

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 August 2013**

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

Present:

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

SDNPA Officers: Keith Reed (Deputy Director of Planning), Pat Aird (Development Management Lead), David Cranmer (Recovered Service Manager), Tim Bettany-Simmons (Development Management Officer), David Boyson (Historic Building Officer), Michael Scammell (Historic Building Officer), Andrew Triggs (Planning Policy Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

43. The Committee was informed that agenda item 9 SDNP/13/01526/FUL Uplands park Garrison Hill Droxford, Hampshire had been deferred.

### **APOLOGIES**

44. Apologies were received from Charles Peck & Ian Phillips.

### **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

45. Jennifer Gray declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 7 as a member of East Hampshire District Council.
46. At the start of Item 8 Tom Jones declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 8 as a member of Ditchling Parish Council and Lewes District Council. He would take part in the Committee debate but not the decision making process.

### **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 July 2013**

47. Subject to the following amendments:
- Minute 18; to add 'Following a vote the proposal was carried'
  - Minute 26; the last bullet point to read 'The application did not conserve or enhance the appearance of the conservation area by *reason of its scale and massing*'
- The Minutes of the meeting 11 July 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

### **UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

48. There were none.

### **URGENT ITEMS**

49. There were none.

### **Rampion Offshore Wind Farm Local Impact Report and Written Representation**

50. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 65/13 Page 8)
51. The lead officer highlighted the revised recommendation on the August 2013 update sheet.
52. The committee commented on:
- The comprehensive officers report that raises the concerns of the SDNPA
  - The lights on the turbines and the impact from these on the Heritage Coast and views from the coastline
  - The Authority should not be seen as resistant to underground cabling, as a preference to overground, although there are serious concerns regarding the ability to achieve this without significant damage to the landscape and sensitive chalk grasslands
  - Balancing the need for alternative energy and the impact on the SDNP

- The need to work with partner organisations and societies to strengthen issues and concerns raised by them and the SDNPA.
- The Committee concerns regarding:
  - The impact on the iconic heritage coast
  - The scale and density of the proposal
  - Migrating birds and shipping
  - The need to know more about the temporary PRow closures and diversions
  - Archaeology and how this would be monitored throughout the process
  - The removal and replacement of turf and possible re seeding on areas of sensitive chalk grassland
  - The monitoring of the discharge of conditions
  - The possibility of heat being generated from the cables and the impact on chalk grassland
  - The lack of meaningful testing by E.ON to test the likely impact upon chalk grassland
  - The lack of evidence provided by EON to support their claims that the development would not have a negative impact on the landscape of the SDNP; especially on sensitive areas of chalk grassland, such as Tottington Mount.

53. In response to questions officers clarified:

- The lighting on the turbines would be anti collision lighting. All tall structures including those on the mainland are required to have these. The Local Impact Report could reference this concern
- The turbines are proposed in a zone identified by The Crown Estate and E.ON must seek to develop within this zone
- EON would have the opportunity to respond to the Local Impact Report and offer further mitigation
- There was no evidence to suggest that the proposal was more dense than other wind farms
- EON were awarded 6 zones around the UK with an allotted power output for each of the zones. The larger the turbines the greater the power output they would produce. If the turbines were required to be smaller, there would need to be a greater number of them to produce the allotted power output
- Consent for the turbines would be for 25 years with the potential for a further 25 years
- Comments were included in the report regarding archaeology - concerns have been raised with EON regarding their methodology
- West Sussex County Council have sought control over the discharging the conditions. The SDNPA have already commented that this would not be acceptable
- EON are proposing 5 year monitoring period and the SDNPA have already commented that this time period was not acceptable. A legal obligation would be needed to extend this time period
- The SDNPA was already engaged in talks with partner organisation and societies, in particular the South Downs Society
- Officers would include comments raised by the Committee including lighting, the missed opportunity for trialling the proposed construction methodology on an area of less sensitive chalk grassland.

54. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation as detailed on the August update sheet. Following a vote the proposal was carried:

55. **RESOLVED:**

- I. That, subject to minor changes in accordance with the concerns raised (detailed wording of which be delegated to the Director of Planning), the SDNPA issues the

appended response to the Planning Inspectorate for consideration in the Public Examination

2. That the planning committee agree delegation to the Director of Planning to deal with any matter arising throughout the Examination process

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

### **EAST HANTS DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Application No: SDNP/13/02650/OUT**

**Proposal: Outline Application - Residential development comprising 30 two storey dwellings with new access to Selborne Road, garages, parking, landscaping and re-routing of public footpath (Appearance to be reserved)**

**Address: Burlands Field, Selborne Road Selborne GU34 3JA**

56. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 66/13).
57. The case officer referenced items on the August 2013 update sheet including
  - Additional Comments received from:
    - EHDC Contract Monitoring Officer
    - Natural England
    - County Councillor Adam Carew
    - 9 additional third-party representations received objecting to the application
    - 26 additional third-party representations received in support of the application
  - There were 6 additional third-party representations received in support of the application and the Highways Authority reconfirming their objection which were not referenced on the Update sheet.
58. Cllr Minette Palmer spoke against the application on behalf of Selborne Parish Council; she spoke about:
  - The officer recommendation was welcomed
  - The Inspectors report in 2006 in relation to the application site.
  - The development would cause harm to the landscape, the setting of the village and wildlife in the area
  - The development conflicted with the SDNPA Purposes and Duty
  - There were no exceptional circumstances to justify the development
  - The village was dependent on the attraction of visitors to the area particularly in terms of the cultural heritage and landscape setting of the village, trading on the legacy of Gilbert White.
  - Their concerns regarding the diversion of the footpath through what would be a housing estate.
59. Mr Ronald Davidson-Houston spoke against the application on behalf of himself; he spoke about:
  - The application was against the wishes of the local community
  - The exceptional heritage of Selborne in terms of landscape, literacy, education and culture. A place of pilgrimages for thousands of visitors from across the world to witness Gilbert White's village; all of which enriched the local economy
  - How visitors are delighted to be able to walk the same footpaths used by Gilbert White and his concerns towards the re routed footpath which would be through a housing estate
  - How the application site, Culverscroft, referenced in the writings of Gilbert White
  - The tranquillity of the village would be imposed upon

- The development would be a man made intrusion compared to nature's true magnificence
  - The amount of TV programmes that had been made in the area regarding the cultural heritage and landscape
60. Mr Peter Lewis-Jones spoke against the application on behalf of himself and a sizable group of local residents; he spoke about:
- The comprehensive officer's report
  - Protected dormice and their habitat would be destroyed and need for a phase 2 survey
  - The letters sent by the agent to local residents in response to their representations – how this demeans local residents.
  - Referenced the Bell Cornwall report and independent ecology and landscape report commissioned by residents
  - Paragraphs 115-116 of the NPPF, the twin Purposes of the National Park and how the Duty was secondary
  - It was pleasing that the Selborne Village Community Plan and Local Landscape Character Assessment had been referred to in the officer's report
  - Acknowledged need for affordable housing, but for the Parish to identify suitable sites in accordance with the emerging Joint Core Strategy
  - The development would cause lasting damage to the cultural heritage and impact on natural habitats and wildlife of the National Park.
61. Mr Fergus Slinger spoke in support of the application as the applicant's son in law; he spoke about:
- He cared about the village of Selborne and they were not a faceless large developer, but had a proven track record – how 30 years ago converted farm buildings to residential – would develop the application site to the same exceptional quality
  - 40% of the development would be for affordable housing with priority given to those with local connections
  - East Hampshire District Council had identified the need for 26 affordable dwellings within the Parish – 12 of these would be provided at Burlands
  - Burlands was a SHLAA site and was suitable, available and deliverable.
  - The comments from the SDNPA Design Review Panel were frustrating. Selborne not entirely linear.
  - Historic photos of Selborne, has shown that the village had already changed over the years
  - The Gilbert White legacy was crucial to the village of Selborne although it should not be used as an excuse to freeze the village in time
  - Burlands development would not detract from the landscape.
62. Vicky Jarman spoke in support of the application as a local resident; she spoke about:
- She had grown up and worked in the area with family close by; she still lived at home as there was no affordable housing in the area
  - Questioned where people, especially young people are to live. Explained that 24/25 year old young people had no option but to move out of the area and away from their extended family support to find affordable housing and how this has a detrimental impact on the community
  - The application provided affordable housing opportunities for local young people to continue to live and enjoy the area
  - The severe lack of rural housing and the waiting lists for affordable housing

