

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 February 2013

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

Present:

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

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

454. Apologies for absence were received from Diana Kershaw.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

455. Jennifer Gray declared a personal non prejudicial interest in item 7 as a member of East Hampshire District Council and item 6 as she used to live in the area and Ian Ellis (public speaker) had previously acted on her behalf on a personal matter.
456. Charles Peck declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 9 & 10 as a member of Wealden District Council and as the Ward Member.
457. Additional declarations are noted in minutes 499 & 500.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17 January 2013

458. With the amendment of minute 418; for clarity, to remove the word 'supported' from the 1st bullet point, the minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

459. There were none.

URGENT ITEMS

460. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/03018/FUL
Proposal: Eight affordable dwellings
Address: Land East Of The Priors Way Hill Farm Road Monkwood Alresford Hampshire

461. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 06/13)
462. The case officer referenced the items on the February 2013 update sheet, referring to the additional conditions 18 & 19 which was available on the Authority Website. A verbal update was given to the Committee that the Highways Authority had no further objections and all objections had been noted by SDNPA officers.
463. Mrs Judith Medley spoke against the application representing the Monkwood Residents Group; she spoke about:-
- She lives in Monkwood and her personal objection
 - Her support for affordable housing in suitable locations
 - The inappropriate and isolated position of the application site for affordable housing;

- the challenges of living in a rural hamlet
 - limited access for the most vulnerable
 - the distance between neighbouring villages for amenities
 - the lack of school places locally
 - lack of activities and amenities
 - The amount of objections
 - There were affordable housing within Monkwood
464. Mr Ian Ellis spoke against the application on behalf of the objectors to the application; he referenced:-
- The letter of objection that had been emailed to all members of the Planning Committee
 - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and that the development was contrary to this and planning policies
 - It was not a sustainable development
 - The location was unsuitable for affordable housing
 - no public transport
 - too dangerous to walk or cycle in the lane
465. Councillor mark Kemp-Gee spoke against the application as the Divisional Councillor for Hampshire; he spoke about:-
- The need for affordable housing in adjacent parishes
 - There were more sustainable areas for affordable housing which had been refused planning permission by East Hampshire District Council
 - The hedge should be protected and referenced the request from the Highways Authority for it to be removed
 - The s106 transport contribution was not acceptable
 - The development was contrary to planning policy
 - The inappropriate location of the proposed development which was not sustainable
 - The proposal was for significant development
466. Mr Anthony Crawford spoke in support of the application as the Chairman of the West Tisted Parish Meeting; he spoke about:-
- The high cost of houses in the area
 - The application site was within the parish of West Tisted
 - There were 144 people on the electoral role for the area
 - The use of a car in rural areas was high
 - The need for affordable housing for those who had lived and worked in the area, especially for those needing to retire from tied housing
 - The lack of available land within the parish of West Tisted
 - Screening had been sympathetically proposed to retain the character
467. Ms Helen Cann spoke in support of the application representing the Housing Service at East Hampshire District Council: she spoke about:-
- The need for affordable housing for local people
 - this was a priority for the Council
 - the reason for bringing forward a rural exception site
 - the work with partner organisations
 - the council had been involved in talks regarding affordable housing in West Tisted before the launch of the SDNPA
 - the housing need in West Tisted

- Market housing was beyond the reach of most people on modest incomes
 - Local residents would register to identify their local need/connection
 - The unmet housing need in the area
 - The number of people requiring affordable housing
 - A s106 agreement would have a local connection need
468. Mr Chris Buchan-Hepburn spoke in support of the application as the applicant; he spoke about:-
- The housing would provide for people that were already part of the community and sustain family networks
 - The housing need in the area
 - The local community had been consulted with public meetings and exhibitions with a mixed reaction to the proposal
 - The support for the proposal including the Parish and District Councils
 - The local connection would cascade to neighbouring parishes
 - Hedges would be preserved
 - The car sharing scheme operating in West Tisted
 - There was good access to neighbouring parishes
469. The Committee commented on:
- The National Park (NP) Purposes & Duty
 - The importance of the NP boundary, which must not be eroded
 - The importance and need for affordable housing
 - The difficulty in finding affordable housing sites in rural areas
 - The challenges of living in rural areas
 - The use of exception sites
 - The large amount of tied accommodation in the community and the need for retired people to be able to re locate locally
 - The visual impact of the proposal
 - The proposed site was not close to the settlement boundary and therefore amenities
 - Affordable housing should be close to amenities
 - The isolated and inappropriate location of the site which was not sustainable
 - The proposal encouraging the use of private cars within the NP and lack of sustainability regarding transport
 - The lack of creativity on the sustainability of the houses, disappointing to only achieve code level 3
 - Whether the proposal was contrary to policy
 - The support from the Parish Council
 - The demand for the type of accommodation proposed
 - The balance of the proposal needing careful consideration
470. In response to Committee questions, the case officer and the Director of Planning clarified that;
- The community orchard would be accessible to all
 - Whilst housing provision was not a primary responsibility of the SDNPA the Authority has the Purposes and Duty to consider and the provision of affordable homes is also a component of the planning role
 - The SDNPA were satisfied there was a local housing need. The need had been verified with telephone interviews

