

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 March 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: Pat Aird (Development Management Lead), Peter Earl (Minerals & Waste Support Officer), Tim Richings (Planning Policy Manager), Michael Scammell (Historic Building Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) & Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer).

APOLOGIES

510. Apologies for absence were received from Diana Kershaw.
511. The Chair informed the Committee that; applications SDNP/12/02704/FUL & SDNP/13/00423/FUL (agenda items 6 and 7) have been deferred from the agenda to allow officers and third parties time to absorb further additional information that has been submitted, in view of concerns expressed by third parties relating to the publicity period. Application SDNP/12/01557/FUL (agenda item 8) had also been deferred from the agenda to allow Lewes Town Council additional time to consider the proposals.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

512. Charles Peck declared a personal non prejudicial interest in items 9 & 10 as a member of Wealden District Council.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17 January 2013

513. The Minutes of the meeting 17 January 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

514. The Committee was informed:
- In regard to the Inwood Road appeal and as a result of the inspectors report on the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy, the first bullet point on the reasons for refusal (no need for development to meet the housing need) would not be defended. The appeal date was set for 29 May 2013
 - The Rampion off shore Windfarm application had been re submitted to PINs. The adequacy of consultation response deadline was 14 March 2013 and the SDNPA would submit the consultation response that was prepared for the previous application.
 - Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/A/12/2178169 Westland Field, Crossbush Lane, Crossbush, BN18 9PQ decision had been received and the appeal was dismissed.

URGENT ITEMS

515. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

SDNPA (WEALDEN DISTRICT)

Application No: SDNP/13/00522/HOUS
Proposal: Erection of 2m high close-boarded wooden fence 2m from public footpath
Address: Wistons, 6 Deans Road, Alfriston, Polegate, East Sussex, BN26 5XR

516. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 15/13)
517. The case officer referenced the items on the March 2013 update sheet, referring to the amended conditions, which was available on the Authority Website.

518. The Committee commented on:
- The recovered planning service areas and the circumstances under which applications were brought to committee
 - The hedgerow planting details within the conditions was welcomed
 - It was correct to set the standards in villages with urban settlements
519. SDNP/13/00522/HOUS It was proposed and seconded to vote on the amended officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
520. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted for the reason as set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC15/13 and subject to the amended conditions as set out in the March Update sheet.

SDNPA (WEALDEN DISTRICT)

Application No: SDNP/12/01580/LIS
Proposal: Remove existing door on front of cottage and replacing with flint mortar to match existing wall
Address: Milton Cottage Back Lane Milton Street Wilmington Polegate East Sussex BN26 5RN

521. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC16/13)
522. The case officer reference the items on the March 2013 update sheet which was available on the Authority Website.
523. Mrs Gillian Wills spoke against the application on behalf of herself; she spoke about:
- The cottages were a unique, delightful cluster of buildings which were admired by many. They dated back to 1650, were of historical importance and any alterations would damage their charm
 - Milton Street was in a Hamlet and not the village of Alfriston
 - Her ownership of no's 10 & 11 of the original row of cottages
 - It would be impossible to match flint and mortar to the existing
 - The false door was repairable and should be preserved
 - The heritage of the building had not been taken into consideration.
524. Mrs Wendy Young spoke in support of the application as the applicant; she spoke about:
- The cottages were originally 4 workers cottages , now 2 individual dwellings with extensions and conservatories
 - The cavity of the property was rotten and there was no stability to the wall above the warped door, with cracks visible above
 - The works were necessary to maintain stability of the cottage
525. The Committee commented:
- On section 1.1 of report PC16/13
 - The need to carefully consider the decision to be made
 - Possible complaints or compensation claims should not influence the Committee decision
 - The functionality of the use of the building was not changing
 - The door was a feature and part of the character of the property which could be repaired
 - The need to conserve listed buildings
 - The need to approach with care when considering removing existing external features from listed buildings
 - The buildings were charming and attractive, and had changed over previous years

- Flint work could be repaired well and the door removed
 - It was visually obvious that the exterior of the cottages had changed over the years.
526. In response to Committee questions, the case officer and the Senior Solicitor clarified that:
- The Committee had 3 options:
 - not revoke or modify the permission granted on 6 February 2013
 - to revoke the permission granted on 6 February 2013
 - to modify the conditions for the permission granted on 6 February 2013
 - The process to revoke or modify any granted permission was for it to be submitted and confirmed by the Secretary of State if objections are received.
 - When considering alterations to Listed Buildings there were 2 important considerations
 - The impact on the appearance of the building; and
 - The impact of the 'story' that the building tells us
 - A SDNPA Historic Building Officer had seen the property and his views were expressed within the report.
 - Listed Buildings could be altered, and the water damage could cause more harm to the Listed Building than the proposed alterations.
527. SDNP/12/01580/LIS It was proposed and seconded to vote to make an order to revoke the Listed Building consent granted on 6 February 2013. Following a vote the proposal fell.
528. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
529. **RESOLVED:** That the Listed Building Consent granted on 6 February 2013 should not be revoked or modified for the reasons set out in report PC16/13

