

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 17 January 2013

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

Present:

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

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), David Cranmer (Development Management Officer), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Officer), Claire Potts (Minerals & Waste Lead), Tim Townsend (WSCC Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

APOLOGIES

411. Apologies for absence were received from Ken Bodfish & Charles Peck.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

412. There were none.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 December 2012

413. The minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2012 were agreed as a correct record.

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

414. There were none.

URGENT ITEMS

415. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/02347/FUL
Proposal: The permanent siting of static homes with occupancy between August and April (change of use)
Address: Hill Farm Orchards, Hill Farm, Droxford Road, Swanmore, Southampton, SO32 2PY

416. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 1/13)

417. The case officer referenced the items on the January 2013 update sheet, referring to the additional condition 13 and the revised conditions 6 & 10, which was available on the Authority Website. A verbal update was given to the Committee regarding paragraph 809 of report PC 1/13 that the 'no impact on setting' included the curtilage listed wall to Hill Place.

418. The Committee commented on:

- This use the seasonal workers supported was beneficial to the NP and should be supported
- The site did not further the SDNP 1st purpose and was aesthetically unpleasant but it was recognised that it as not visible from any Right of Way and the conditions attached provided control
- Whilst acknowledging not wanting to set a precedent for the siting of caravans on farm land in general, the specific circumstances of the application allowed greater control than those currently in place under the sites permitted development rights.

419. In response to Committee questions, the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;

- Works on treating & pruning vines and working the ground, would require a demand for workers outside of harvesting time
 - Under the existing arrangements the caravans would be delivered on a 'low loader' each year causing disruption on the surrounding roads
 - Under their current arrangements the applicant would not own the caravans, using a company to supply them
 - The colour of the caravans should not be intrusive on the environment and landscape character impact
 - A condition was included for production thresholds to be linked to the number of caravans on site to ensure the caravans would be removed if the need ceased
 - The adverse weather conditions were to blame for the lower production figures for 2012 and a 3 year rolling figure was included for this reason which would commence from the date permission was granted, if granted.
420. SDNP/12/02347/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the additional condition 13 and revised conditions 6 & 10. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
421. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reason and conditions, set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 1/13, including the additional condition 13 and revised conditions 6 & 10 as listed on the January 2013 update sheet.

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/00825/FULNP

Proposal: Retention and refurbishment of the showroom (sui generis). Demolition of existing petrol filling station and workshop. Erection of two buildings for flexible uses (B1/B8) and ancillary retail. Demolition and replacement of a single dwelling

Address: Former Garage Site, Bury Road, Bury, Pulborough, West Sussex, RH20 1NN

422. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC2/13)
423. The case officer referenced the updated reason for refusal as detailed on the January 2013 update sheet, which was available on the Authority website. The Committee was informed that the Highways Authority had withdrawn their objection regarding parking provision on site and suggested that HGV parking within the site could be conditioned.
424. Mr Philip Villars spoke in support of the application as the Applicant's Planning Consultant; he spoke about:-
- The discussions held with SDNPA officers regarding the application including the appearance and character of the site
 - The issues of the existing access
 - Finding an appropriate solution for landscaping, appearance and access arrangements
 - The recent proposals for safer access arrangements currently with the Highways Authority and his willingness to discuss any concerns with the Committee.
425. Mr Giles Jollands spoke in support of the application as the architect; he spoke about:-
- The design approach being contemporary rather than traditional, led from the retention of the main building that was a sustainable solution, which also took into account the landscape point of view and the ambition to develop a courtyard form, reducing the visual impact in terms of height
 - The parking arrangements
 - The vernacular approach taken to minimise the impact on the surrounding area.