- Many local people that had to move away, would welcome the opportunity to move back and stay in the community
  - The growing frustration as the cost of rural living
  - The young people of today would be the future community of Selborne.
63. Ian Ellis spoke in support of the application as the agent; he spoke about:
- The application ensures the future prosperity of the local community
  - The officer's report was unbalanced
  - Report contains selective reference to the NPPF and Defra circular these should be taken as a whole
  - The report did not deal with the Duty and misquotes the Sandford principle
  - Made reference to the Taylor Report
  - The out of date local plan
  - The landscape impact was not a great weight against the SDNPA Purposes and Duty and exceptional circumstance provided
  - The lack of a 5 year land supply
  - Harking back to the 2006 Inspector report was pointless and how the planning system had moved on since this report
  - No evidence of landscape harm
  - The Natural England and Ecologist objection on the basis of one nut which contained teeth marks. There was a dormouse survey which had been underway for the last 3 weeks and found no evidence of them
  - The development was beneficial for the community and offers continued prosperity for future generations and would add to the vitality of the village
  - No one doing anything for the local community and how the decision effect the future of Selborne.
64. The Committee commented on:
- The development was inappropriate, not suitable for the village and not a suitable site
  - It was a very sensitive site
  - The site was not an appropriate location for a large new development
  - The footpath would be diverted through the properties. The existing RoW would be a significant loss
  - There were highways safety issues
  - The affordable housing element was an excuse for market housing
  - The Inspector Report in 2006 discounted this site – nothing had changed to alter this view
  - How the local community cared about the special qualities of the village and had produced the Community Plan and Landscape Character Assessment endorsed by EHDC
  - The Joint Core Strategy & Parish Plan should identify suitable sites for development and alleviate local concerns regarding housing provision
  - The Parish Council should be supported in identifying suitable sites
  - The development would not enhance and would have a negative impact on the area and landscape
  - This was an example of a community that cared about its cultural heritage and local distinctiveness
  - The 5 year land supply did not outweigh the landscape impact

- Their sympathies and appreciation of local residents and families needs regarding housing provision
  - The need for affordable housing in the area & provision of affordable housing was the biggest challenge in rural areas
  - After visiting the site and seen the surroundings even 100% affordable housing on the site would be unacceptable.
  - The SDNPA Purposes and Duty was to protect & conserve from harm but not change
  - The design of the development
  - The application was contrary to the SDNPA Purposes and Duty
  - The public speakers all spoke well with convincing arguments and the application raised difficult balancing issues
  - The officer's report listed 8 reasons for refusal
  - There was concern regarding the lack of legal agreements or mitigation.
65. SDNP/13/02650/OUT: It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
66. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC66/13.
67. Tom Jones declared an interest as detailed in minute 46.

