for 'exceptional circumstances' for development within the SDNP.
  - The proposed landscaping scheme
16. In response to questions officers clarified:
  - The number of jobs that the proposal would generate locally during and outside of the harvest period, as outlined from the submitted information. This included 26 pressing centre and 21 vineyard staff during the harvest period, and 14 pressing centre staff (2 weeks only) and 7 vineyard staff outside of this period. It was also outlined that the vineyard employs approximately 250 seasonal worker to pick the grapes.
  - The scheme was not intended to screen, but to replace lost hedgerows and form part of the landscape framework

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee  
Agenda Item 3**

- Planning permission would be required for a change of use from agriculture
  - The SDNPA Design Officer had commented on the application
  - No detailed discussions had been held with the applicant regarding alternative access
  - The solar panels were proposed to be matt grey consistent with the roof slates and could be conditioned
  - The existing pressing plant was on a temporary lease and the building was not suitable for the long term
  - The surface of the yard would be concrete with built-in drainage
  - In regard to operational need; the policy did not require the applicant to provide documentary evidence to support the need. The site was a brownfield site with an existing barn
  - Policy B5 did not outline a sequential approach in regard to site selection for proposals in the same way retail development is assessed by other policy for example
  - The information of critical timescales from grape harvesting to pressing were not available
  - Paragraph 116 from the NPPF regarding major developments in National Parks and the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for development, which are in the public interest
  - In regard to long distance views, the building would be visible from the South Downs although the impact would not be significant, but consistent with the existing barn, although it would be larger
  - An excessive woodland planting approach would not provide a setting for the building and it was not necessary to screen the building completely. Local views had been taken in to account
  - Landscape scheme was sensitive to local biodiversity
  - The presence of vines created a change to the landscape and the building would be seen in this context
17. SDNP/12/00065/FUL: It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the revised condition 8 as detailed on the July update sheet and an additional condition for materials on solar panels and all hard surfaces to be agreed in writing prior to any construction. Following a vote the proposal fell.
18. SDNP/12/00065/FUL: It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application as the application constituted major development within a National Park, for which exceptional circumstances were not proven to be justified. It would also have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the White House. The application and associated vehicle movements would also have a detrimental impact on the landscape. The final form of words be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
19. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
1. The proposal constitutes major development in a National Park, for which planning permission should only be granted in exceptional circumstances. The need for the development within the National Park has not been adequately demonstrated.
  2. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the White House by virtue of the traffic which would be generated
  3. The proposed measures to moderate the detrimental impact of the proposed building and associated vehicles on the landscape of the National Park, particularly the additional hedgerows would themselves have an adverse impact on the open views of the National Park from the A272.
- and that the final form of words be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee.

**SDNPA (Arun)**

**Application No:** SDNP/13/01177/HOUS  
**Proposal:** Two storey extension and detached double garage/store  
**Address:** Cedar House, Dyers Lane, Slindon, Arundel, BN18 0RE

20. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC62/13).
21. Karen Coburn spoke against the application on behalf of herself; she spoke about:
  - The property had already been extended and trees had been felled
  - Previous planning permissions
  - The development did not adhere to the approved plans and exceeded the footprint
  - The application was not an improvement on previous plans
  - It was a large scale development which did not enhance the area
  - The site was an eyesore and for over a year has contained building rubble and scaffolding
  - Building works were only carried out on a Saturday
  - The letters of objection.
22. Norman Dingemans spoke against the application on behalf of Roy Haycock, a neighbour to 'Cedar House'; he spoke about:
  - The letters of objections
  - There were no letters of support for the application from residents living in direct line of site of Cedar House
  - The officers report
  - The scale of works was much larger than the previous approved permission
  - The application constituted a large development on a small site
  - The development was not acceptable
  - The case officer had not taken the increase in size into account.
23. Barbara Brimblecombe spoke against the application on behalf of Slindon Parish Council; she spoke about:
  - The Parish Councils objections
  - The adverse impact on the neighbourhood
  - The development was not in keeping with the area
  - The impact on highway safety
  - The Parish Council received many letters of objections.
24. Dr Justin Murray spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he spoke about:
  - The history of the house and when purchased in 2004 it was in a poor state of repair, where no upkeep or maintenance had been carried out for considerable time
  - The process of the restoration, including establishing a lawn and gardens, removing dead elm trees with permission and new landscaping
  - Previously planning permissions and that materials use were in agreement with permission conditions
  - The current application with changes to the foundations to comply with building control and a request for a new garage and store.
25. The Committee commented on:
  - The application would increase the size of the dwelling by a significant amount
  - The need for high standards of design within the SDNP especially in conservation areas
  - There was insufficient information regarding the use of the garage and store.
26. The Committee debated their concern regarding:

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee  
Agenda Item 3**

- The materials and finish of the existing permitted development
  - The large double garage and store which could be used as a residential dwelling
  - The design and materials were out of character and not sensitive to the conservation area
  - The application did not conserve or enhance the appearance of the conservation area by scale and massing.
27. In response to questions officers clarified that:
- The garage and store did not form part of the previous permission
  - The proposed studio could be a multi functional space which is ancillary to the dwelling such as an office and/or store, but was highlighted on the plans as a 'loft'
  - The garage would require planning permission to be used as a separate residential use.
28. SDNP/13/01177/HOUS: It was proposed and seconded to refuse permission. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
29. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reason:
- The proposed development fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment of the conservation area by virtue of the inappropriate materials and elevational treatment and of its excessive scale and massing.
- And that the final form of words be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee.

