

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 FEBRUARY 2015**

Held at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:00am.

Present:

Andrew Shaxson (Chair) Alun Alesbury Jennifer Gray Neville Harrison
Barbara Holyome David Jenkins Doug Jones Diana Kershaw
Charles Peck Margaret Paren (ex officio) Norman Dingemans (ex officio)
SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Richard Ferguson (Planning Officer), Chris Manning (Water Policy Officer), Tim Bettany-Simmons (Development Management Lead (Called-in Applications)), Sally Stallan (Development Management Officer), Rory Moores (Assistant Development Management Officer), (Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

APOLOGIES

506. Tom Jones, Ian Phillips.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

507. Charles Peck declared a Public Service interest in items 13, 15 and 16 as a member of Wealden District Council.
508. Jennifer Gray declared a Public Service interest in item 10 as a member of East Hampshire County Council
509. Doug Jones declared a Public Service interest in item 10 as the SDNPA representative on the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Group.
510. Neville Harrison declared a Public Service interest in items 9 and 12 as a member of the South Downs Society.
511. During Item 8, Charles Peck declared a Public Service interest in item 8 as a member of Wealden District Council as detailed in minute 528.
512. During Item 15, Alun Alesbury declared a Public Service interest as a Friend of the Landmark Trust, as detailed in minute 571.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 15 JANUARY 2015

513. The minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING

514. There were none.

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

515. The Planning Policy Manager informed the Committee that the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan had been published for formal consultation under Regulation 16, which would run from 2 February to 16 March 2015.
- Officers were currently preparing the SDNPA's representation which would be brought to the Committee for approval at the 12 March meeting.
 - The Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan would be submitted for examination and a public hearing was likely.
 - The Plan would return to the Planning Committee for a Decision Statement in June, with the referendum scheduled for the first part of July, and its incorporation into the Development Plan in August.
516. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that the appeal against the SDNPA's decision to refuse 230 homes at Causeway Farm had been dismissed by the Planning Inspector.
- This gave indication that the SDNPA's approach to balancing reserved sites vs. housing need had been correct.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

- Although not at an advanced enough stage to be given full weight, the Inspector had considered the proposals for the site put forward in the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan.
517. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that a draft letter with the Planning Inspector's preliminary assessment of the Lewes Joint Core Strategy had been circulated to consultees for comment.
- The Inspector was minded to find the Lewes Joint Core Strategy sound and had commended the evidenced partnership working and duty to cooperate.
 - The Inspector considered the housing numbers for Lewes District Council should be higher.
 - The Inspector considered that the shortfall could be met through windfall, exception sites and the allocation of the Old Malling site, which had previously been considered by the Committee as unsuitable for development due to the impact on the landscape.
 - On balance the SDNPA would support the Inspector's view as this was preferable to withdrawing from the Lewes Joint Core Strategy, and officers would update the Committee following the public consultation.
518. The Committee commented:
- The Committee had spent considerable time visiting and debating the merits of the Old Malling site.
 - The site was located in a visually prominent valley significant to the landscape of the National Park.
519. In response to questions officers clarified:
- It appeared that the whole of the Old Malling site would be included for allocation.
 - The site would be determined as a strategic site, and the preliminary work done by the emerging Lewes Neighbourhood Plan gave indication that some development of the site would be considered appropriate.
 - The Inspector had given due consideration to Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) relating to exceptional circumstances and the public interest, and the SDNPA Local Plan would need to reflect this when considering the allocation of strategic sites.
 - The Inspector had also considered sites in Peacehaven and Newhaven, which demonstrated consistency with regard to numbers.
 - The draft letter from the Inspector, a plan of the site and a briefing note would be circulated to Members in due course.

URGENT ITEMS

520. There were none.

OPENING REMARKS

521. The Chair informed the Committee and public that Items 12-16 would not be considered before 1pm, and that Item 14 had been withdrawn.

STRATEGY & POLICY

PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: ECOSYSTEMS SERVICES POLICY

522. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC12/15) and update sheet.
523. The Committee commented:
- Officers were commended for a very clear chapter that would be hopefully well received in the public consultation.
 - The term 'Cultural Services' was unclear as culture tended to relate more to human activity than the landscape.
 - '46 million *visitors*' on p17 should be corrected to '46 million *visits*'.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

524. In response to questions officers clarified:
- Policy a) related to Purpose 1 and was included in other strategic policies, so could be removed.
 - Reference to the Weald could be included in the paragraph relating to Cultural Services.
 - Cultural Services formed part of the Ecosystems Services approach; however the wording of the Cultural Services paragraph could be revised for clarification.
525. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, subject to the removal of policy a) relating to Purpose 1 and the rewording of the Cultural Services paragraph. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
526. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Endorsed the direction of the draft policy as detailed in Appendix 1 of Report PC12/15 for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed.
 - 2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
 - 3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval by the National Park

PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: FLOODING & WATER ISSUES POLICIES

527. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC13/15).
528. The Committee commented:
- Their welcome of the chapter's inclusion, which was innovative in terms of protecting aquifers, and could be influential.
 - Charles Peck welcomed the reference to Birling Gap and Cuckmere Valley and declared a Public Service Interest as a member of Wealden District Council.
 - Their concerns regarding the Coastal Change Management Areas including:
 - Reference could be made to maintenance of Rights of Way and access given the high visitor use of coastal honeypot sites such as Birling Gap and the Cuckmere Valley.
 - A holistic long-term management approach was required for these areas.
 - The extent to which the areas would extend inland was not yet established.
 - The Ouse Valley was tidal, and could be considered part of a Coastal Change Management Area.
529. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The Aquifers policy would come before the Flooding Policy in the Local Plan and reference made to their extent and how many people they served.
 - The Local Plan policies would cover 3 main water issues:
 - Flood risk management
 - