

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 MAY 2014**

Held at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:30am.

Present:

Andrew Shaxson (Chair)	Alun Alesbury	Jennifer Gray	Neville Harrison
Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones	Tom Jones	Diana Kershaw
Charles Peck	Ian Phillips	Norman Dingemans (ex officio)	
Margaret Paren (ex officio)			

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Pat Aird (Development Manager), Tim Richings (Planning Policy Manager), David Cranmer (Development Management Lead Recovered Service Area), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Officer), Gary Palmer (Development Management Officer), Andrew Triggs (Planning Policy Officer), David Boyson (Historic Buildings Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Rebecca Haynes (Member Services Officer) and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

585. The Chair informed the Committee agenda items 13-17 would not be considered before 1:30pm

APOLOGIES

586. None received

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

587. Jennifer Gray declared a Public Service interest in items 12 & 18 as a member of East Hampshire District Council.
588. Neville Harrison declared a Public Service interest in items 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 & 16 as a member of the South Downs Society and Item 7 as the SDNPA representative on the Town Council Steering Group.
589. Tom Jones declared a Public Service interest in item 7 as a member of Lewes District Council.
590. Andrew Shaxson declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 13 and would leave the room during Committee deliberation and decision. The Planning Committee Deputy Chair would Chair that item.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 10 APRIL 2014

591. The Minutes of the meetings held on 10 April 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING

592. There were none.

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

593. The referendum on the Kirdford Neighbourhood Plan was held on 1 May 2014. More than half of those voting had voted in favour of the Kirdford Neighbourhood Plan. A report on the adoption of this Neighbourhood Plan would be presented to the Committee at their next meeting.

URGENT ITEMS

594. There were none.

STRATEGY & POLICY

APPLICATION FOR THE DESIGNATION OF A NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA FOR LEWES TOWN PARISH

595. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC36/14) and update sheet.
596. The Committee commented:

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

- The Lewes District and SDNPA Joint Core Strategy (JCS) had been approved by Lewes District Council and the Lewes North Street Quarter proposals would not have any impact on the Neighbourhood Plan or the JCS
 - The Neighbourhood Plan boundary was unanimously agreed by the steering group.
597. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The Lewes Chamber of Commerce were represented on the Steering Group, businesses and landowners were generally only involved in regeneration schemes
 - The historic and cultural heritage of the Battle of Lewes was considered during the deliberations and the Steering Group may wish to further reflect on this in due course.
598. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
599. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Noted that Lewes Town Council had complied with the regulations relating to the submission of a neighbourhood area application
 2. Agreed to designate the neighbourhood area as proposed in the application.
600. Margaret Paren and Norman Dingemans left the Committee at 9:48am.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

601. The Chair informed the Committee that items 8,9,10 & 11 would be considered together. The case officer would present all 4 applications, the Committee would then hear from all the public speakers before debating all 4 applications and then taking each application for a decision separately.

Applications: SDNP/13/04908/FUL, SDNP/13/04909/LIS, SDNP/13/04910/FUL & SDNP/13/04911/LIS Manor Farm, Greatham Lane, Greatham, Pulborough, RH20 2ES

602. The Case officer presented the applications and informed the Committee:
- The update of paragraph 3.5 had been withdrawn as the Committee would consider the plans that were formally submitted with the applications and therefore consulted on.
 - The updated amended condition 11 had been withdrawn.
 - The comments received from the SDNPA Historic Buildings Officer which can be found at the [Consultee Comments](#) section of the SDNPA website.
603. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Robert Englehart spoke against Items 8 and 10 as an Immediate neighbour and Churchwarden
 - Janet Aidin spoke against Items 8 and 9 as a local resident and Secretary of the Wiggonholt Association
 - Katharine Ohno spoke against Item 11 on behalf of herself as a local resident
 - Professor Robin Milner-Gulland spoke against Item 9 on behalf of himself as a local resident, Executive of South Downs Network, Greatham Church historian and author of series of books on South Downs
 - Malcolm Simmonds spoke against Item 9 on behalf of himself as a Local Resident and Heritage Architect
 - Grahame Joseph spoke against Item 10 as Chairman of Amberley Society and local resident
 - Dr Roger Smith spoke against Item 11 on behalf of CPRE Sussex
 - Diana van der Klugt spoke against Items 8 and 10 as a Horsham District Councillor for Chantry ward which includes Greatham, Churchwarden, Parish Councillor and Greatham resident
 - Robert Cheesman spoke against Item 11 on behalf of the South Downs Society as the Chairman
 - Jeremy Tyrrell spoke in support of Items 9 and 11 on behalf of Liz Lawrence, the agent