**APPEALS**

**Application No:** SDNP/12/02013/FUL  
**Proposal:** Erection of secure entrance gate to commercial woodland  
**Address:** Fox Rough, Selden Lane, Patching, Worthing, BN13 3UL

30. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC63/13).
31. **RESOLVED:** the Committee noted the contents of report PC63/13.
32. The Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:30pm.
33. The meeting re convened at 1pm.

**STRATEGY & POLICY**

**Proposed Modifications to the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy**

34. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC64/13).
35. The lead officer referenced items on the July 2013 update sheet including, the revised recommendation and the amendments to page 32 & 43 of appendix 2.
36. The Committee were asked to email the lead officer any minor amendments they may have with the modified sections of the strategy document
37. Councillor David Parkinson (Portfolio holder for Planning at East Hampshire District Council EHDC) spoke on the item; he spoke about:
- He thanked officers and members from both the SDNPA & EHDC who had worked extremely hard over the last few months to bring the project forward
  - EHDC were supportive of the Purposes and Duty of the SDNPA although had concerns regarding the level of housing proposed by the SDNPA as this would create uncertainty as to where the gap would be made up
  - The SDNP had a disproportionate level of housing need with the SDNP covering 56% of the District area, 30% of the population and 32% of the affordable housing need. The proposed housing numbers would only meet the existing backlog and not provide for future housing need

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee  
Agenda Item 3**

- The level of new housing the SDNPA was proposing would exacerbate the disproportionate level of housing need. Local residents would be forced to move elsewhere as in-migrants with higher purchasing power would out price local households, particularly younger families, those on low incomes and in need of affordable housing
  - The range of the proposed housing in the officer's report was unacceptable to EHDC Councillors and requested the SDNPA agreed the higher figure of 950 or the strategy would fail at the full EHDC Council meeting on 1 August 2013.
38. The Committee debated at length:
- The proposed housing figure in regard to the SDNPA Purposes and Duty and how the SDNPA was different to local authorities, and was able to adopt a different approach to housing
  - Having a range of housing was appropriate and would provide flexibility
  - Whilst there was 'in principle' support for the higher figure, there was insufficient evidence at this stage that the proposed higher level of housing could definitely be accommodated within the SDNP without a significant landscape impact
  - Recognising the SDNP was a special place and therefore treated differently, the landscape impact assessments explain why the SDNPA could not commit to a specific target.
39. The Committee commented:
- On the excellent evidence base and landscape impact assessments
  - Not wanting the Strategy to fail
  - Some communities may need to absorb the remaining housing requirements
  - Other housing sites may come forward
  - Sites and locations would be decided by other Plans
  - The supporting text relating to the SDNPA in the deleted CP9 policy should be included elsewhere within the document
  - Parts of East Hampshire were excluded from the boundary of the SDNP for a reason
  - The SDNPA may not be able to achieve high housing figures and therefore should not be swayed by the comments of EHDC Councillors.
40. In response to Committee questions, Officers clarified that:
- The proposed housing range was largely due to the uncertainty of one potential development site
  - Ranges of housing were included for eight settlements in the submitted Winchester Joint Core Strategy, with the inspector recommending the top of the range
  - The SDNPA were confident that there are sufficient development sites that have the potential to have a minimal impact on the National Park landscape that would meet the bottom of the range, although were not confident the Authority could meet the top range figure of 950
  - The 950 dwellings (representing the top of the range within the National Park) would not meet the objectively assessed need from a demographic requirement for the part of the National Park in East Hampshire district, and the shortfall may need to be met in the part of the district outside the National Park
  - The fear from EHDC is that, if housing figures cannot be accommodated within the SDNP then they would have to be met elsewhere within the district
  - The figures took into account brownfield sites, although they could be revisited and any not already identified could help to bridge the gap which would need to be checked by the Planning Inspector

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee  
Agenda Item 3**

- The modification in Policy CP8 was for the range 400 – 700 dwellings in Petersfield to be included
41. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation as detailed on the July update sheet. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
42. **RESOLVED:** To:
1. Recommend to the National Park Authority that the Proposed Modifications to the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy be agreed for submission to the Secretary of State subject to the change:
  2. In Policy CP8 for Petersfield the figure for new housing allocations should be in the range 400-700 new dwellings, and
- That any minor amendments are agreed by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair

**CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 2:05pm