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

Application No: SDNP/12/02275/CW
Proposal: Restoration of Golding Barn Quarry using imported inert waste to recreate pre-existing landform
Address: Golding Barn Quarry Henfield Road Small Dole Henfield West Sussex BN5 9XH

530. The Committee considered a report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 17/13)
531. The case officer referenced items from the March 2013 update sheet including the amended conditions and additional condition 34 which was available on the Authority website.
532. Hilary Pierce spoke against the application as the Chairman of Mid Sussex Bridleways Group; she spoke about:
- The conflict with the access track and the bridleway
 - An alternative bridleway should be provided whilst the restoration works were carried out
 - The previous historic separate access route
 - The impact on horses and their riders, and their avoidance of using the bridleway
 - The importance of the bridleway link to the South Downs.
533. The Committee commented on:
- Their concern regarding:
 - the shared access track and bridleway
 - the lack of clarity regarding an alternative bridleway
 - The need to be confident that the restoration scheme could be completed in the allotted time frame and enough inert waste available for the restoration project to achieve a suitable chalk grassland finish
 - The National Park Purposes and Duty

- Taking advice from the Local Access Forum
 - The current shared access use for the quarry, industrial park and bridleway, has had unrestricted vehicle movements for many years and the bridleway had not had sole use during this time.
534. In response to Committee questions, the case officer, Senior Solicitor and Development Management Lead clarified that:
- The existing bridleway to the north east of the site was not on its definitive line and the conditions proposed require the definitive line to be re instated on completion of the restoration. A section 106 obligation would be required to secure the currently used route.
 - In regard to alternative routes for the part of the bridleway that runs over the access track whilst restoration works were being carried out;
 - the applicant does not own 3rd party adjacent land
 - any alternative route would need to be formally approved through West Sussex County Council's RoW process.
 - the current use was established and also had shared access with the Industrial estate
 - The s106 agreement obligation would require the applicant to waive the right to extract chalk under a previous permission. As with any legal agreement s106 agreements they can be applied to be modified, however all parties would need to be in agreement.
 - The management of the land would include 10 year aftercare arrangements to ensure effective restoration allowing the local authority to make yearly visits to require any necessary works. The applicant had access to sheep to graze the land to aid the establishment of chalk grassland.
 - The application could be deferred for officers to address issues of concern with the applicant and in particular to investigate the public rights of way issues.
 - The SDNPA had confidence the restoration would be completed within the allotted time frame and restoration was to be carried out in phases for this reason
535. SDNP/12/02013/FUL It was proposed and seconded to defer the application for the following reasons: to consider the mechanism to secure the retention of the currently used route of the Bridleway within the quarry; to consider further with West Sussex Public Rights of Way and other interested user groups the user conflict on the access route; to seek further information to demonstrate that there will be inert waste available to complete this proposal.
536. **RESOLVED:** To defer the application to:
1. Consider the mechanism to secure the retention of the currently used route of the Bridleway within the quarry
 2. Consider further with West Sussex Public Rights of Way and other interested user groups the user conflict on the access route including alternative access
 3. Seek further information to demonstrate that there will be inert waste available to complete this proposal.
537. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 12:35pm
538. The meeting re convened at 12:45pm

STRATEGY & POLICY

Adoption of the Winchester Joint Core Strategy (Winchester District Local Plan Part One)

539. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 18/13).
540. Mrs Judith Martin spoke against the proposal on behalf of the City of Winchester Trust and CPRE Southdowns & Central Winchester District Planning Group; she spoke about:

- Her concerns regarding policy WT3 Bushfield Camp
 - the views from St Catherine's Hill
 - the site was close to the SDNP boundary
 - it was a precious site with 20 hectares proposed for an employment site and the lack of need for employment sites
541. Mr Corcoran spoke against the proposal on behalf of Twyford parish Council; he spoke about:
- His concerns regarding policy WT3 Bushfield Camp
 - The site was not in Twyford however there were views of the site from the parish
 - Bushfield was on high ground and could not be hidden
 - 20 hectares had been allocated for general employment which was a major development adjacent to the SDNP
 - Not complying with the SDNPA Purposes & Duty
 - To consider deferring the item in order to carry out a landscape Impact Assessment of the site
542. The Committee commented on:
- The site was visible from St Catherine's Hill
 - The risks with delaying the adoption of Joint Core Strategies
 - The site was in a brown field area
 - The site was identified in December 2011 as an Opportunity Site
 - Paragraph 4.4 of report PCI8/13 '*recognising the importance of ensuring that any new built development respects the local landscape sensitivity of the location close to, but outside the SDNP and within a local gap, in terms of high quality design, layout and landscaping, as well as new building heights*'; which would need to be considered in any planning application
 - The SDNPA and Winchester District Council had worked together on the Joint Core Strategy as equal partners
543. In response to Committee questions, the lead officer & Development Management Lead clarified that:
- The Committee could either recommend acceptance of the Inspector's Main Modifications or refuse to adopt the Joint Core Strategy. If they were minded to refuse the process would start again and a new Joint Core strategy would need to be submitted
 - A full discussion took place at the examination stage in public on the Bushfield Site and the Inspector undertook a visit to St Catherine's Hill
 - There were opportunities at the consultation stages for comments and objections to be put forward
 - An opportunity site allows for all appropriate development excluding housing, and could include leisure or recreational use
 - SDNPA would have the opportunity to respond to consultations on applications outside the SDNP.
544. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
545. **RESOLVED:** The Committee recommended to the National Park Authority that the Winchester Joint Core Strategy (Winchester District Local Plan Part One) be adopted, subject to the decision of Winchester City Council, and for any decisions regarding non-material minor amendments that may arise from Winchester City Council's decision to be delegated to the Director of Planning for agreement.

Designation of Neighbourhood Planning Areas (second 'round')

546. The Committee considered the report by the director of Planning (Reports PC 19/13)

547. The Committee commented on:

- Parish Plan do not have the material weight in decision making on planning applications, whilst Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in conformity with Local Plans and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and are part of the development plan once adopted
- The resource implications for the SDNPA & the need to establish a working protocol with other Local Authorities if necessary to assist the SDNPA to support the delivery
- The SDNPA should take a positive approach and provide resources. It was a positive process for inclusion, which was of importance to the SDNPA and had a positive impact across the Park.

548. In response to Committee questions, the lead officer clarified that:

- Where a Neighbourhood Plan area boundary encompasses both the SDNP and a Local Authority and the major settlement was outside the SDNP, there were arrangements in place for the Local Authority to lead on those plans
- Local Authorities and the SDNPA jointly provide information and support Parishes. They also support each other using time and resources more efficiently
- The monies received from the CLG covers the costs to the Local Authority / SDNPA of the referendum and the examination
- The SDNPA would encourage Parishes working together to produce joint plans.

549. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

550. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the designation of the following proposed neighbourhood planning areas in the National Park;

Patching Parish	Rogate Parish	Singleton Parish
Angmering Parish (part of)	Ferring Parish (part of)	Walberton Parish (part of)
Boxgrove Parish (part of)	Plaistow & Ifold (part of)	Arundel Town (part of)
Sompting Parish (part of)	Rottingdean Parish (part of)	Lavant Parish (part of)

Petworth Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP)

551. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 20/13).

552. The lead officer referenced the revised 2nd recommendation from the March 2013 update sheet which was available on the Authority website.

553. The Committee commented on:

- It was a good report to circulate for public consultation
- The document needed reference to the SDNPA as the creator
- It would be good to have the photos numbered and named
- The concern that houses surrounding listed buildings did not have the permitted development rights removed
- The 2nd bullet point on paragraph 7.2 could be worded more clearly.

554. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried

555. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1). Approved the consultation draft of the Petworth Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan attached at Appendix I to report PC20/13.

- 2). Noted proposed boundary amendments to the Petworth Conservation Area as shown on the proposal map, attached as Appendix 2 to report PC20/13.

556. Planning Performance Update – April to December 2012 (Q1, Q2 and Q3)

557. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/13).

558. The Committee commented on:

- The need for a Member workshop with Link Officers to discuss the quality of the decisions made by Officers/Planning Committees in the delegated Local Authority areas.

559. In response to Committee questions, the lead officer clarified that:

- Planning fees were paid directly to the SDNPA and partner LPAs were paid a fixed sum as part of the s101 agreements
- Further information could be provided on how many applications were being monitored by Link Officers and how significant applications were identified if members required this in a subsequent report
- Case studies from Local Authorities could be discussed with Committee Members.

560. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted performance for the period from 1 April to 30 December 2012.

APPEALS

SDNPA (Wealden District)

Application No: SDNP/12/02528/HOUS

Appeal ref: APP/Y9507/D/13/2191478

Proposal: Erection of double garage

Address: Milton Court, Milton Street, Polegate, East Sussex, BN26 5RJ

561. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 22/13).

562. The Committee commented on:

- The Inspector gave weight to the previous Inspectors report and the Committee should note that for the future.

563. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the appeal decision.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 1:53pm