426. Mr Paul Jackson-Cole spoke in support of the application as the Applicants Highways Engineer; he spoke about:-
- The access strategy and accident statistics
 - The wish to meet current design arrangements
 - The speed traffic and visibility surveys undertaken
 - The revised proposals currently with the Highways Authority for consideration to improve safety on access arrangements.
427. The Director of Planning clarified that the application to be determined was that set out in report PC 2/13. Whilst the Committee had heard from the public speakers of alternative proposals currently with the Highways Authority to mitigate the reasons for refusal this may also require a change in the red line area. The options available for the Committee would be to:
- Approve the application
 - Refuse the application
 - Defer the application pending negotiation on the amended plans although that may include a new application being submitted
428. The Committee commented:
- The design had support from the SDNPA Design Officer
 - It was positive that dialogue was continuing between the applicant and the Highways Authority regarding the safety of the access arrangements
 - It was positive that employment opportunities would be increased
 - If approved, safe traffic access arrangements should be in place before any development works were carried out
 - It would be inappropriate to defer the application because a proposal might come forward and may require a change to the area of the red line
 - The site was unattractive in its present condition and not suitable for an area within a National Park
 - The application included an increase in commercial floorspace
 - Their concerns regarding the relocation of the replacement dwelling
 - it would be relocated in an area away from the current site that was not currently residential and into an isolated position
 - The need to remove permitted development rights if permission was granted
 - Vernacular traditions within the landscape area of a National Park should be followed in the design and their concerns regarding the harsh angular design of the proposal
 - Their concerns regarding the safety of the access arrangements
 - The need to have regard for the National Park Purposes & Duty
 - The site was situated within a rural attractive location and tight conditions on landscaping and signage should be applied if permission was to be granted. Improvements would need to be made on landscaping and appearance
 - Sustainability proposals were commended but noted that it was aspiration and not guaranteed.
429. In response to Committee questions, the case officer and Director of Planning clarified that:
- The permission for showroom use could mean that uses other than for a Car Showroom could take place in the future
 - It would not be appropriate to open debate on the proposed new plans currently with the Highways Authority

- The Highways Authority were confident that parking provision for HGV's could be achieved by conditions, current proposals suggest that there would be a loss of 3 car parking spaces or some loss of landscaping
 - In regard to policy B5 and scale of the application, no detailed viability statement was provided by the applicant but SDNPA officers concluded that the application met with the policy
 - The design had support from the SDNPA design officer and it was more sustainable to use the existing building and dictate the design from that point rather than starting from scratch using a more traditional design
 - In regard to employment the NPPF and Defra circular state that the SDNPA need to have regard to employment opportunities.
430. The Senior Solicitor recommended to the Committee that as no revised plans had been submitted for HGV parking provision the 2nd reason for refusal, should they be minded to refuse the application, should remain.
431. SDNP/12/00825/FULNP It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation as set out in the update sheet with 2 additional reasons for refusal being (1), the design is and (2) there is excessive employment space which is contrary to policy B5 and as a result the siting of the replacement dwelling is in an inappropriate isolated position away from the current site and contrary to replacement dwelling policy. Following a vote the proposal fell.
432. SDNP/12/00825/FULNP It was proposed and seconded to vote to defer determination of the application to allow time for further discussions between the applicant and the Highways Authority following submission of a plan showing revised access arrangements. Following a vote the proposal fell.
433. SDNP/12/00825/FULNP It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation as set out in the update sheet and clarified by the Senior Solicitor. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
434. **RESOLVED:** That permission be refused for the following reasons:
1. The proposals do not include a satisfactory means of access which would be detrimental to the safety and free flow of traffic on the public highway. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policy TR6 of the Chichester District Local Plan (Review) 1999 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
 2. Insufficient parking provision has been provided on site for vehicles and heavy good vehicles which could result in vehicles parking on the public highway, which would be harmful to highway safety. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policy TR6 of the Chichester District Local Plan (Review) 1999 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
435. The Chair adjourned the meeting for comfort break at 11:55am
436. The meeting re convened at 12:05pm

SDNPA (Arun District)

Application No: SDNP/12/03020/HOUS
Proposal: First floor extension over existing garage
Address: Dormers, Steep Lane, Findon, West Sussex, BN14 0UE

437. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC3/13)
438. The case officer referenced the amended condition 2 from the January 2013 update sheet which was available on the Authority website.
439. Ms Jo Oliphant-Hope spoke in support of the application as the home owner; she explained-
- She was the current owner of the property