#### **LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Application No:** SDNP/13/00692/FUL  
**Proposal:** Creation of a seasonal campsite for up to 30 pitches and erection of facilities building  
**Address:** Land On The West Side Of Lodge Lane Ditchling East Sussex

68. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC67/13).
69. The case officer referenced items on the August 2013 update sheet including the amended reason for refusal.
70. Mr FG Wright spoke against the application on behalf of the Charity Sussex Lantern who own QE11 Dedicated Park, Southdowns Way, Caravan camping Park, Lodge Lane Keymer Hassock; he spoke about:
- The existing campsite with capacity to cope with all campers and visitors and how all profits from that site were allocated to charitable funds
  - The effect of competition on the charity's income
  - Volunteers on the existing campsite did not receive payment for their time
  - The new proposal would have a detrimental impact on the charity and local facilities provided by it
  - Their concern that the proposed campsite would not be managed
  - Any Bell Tent left in situ for 6 months would damage the ground
  - No provision had been made for the removal of waste and campers would not take their waste with them, food waste would increase vermin
  - The development was unnecessary, undesirable and would be detrimental to the area.
71. Robert Kemp spoke against the application on behalf of himself; he spoke about:
- The site was in an area of natural beauty and the development would be detrimental to the landscape
  - The site would be seen from the surrounding road network and the South Downs
  - The impact of paraphernalia and rubbish
  - There would be no enforcement from noise pollution

- There was potential for Travellers entering the site
  - Access issues on the single lane track and the additional vehicle movements including lorries to empty sewage tanks which would have a detrimental impact on walkers and horse riders
  - There was an alternative and established campsite in the area.
72. Dr Paul Shepherd spoke against the application on behalf of himself; he spoke about:
- He lived on Underhill Lane
  - He enjoyed the South Downs and supported improvements to walkers and cyclists
  - The proposal would require more development than shown
  - The area was not suitable for a campsite and additional associated vehicles
  - There had been no provision made for the removal of waste
  - The site would be visible from Ditchling Beacon and across the South Downs
  - The proposal was an inappropriate development for the area
  - The site would be a magnet for Travellers if the site was not managed and manned
  - There was no need for an additional campsite as there was a local facility nearby.
73. The Committee commented on:
- There was a general lack of campsites near public footpaths
  - Rural sites were often cluttered with agricultural associated building and developments
  - There were a great deal of single access lanes within national parks
  - There were alternative campsites in the local area which were well maintained and managed
  - The visual impact of campsites were expected within a National Park
  - The possibility of Travellers using the site was not a consideration
  - The views of the Highway Authority.
74. The Committee debated their concern regarding:
- The lack of on site management and managing noise pollution
  - The lack of provision for the removal of waste
  - The SDNPA Landscape Officer's objections.
75. In response to questions officers clarified that:
- 'Need' would not normally be a planning consideration unless as a justification on exception grounds
  - Taking income from a competitors business was not a planning consideration
  - SDNPA officers have asked for the submission of a management plan but the applicant had not submitted one.
76. SDNP/13/00692/FUL: It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
77. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for reason 2 as set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC67/13 and the amended reason 1 as detailed on the August update sheet.
78. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:50pm for lunch
79. The meeting re convened at 1:20pm

## **SDNPA (Arun)**

**Application No:** SDNP/13/01654/FUL  
**Proposal:** Retrospective application for change of use from A1 retail (shop/post office) to A3 cafe with A1 retail

**Address: Clapham Post Office The Street Clapham Worthing West Sussex  
BN13 3UU**

80. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC69/13).
81. The case officer referenced items on the August 2013 update sheet including the clarified information from the applicant in relation to how the premises is operated and comments received from the County Highway Authority
82. Mr Will Picton spoke against the application on behalf himself; he spoke about:
- The café had been built up and the shop run down – general support for the shop but not the A3 use
  - The shop was not viable in the current location
  - The hours of opening- should close at 6pm and not open on Sunday
  - His concerns regarding the café turning into a bar
  - There was no security that the shop would continue and be maintained
  - The application would de value his property
  - The village store was needed
  - The views of affected neighbours not given weight
83. Mrs Lyn Picton spoke against the application as Chairman of the Parish Council and an immediate neighbour of the planning site and representing those immediate neighbours and others opposed to the application; she spoke about:
- The recommendations of the planning officer did not recognise, acknowledge or address their objections to the application
  - Disturbance and parking issues
  - The National Park should provide protection to residents from this type of application
  - The land is the subject to a Trust for the benefit of the parishioners of Clapham and on that basis the opinions of others were not relevant
  - There would not be support if it was not for the personalities of the applicants.
  - The social welfare aspects of the village store would be safeguarded if the application was refused
  - Should permission be granted there would be no requirement for the village shop to remain open and the premises could be run as a restaurant
  - The proposed opening hours would not preserve the residential amenity of the neighbours and should be limited with no opening hours on Sundays or Bank Holidays
  - The Environmental Health objections had not been addressed – already had 18 months to comply
  - Using the premises for meetings instead of using the Village Hall and the disturbance they caused to the amenity of the neighbours
  - The seating on the raised garden area was not part of the lease or planning application and its use should not form part of the permission.
84. Kerry Allen spoke in support of the application on behalf of Giles Allen; she spoke about:
- They lived in the village and were pleased to have the use of a village store
  - The Village Hall was not easy to access and was not in the centre of the village
  - ‘The Junction’ was at the heart of the village and a place to meet to ‘get to know’ others within the village. It was a place to meet and socialise
  - Her family often spent time there and on the recreation ground
85. It was noted that the planning application boundary was confined to the building itself and excluded the veranda, garden and WC. In view of the proposed condition relating to the use of the veranda and garden area, and the assessment of the application overall, the Deputy



Director of Planning advised that the application be withdrawn from the agenda to enable the application to be revised to include the wider area.

### **SDNPA (Wealden)**

**Application No:** SDNP/13/02235/HOUS  
**Proposal:** Proposed alterations to replace existing dormer with enlarged flat roofed dormer at side  
**Address:** 2 Peakdean Close, East Dean, BN20 0HZ

86. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC70/13).
87. The case officer referenced items on the August 2013 update sheet including, there had been one additional third party representation received objecting to the application raising an additional point of distance between the properties
88. The Committee commented:
- The proposal was acceptable within the context of the street view
  - There were other flat roof dormers in the area
  - The existing window was clear glass, the proposed window would be obscured and would therefore give the neighbours better privacy
89. In response to Committee questions, Officers clarified that:
- The larger dormer was proposed to increase head room in the bathroom
  - The application was from an area within the recovered service and had been reported to the Planning Committee following the 'call in' procedure from an SDNPA Member.
90. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
91. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for the reason and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 report PC70/13

### **APPEALS**

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

**Application No:** SDNP/12/00085/FUL  
**Proposal:** Residential Development comprising 32 dwellings with new access, cycle path, footpath, landscaping and additional parking  
**Address:** Land To The South Of, 63 - 65 Inwood Road, Liss, Hampshire

92. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC71/13).
93. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the contents of report PC71/13.

### **STRATEGY & POLICY**

#### **Alfriston Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP)**

94. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC72/13).
95. The Committee referenced The following typos to be amended and commenting including:
- Paragraph 4.2 the western boundary should be the eastern boundary
  - Paragraph 6.21 the local list needs an explanation
  - Page 62 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph should replace the 3<sup>rd</sup> line 'red brick' with 'red quoins'
96. The Committee commented;
- It was disappointing not to have the traffic issues referred to
  - References to signage and road lines should be included in all CAAMPs.
97. In response to Committee questions, Officers clarified that:
- There were no extensions

- Traffic was an issue within Alfriston. SDNPA officers comments were general within the report as two groups within Alfriston were liaising to tackle the issue. It would be advisable to wait for the results of the consultation before considering our response.
98. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
99. **RESOLVED:** To approve the consultation draft of the Alfriston Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan attached at Appendix I of report PC72/13.