- The village of Ropley would be included in the cascade system
471. SDNP/12/03018/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the additional conditions 18 & 19 as detailed on the update sheet. Following a vote the proposal fell.
472. SDNP/12/03018/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote to refuse the application for reasons of Landscape impact, lack of sustainability, distance from the settlement boundary, peace & tranquillity and contrary to policy H12. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
473. **RESOLVED:** That permission be refused for the following reason:
The proposal constitutes, by virtue of its scale and location within the South Downs National Park and in close proximity to its boundary, an unsustainable form of development in an isolated location away from West Tisted and other settlements. The development would therefore be harmful to the principles of sustainable development, and the landscape character and tranquillity of this part of the South Downs National Park. The proposal is therefore in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, policies CCI and C2 of the South East Plan, and policy H12 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan 2006.
474. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:40am for a comfort break
475. The meeting re convened at 11:50am

EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/01868/FUL
Proposal: The change of use of land within the Queen Elizabeth Country Park from scrub land to use as a compound, with provision of container storage and hardstanding
Address: Queen Elizabeth Country Park, Gravel Hill, Waterlooville, Hampshire PO8 0QE

476. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC7/13)
477. The case officer reminded the Committee that the application had been brought for a Committee decision as the SDNPA was the applicant.
478. The Committee commented:
- The limited period of permission was welcomed
479. In response to Committee questions, the case officer and Director of Planning clarified that:
- To return to previous condition, the additional hard standing would be removed and site would be returned to the pre application state
 - Once the containers had been taken away, the bulk of the impact would be removed
480. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
481. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted, for the reason and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC7/13

SDNPA (Arun District)

Application No: SDNP/12/02013/FUL
Proposal: Erection of secure entrance gate to commercial woodland
Address: Fox Rough, Selden Lane, Angmering

482. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 08/13)
483. The case officer referenced items from the February 2013 update sheet which was available on the Authority website.
484. Councillor Mariner spoke against the application on behalf of Angmering Parish Council; he spoke about:

- The previous application enabled vehicles to pull clear from the road. Approving this application would prevent vehicles from doing this
 - Large vehicles would need to wait, blocking the road until the gate was opened preventing access to the remainder of the lane by emergency vehicles
 - The impact and issues for other road users
 - Localised flooding in the area
 - The proposal was visually intrusive although commended the use of locally sourced materials
 - No other commercial property nearby has the same level of secure access
485. The Committee commented on:
- It was disappointing to have an application that would remove the local woodland view by encouraging the hedge to grow
 - The design and size of the gate was inappropriate for a rural location
 - The photo montage supplied by the applicant did not correspond with the submitted drawings
 - There was a 3 metre secure compound further inside the site
 - The additional security gate would be better positioned further in the application site closer to the sawmill
486. In response to Committee questions, the case officer and Director of Planning clarified that:
- Vehicle movements could not be considered as previous permissions for the sawmill had already been granted through agricultural prior notifications which do not include conditions
 - The Highways Authority would not usually be consulted on this type of application although they had offered advice after an SDNPA request due to the Parish Councils objection
 - There was already an existing gate in place and the application was for a replacement
 - The impact of the proposal upon the Landscape character of the SDNP could be considered for the replacement gate
 - The applicant had concerns regarding 'fly tipping' and wished to deter people from entering the site
487. SDNP/12/02013/FUL It was proposed and seconded to refuse permission due to the harmful impact upon landscape character within the National Park. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
488. **RESOLVED:** That permission be refused for the reason, the proposed gate, by reason of its size and appearance, would have a harmful impact upon the landscape character of the South Downs National Park in conflict with Saved Policy GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003.

SDNPA (Wealden District)

Application No: SDNP/12/03386/FUL
Proposal: Proposed Horticultural Workers Dwelling
Address: Litlington Nursery, The Street Litlington Nr. Polegate East Sussex BN26 5RB

489. The Committee considered the report by the director of Planning (Reports PC09/13)
490. The case officer referenced items from the February 2013 update sheet, including the additional condition 9 in relation to site levels which was available on the Authority website
491. Mr Chris Wojtulewski spoke in support of the application as the agent; he spoke about:

- Apologised that the applicant, Mr Barratt, could not come and speak himself but he was attending the needs of the Nursery
 - The previous planning applications and change in circumstances since 2007 with the requirement to sell Holly Tree House to honour the applicants late Mother's and Sister's Will
 - The viability of the Nursery and its importance as a valuable contributor to local economy
 - The functional need for a dwelling on site
 - How the application proposes a smaller dwelling than the previous application more in keeping with the Conservation Area in terms of design and materials
 - How the siting of the dwelling has changed and that it would allow for surveillance of the Nursery
 - The support from the Parish Council and local community for this long established business
 - No objections had been raised
492. The Committee commented on:
- The nursery was an attractive facility in a rural location
 - They were not opposed to an increase in density within the community
 - How one-third of the villages enterprises had already been lost
 - The design was 'in keeping' with the conservation area
 - The applicant had articulated the proposal well
 - There was strong local support for the proposal
 - The personal and exceptional circumstance of the applicant
 - The case officer was commended for his report
 - It was pleasing to know a sample panel would be available for quality assurance
 - Disappointment that the property would only be a sustainability code level 3
493. In response to Committee questions, the case officer & the Director of Planning clarified that:
- That it would be unreasonable to impose a condition requiring evidence of Holly Tree House having been sold to be submitted prior to the construction of the dwelling
 - Access to the property would be through the existing car park. A formalised access track would detract from the appearance of the site.
494. SDNP/12/03386/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with additional condition 9. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
495. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reason set out under 10.1 of the report and subject to the conditions in section 10.1 of the report and condition 9 on the update sheet and subject to a s106 with clauses:
- to ensure the dwelling is tied to Litlington Nursery and not sold separately, and
 - that the dwelling is only occupied by someone working in agriculture, horticulture or forestry

SDNPA (Wealden District)

Application No: SDNP/12/02947/FUL

Proposal: Change of use of the (former) **Birling Gap Hotel** to visitor facilities to include an enlarged cafe, retail facility and education and interpretation facilities, together with the erection of a garage for storage of essential countryside management equipment and minor works to external appearance of the building.

Address: **Birling Gap Hotel Birling Gap East Dean Eastbourne BN20 0AB**

496. The Committee considered the report by the director of Planning (Reports PC 10/13)
497. The case officer referenced items from the February 2013 update sheet, including the amended condition 5, which was available on the Authority website
498. Ms Jane Arnott spoke in support of the application as the planning advisor on behalf of the applicant; she spoke about:
- The aims of the project
 - to enhance and improve the visitor experience
 - to provide all year round use
 - to increase the use by schools and colleges out of season
 - would support the SDNP Purposes and Duty
 - The co operation from the local community
 - The local community would be supported by the sale of local produce and an increase in employment
 - The partnership working with the SDNPA and applications for funding
 - A car parking manager would be employed during peak seasons. Monitoring would be carried out and reviewed seasonally as impacts of parking was a priority for the National trust
 - Walking and cycling would be actively promoted by creating walks linked to bus timetables
499. Declarations of Interest, personal & non prejudicial were registered by the following Committee members as members of the National Trust
- Alun Alesbury
 - Neville Harrison
 - Doug Jones
 - Ken Bodfish
 - Tom Jones
 - Andrew Shaxson
500. Declarations of Interest, personal & non prejudicial were registered by the following Committee members as members of the SDNPA Major Partnership Panel
- Ken Bodfish
 - Andrew Shaxson
 - Charles Peck
501. The Committee commented on:
- Birling Gap was a popular visitor attraction and interpretation activities would be welcomed
 - It was a good proposal
 - It was disappointing not to have a strategic management plan for Birling Gap and a pro-active and co-ordinated approach to the overall management of visitors. Acknowledged that a transport plan for these proposals was a step forward.
 - There were no local objections
 - The wish for the car park marking to be completed with sensitively to the area and not using white lines
502. SDNP/12/03386/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation including the amended condition 5 as detailed in the update sheet. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
503. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reason and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC 10/13 including the amended condition 5.

STRATEGY & POLICY

Review of Validation Requirements for planning applications and related consents

504. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 11/13).
505. The lead officer referenced items from the February 2013 update sheet which was available on the Authority website.
506. The Committee commented on:
- The language used within the document could be clearer so the public would not be confused thinking that certain documentation would not be required
 - Light pollution and night skies were important to the SDNP
 - Community involvement was important to the SDNPA
 - The need for a simple efficient planning process
507. In response to Committee questions, the Lead Officer and Director of Planning clarified that:
- Removing the need for certain documentation at validation would not exclude requesting it at a later stage
 - Current Government consultations suggested the direction of travel is that the process should be streamlined to ensure it is efficient; the proposal reflects this
 - Some items of documentation were covered under separate sections such as travel/transport and it was important to avoid duplication
 - The wording could be changed to remove the word deleted and replace with wording such as 'not necessary at validation' or 'covered elsewhere'
 - For major applications the pre application service would, on most occasions, make the developer aware of what was required
 - The revised document had been prepared after discussions with Heads of Development Management across the National Park; all were keen to streamline the planning process to provide a shorter more efficient process
 - The validation lists would be reviewed every 2 years
508. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer recommendation, with amendments to the documents regarding the language used. Following a vote the proposal was carried
509. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee approve the revised requirements, with amendments to the documents regarding the language used, for validating planning applications and related consents for consultation purposes

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 1:47pm