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

- William Rydon spoke in support of Items 8 and 10 on behalf of himself and his wife Tracey Rydon as the site owners
 - Steve Davies spoke in support of Items 8 and 9 as the applicant
 - Jeremy Tyrrell spoke in support of Items 9 and 11 as the architect for the schemes
 - Richard MacCullagh spoke in support of Items 9 and 11 as the Heritage Advisor
 - Robin Lamb spoke in support of Items 8 and 10 on behalf of himself
604. The Committee considered reports PC37/14, PC38/14, PC39/14 & PC40/14, the update sheet, public speaker comments and commented:
- The proposals would remove unattractive redundant buildings and provided a viable way to restore the listed building
 - It would be more appropriate to have a couple of larger properties on the site rather than many smaller properties or commercial uses
 - Any new development should be sensitive to the local vernacular and the setting was equally important when considering new development. The key issue to consider was the effect on the character of the conservation area
 - It was unfortunate that the application and proposals had divided the local community
 - The location was remote, and was a couple of miles to the nearest town and facilities
 - There was evidence of damage to the Barn and the SDNPA had a duty to preserve listed buildings although good justification for redevelopment should be given and the Authority should demand high quality proposals and design
 - The area concerned possessed all of the NP Special Qualities
 - There may be alternative sustainable uses for the barn and questioning if alternative funding opportunities had been investigated
 - Whether the modern extensions were appropriate
 - The paraphernalia associated with modern living could have an impact on the setting, such as:
 - Play equipment
 - Gates, fencing and walls
 - Bins
 - lighting
 - On the NP Purposes and Duty and NPPF
 - Their sympathy with the farming community and their increasing need to investigate ways of diversifying in order to remain commercially viable
 - There was a similar development in the village of Ditchling within the NP that used a modern structure to connect with a listed building which had a positive impact on the area
 - The removal of modern steel structure would enhance the conservation area and it would be difficult to find a solution that would not create an impact on the area
 - On balance, the proposals were appropriate for the historic buildings and the sensitive setting and character of this tranquil conservation area.
 - That if the planning permission be granted, all permitted development rights should be removed, adding additional conditions regarding hard and soft landscaping, lighting, archaeology and limiting equestrian use.
605. In response to questions officers clarified that:
- The applications were not enabling development
 - If the Committee were minded to approve, the SDNPA could advise on an ecological green roof. Removal of permitted development (PD) rights would not be necessary on any listed building application as listed buildings do not have PD rights.
606. SDNP/13/04908/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, including additional conditions:
- Relating to removal of permitted development rights hard and soft landscaping, lighting, archaeology and limiting equestrian use

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

- 12-14 as detailed in the update sheet
Following a vote the proposal was carried.

607. **SDNP/13/04908/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
1. The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC37/14 including additional conditions 12, 13 & 14 as detailed in the May Update Sheet and additional conditions to be formulated by the Director of Planning relating to:
 - a. removal of Permitted Development rights
 - b. Hard and soft landscaping, including all enclosures and walls
 - c. Archaeology
 - d. Lighting
 - e. Limited equestrian use; and
 2. Completion of a S106 Agreement for £5,063 for contributions relating to infrastructure improvements, local libraries and fire and rescue services
608. SDNP/13/04909/LIS It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
609. **SDNP/13/04909/LIS RESOLVED:** That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to conditions in paragraph 10.1 of report PC38/14.
610. SDNP/13/04910/FUL. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, including additional conditions:
- Relating to removal of permitted development rights hard and soft landscaping, lighting, archaeology and limiting equestrian use
 - 12-14 as detailed in the update sheet
- Following a vote the proposal was carried.
611. **SDNP/13/04910/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
1. The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC39/14 including additional conditions 12, 13 & 14 as detailed in the May Update Sheet and additional conditions to be formulated by the Director of Planning relating to:
 - a. removal of Permitted Development rights
 - b. Hard and soft landscaping, including all enclosures and walls
 - c. Archaeology
 - d. Lighting
 - e. Limited equestrian use; and
 2. Completion of a S106 Agreement for contributions relating to infrastructure improvements, local libraries and fire and rescue services
612. SDNP/13/04911/LIS It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
613. **SDNP/13/04911/LIS RESOLVED:** That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC40/14.
614. The Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 1:16pm
615. The meeting reconvened at 1:48pm

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

616. Jennifer Gray declared a Public Service interest in items 12 & 18 as a member of East Hampshire District Council.
617. Neville Harrison declared a Public Service interest in items 13, 14 & 16 as a member of the South Downs Society.
618. Tom Jones declared a Public Service interest in item 14 as a member of Lewes District Council
619. Andrew Shaxson declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 13 and would leave the room during Committee deliberation and decision. The Planning Committee Deputy Chair would Chair that item.