### **Lewes Conservation Area Management Plan**

100. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC73/13).
101. The Committee commented;
- Traffic management solutions should be included within the document
    - The SDNPA should be more pro active on this subject and encourage highways authorities to look at alternatives to tarmac and yellow lines and to de-clutter signage. A bigger impact could be made with the SDNPA influence
  - It was concerning that Article 4 directions were put into place after changes had already been made.
102. In response to Committee questions, Officers clarified that:
- There was a conservation area advisory committee involving the conservation officer from Lewes District Council. The SDNPA Historic Building Officer would also be involved in this to accelerate further movement on traffic solutions
  - There had been little contact between the highways authorities and the SDNPA on this issue. The SDNPA were in the process of gaining greater involvement
  - The document had a short life and would be reviewed in 2017
  - The reference to Highways and traffic management solutions in the document could be strengthened to be more positive
103. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to amendments regarding traffic management solutions and that the final wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
104. **RESOLVED:** To adopt the Final Draft of the Lewes Conservation Area Management Plan, first proposed in the Lewes Conservation Area Character Appraisal, 2007, subject to amendments regarding traffic management solutions for which the final form of wording is to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee

### **Fernhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan – Draft for informal consultation**

105. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC74/13).
106. The Committee commented;
- The relevance of the emerging South Downs Local Plan
  - The production of a Neighbourhood Plan was a complicated task involving SDNPA officer time and resources with the finalised document subjected to professional scrutiny
  - Local residents should have a say on the Syngenta site as part of their Neighbourhood Plan
  - The Syngenta site was a strategic site within the SDNP
  - The document was not robust enough for professional scrutiny
  - In principle the SDNPA and the Parish Council should endeavour to engage in dialogue with each other regarding the Syngenta site and all policy concerns.

107. The Committee debated their concern regarding:
- The failure of the document to meet the basic conditions for a Neighbourhood Plan
  - The comments made in the Brian Dodd report in appendix 3
  - Gaps in the evidence base and supporting information and the need for a housing needs survey and a landscape assessment
  - The need to strengthen the robustness of all policies
  - The need for the Parish Council to engage in dialogue with the Local Authority and the SDNPA regarding policy and the Syngenta site
  - Failure of the Syngenta site proposals to reflect the potential strategic role this key site should could play within the SDNP.
108. In response to Committee questions, Officers clarified that:
- Fernhurst Parish Council were fully aware of the comments addressed within the report and appendix 3 and had been aware of the SDNPA concerns following the review of the pre draft plan
  - Chichester District Council had advised Fernhurst Parish Council to undertake a housing needs survey many months ago
  - Fernhurst Parish Council had been encouraged to produce a strategic plan for the site that the SDNPA could sign up to and use in its local Plan
  - Fernhurst Parish Council had completed their Neighborhood Plan prematurely in advance of the SDNPA Local Plan.
109. It was proposed and seconded to delegate to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to formulate the recommendations taking into account the Committees' comments and concerns as detailed in minutes 106 & 107. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
110. **RESOLVED:** To delegate to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee the formulation of the recommendations to be submitted to Fernhurst Parish Council taking into account the Committees' comments and concerns regarding:
- Failure to meet the basic conditions for a Neighbourhood Plan (as listed in paragraph 4.1 of report PC74/13)
  - The comments made in the Brian Dodd report (appendix 3 of report PC74/13)
  - The need for a housing needs survey
  - The need for a landscape assessment
  - The need to strengthen the robustness of all policies
  - The need for the Parish Council to engage in dialogue with the Local Authority and the SDNPA regarding policy and the Syngenta site
  - Failure of the Syngenta site proposals to reflect the potential strategic role this key site should could play within the SDNP
  - Other gaps in the evidence base and technical supporting information which need to be addressed
  - The relevance of the emerging South Downs Local Plan

## CHAIR

The meeting closed at 3:07pm