- She had lived in Findon for 7 years and enjoyed being part of the local community
 - The previous planning history and the work with SDNPA officers regarding the application
 - She intended on remaining in the property long term and was not extending the property for a re sale
 - The plans for the proposed extension and how neighbouring properties would experience greater privacy once the extension was completed.
440. The Committee commented on:
- The sensitive and sympathetic design approach
 - It was a good design and pleasing to see features in keeping with the rest of the property remain
 - The small impact on the neighbouring property and the improvement of their privacy.
441. SDNP/12/03020/HOUS It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the amended condition 2. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
442. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reason and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 3/13 including the revised condition 2 as listed on the January 2013 update sheet.

SDNPA (Arun District)

Application No: SDNP/12/02570/FUL
Proposal: Conversion of redundant building into holiday let
Address: Farm House, Gallops Farm, Stable Lane, Findon, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 0RP

443. The Committee considered the report by the director of Planning (Reports PC 4/13)
444. Mr David Tetley spoke in support of the application as the Agent; he spoke about:
- The Committee report
 - The NPPF in regard to supporting sustainable new development and rural economy in regard to conversions and diversification of agricultural building and the support of increased tourism.
445. The Committee commented on:
- Their support for farm diversification and a good use for the existing structure
 - The property was on a bridleway with good access to the wider bridleway network.
446. In response to Committee questions, the case officer & the Director of Planning clarified that:
- The application was for a holiday let and not for permanent residential use. The property could be in use all year round but not for use by one individual for more than 28 days in a 180 day period
 - There would be no requirement to tie the conversion to the farm house, through a legal agreement.
447. SDNP/12/02570/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
448. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reason and subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 10.1 of report PC 4/13

STRATEGY & POLICY

Adoption of the joint East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan

449. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 5/13).
450. The lead officer referenced items from the January 2013 update sheet which was available on the Authority website. and informed the Committee of the following comments from the Inspectors report:
- The authorities had demonstrated ‘ A co operative approach which goes beyond mere consultation to reach active engagement’
 - The report recognises that co-operation didn’t always result in agreement
 - The discussions the SDNPA were leading on, on soft sand provision with neighbouring counties was recognised as contributing to the duty to co-operate
 - Regarding landfill it was concluded that utilising existing permissions outside the plan area and not including sites for landfill was sound
 - Regarding soft sand, there was debate at the public examination on a separate apportionment for soft sand but the Inspector concluded that this would; ‘Apply weight in favour of soft sand extraction in the National Park’ and this would create internal tension between National Park policy and minerals supply policy. It was positive that local circumstances were taken in account and landbank was not split which was a good outcome for the National Park
 - Regarding built waste, the Inspector commented that the approach to the ‘Areas of focus’ and excluding the National Park from those areas was correct. This recognises that the National Park is not considered a suitable location for strategic waste sites.
451. The Committee commented on:
- The text in paragraph 3.35 was helpful as waste would be generated by large towns within the Park such as Lewes
 - The lead officer was commended for her work in this process, her partnership working resulting in the production of this well supported Plan.
452. In response to Committee questions, the Minerals & Waste Lead and Director of Planning clarified that:
- The statement in paragraph 3.35 of the document was a positive step to reduce and re use waste and not to develop waste sites. Lewes may be suitable for a small scale facility to meet local need, but not suitable for a large scale facility.
453. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried

RESOLVED: That the Committee makes a recommendation to the Authority to:

1. note the Main Modification to the Waste and Minerals Plan (WMP) and analysis of responses to the associated consultation;
2. note the contents of the Inspector’s Report and her conclusion that the WMP is legally compliant and ‘sound’;
3. note the minor non-material modifications made to the WMP;
4. adopt the WMP, incorporating the Main Modification and minor modifications, as waste and minerals planning policy subject to the Director of Planning (in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee) agreeing any further minor non-material changes to the text of the Waste and Minerals Plan with East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 12:47pm