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

Application: SDNP/14/00079/FUL Under The Hill, High Street, Selborne, Alton, Hampshire

620. The Case officer presented the application.
621. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Simon Bennett spoke against the application on behalf of himself
 - Ronald Davidson Houston spoke against the application on behalf of himself
 - Cllr Minette Palmer spoke against the application on behalf of Selborne Parish Council
 - Martin Hawthorne spoke in support of the application as the planning agent for the applicant
622. The Committee considered report PC41/14, the update sheet, public speaker comments and commented:
- The application was for major development, outside the settlement boundary, inside the conservation area, contrary to the Village Design Statement and was not an allocated site
 - There was a housing need especially with people that had a local connection
 - The quality of the design of the properties was very good
 - The 40% affordable housing was positive
 - Selborne was an important settlement within the SDNP due to the Gilbert White legacy and any development within this area should be sensitive. The SDNPA had a duty to adopt the highest standards in areas such as this
 - The site may be suitable for development and the use of exception sites for affordable housing could be considered as part of the development of the SDNPA Local Plan
 - Their concerns regarding:
 - The development of 10 houses would have a great impact on the setting
 - The application site was alongside the Hangers Way Right of Way (RoW)
 - The proposed access that would create a sunken lane
 - There was a possibility of flooding on the site.
623. In response to questions officers clarified that:
- The SDNPA did not oppose development within the SDNP and since the launch of the SDNPA in April 2011 the development of 1000 homes had been permitted
 - To comply with the highways conditions the visibility splays would not require excavation of the bank area.
624. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
625. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC41/14.
626. The Chair (Andrew Shaxson) left the Committee table and sat in the public seating. The Deputy Chair (Neville Harrison) presided over the next item.

Application: SDNP/13/05575/FUL Rosemary Park Nursing Home, Marley Lane, Marley Common, Fernhurst, Haslemere, West Sussex, GU27 3PY

627. The Case officer presented the application.
628. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Suzanne Riley spoke against the application as a Marley Lane resident
 - Sarah Bain spoke against the application on behalf of the Alliance for Rural Marley, the local residents' association which has members living on Marley Common, Marley Heights and Marley Lane.
 - Ian Donohue spoke in support of the application on behalf of his client Oldercare
629. Andrew Shaxson left the room

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

630. The Committee considered report PC42/14, public speaker comments and commented on:
- The representations made by the National Trust, the South Downs Society and the Highways Authority
 - It was pleasing that the applicant had entered into dialogue with the Parish Council (PC) and noted that the PC did not object
 - The facility provided a highly skilled hospice care for a national need.
 - It was often difficult to provide long term plans for healthcare
 - Their concerns regarding:
 - The highways implications
 - The inclusion of land that was not in the applicants ownership
 - The succession of applications from the applicant
 - There was no justification for the expansion needs
 - Standards of design had already been compromised with incremental development on the site and the site was overdeveloped.
631. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The previous applications and the inspectors comments regarding the impact on the highways
 - Rosemary Park Nursing Home was established before the designation of the SDNP
 - The SDNPA design officer considered that any further extension would be inappropriate on the site and therefore would be beyond what would be acceptable in design standards.
 - The SDNPA had previously won an appeal where design was the sole reason for refusal
 - It was the responsibility of the developer to provide designs for consideration and not for SDNPA officers to present design solutions during the pre application stage
 - Development on the site was reaching an end and therefore a management plan might not be the appropriate solution. However a legal agreement could be drawn up showing intent of no further development on the site.
632. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
633. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reason set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC42/14.
634. Andrew Shaxson return to the Committee table and presided as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Application: SDNP/13/05769/FUL Ringmer Road, Ringmer, East Sussex

635. The Case officer presented the application.
636. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Robert Cheesman spoke against the application on behalf of the South Downs Society
 - Rosalyn St Pierre spoke against the application as the East Sussex County Council member for Ringmer & Lewes Bridge.
 - Alan Cook spoke in support of the application representing East Sussex County Council.
637. The Committee considered report PC43/14, public speaker comments and commented on:
- It was pleasing to have a route for cyclists and walkers between Ringmer and Lewes which fulfilled the SDNPA purpose 2
 - Surfacing on these types of routes was important and in this instance tarmac was appropriate
 - Their concerns regarding:
 - the amount of blue signage proposed and their intrusion into scenic locations
 - cyclists using Mill Road which was very steep

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

638. In response to questions officers clarified:
- Informatives could be included regarding the concerns of the Committee
 - The design and access statement concluded that tarmac was the most appropriate surface for durability for walkers and cyclists
639. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation and to include Informatives covering the concerns of the committee regarding signage and the use of Mill Road. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
640. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
1. the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC43/14 and
 2. Informatives regarding the safe use of Mill Road and the level of signage required
641. Committee members Ian Phillips, Charles Peck, Alun Alesbury & Jennifer Gray left the Committee at 3:58pm
642. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:58pm
643. The meeting reconvened at 4:05pm

Application: SDNP/13/06020/FUL The Black Rabbit Inn Mill Road South Stoke Arundel West Sussex BN18 9PB

644. The Case officer presented the application.
645. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- William Hodgson spoke against the application representing himself, Peter Marsh and David Cooper.
 - Gary Mills spoke against the application representing himself and fellow neighbours of Offham
646. The Committee considered report PC45/14, public speaker comments and commented on:
- Their understanding that increased parking may lead to congestion and a successful pub by nature would attract visitors.
 - The SDNPA was supportive of tourism and attracting visitors to areas such as Arundel and the application supported the SDNPA purpose 2; however there was a need for the SDNPA to investigate ways of managing 'honey pot' spots around the NP
 - There was a need to manage and regulate traffic arriving and leaving the premises and to encourage the use of alternative means of transport such as cycling
 - The Pub would need customers to remain viable.
647. In response to questions officers clarified:
- Evidence would be needed to take forward any noise and amenity issues
 - There was sufficient space for cars to be able to pass at the narrowest point in the East car park and additional space could be gained through careful landscaping
 - Dialogue would continue with the County Council regarding highways concerns and other issues especially around signage
648. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation and to:
1. include an additional condition for hard and soft landscaping
 2. for condition 2 to be approved by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning committee and
 3. for the car park management plan to include clarification that there would be a permanent presence at peak times to direct safe parking
- Following a vote the proposal was carried.
649. **RESOLVED:**
1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC45/14 including an amendment to condition 2 to require a permanent presence at peak times to direct safe parking and an additional condition on hard and soft landscaping

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

2. That condition 2 be discharged by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

Application: SDNP/14/00230/HOU 10, Meads Way, Slindon, Arundel, BN18 0QU

650. The Case officer presented the application.
651. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
 - Katharine Swailes spoke against the application on behalf of herself as a neighbour
 - Caron Penney spoke against the application on behalf of herself as a neighbour
 - Martin Garner spoke in support of the application on behalf of himself
652. The Committee considered report PC47/14, public speaker comments and commented on:
 - The impact upon the neighbouring property and character of the area were considered acceptable
653. In response to a question officers clarified:
 - The application proposed the introduction of 2 velux windows and no side windows
654. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
655. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in section 9 of report PC46/14

Application: SDNP/14/00199/FUL West Sussex Golf Club, Golf Club Lane, Pulborough. West Sussex

656. The Case officer presented the application.
657. The Committee considered report PC46/14, and commented on:
 - The proposals were more intrusive and closer to the RoW than the extant permission
 - No attempt had been made by the applicant to integrate the reservoir into the landscape especially with it being proposed so close to the RoW
658. In response to a question officers clarified:
 - The security fence surrounding it would be located at ground level
659. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
660. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reason/s set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC46/14

CONSULTATIONS

Application 28353/004 Quebec Barracks, Camp Road, Bordon, GU35 0LH

661. The Case officer presented the application.
662. The Committee considered report PC46/14, public speaker comments and commented on:
 - The dark night skies were important to the SDNPA and this should be highlighted for all applications of this nature
 - It was hoped that any designs were of a high standard
663. In response to a question officers clarified:
 - Two of the future applications for the regeneration of Whitehill-Borden may be combined into a single application
 - this proposal would not require alterations to the existing road lay out
 - The relief road would have the potential to have more impact and the SDNPA were working closely with The developers and East Hampshire District Council to seek to reduce that impact
 - Any decision made on this application would not set a precedent for any future applications
664. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
665. **RESOLVED:** That:

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

1. The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) at this point in time raises no objection in principal to the proposed development but advises EHDC as the local planning authority that appropriate measures should be taken to reduce the potential impact of any outside lighting on dark night skies, one of the Special Qualities of the SDNP through submission of a lighting scheme which is prepared in compliance with Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance and that removes any unnecessary upward lighting on specific features such as buildings and trees. A part night lighting scheme should also be considered. If any further information becomes available it may wish to add to the comments.
2. The Committee noted this was the first of three applications to secure the implementation of the Whitehill Borden urban extension to which the SDNPA would be a consultee with potential for a further application within the SDNP for which the SDNPA will be the planning authority.

APPEALS

Application: APP/9507/X/13/2202668 Grazing Land North East Of Flyover, Steyning Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

666. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC49/14).
667. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the content of report PC19/14

Application APP/Y9507/A/12/2180067 Marwell Yard Thompsons Lane, Owslesbury, Winchester, Hampshire

668. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC50/14)
669. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted that the appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.

Enforcement Notice SDNP/12/00089/UCU Land Adjacent to the Cottages, Long Furlong Lane, Patching

670. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC35/14)
671. In response to a question officers clarified that:
 - The outcome of the appeal demonstrated the added value of the SDNP

672. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the content of report PC50/14

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 5.08pm.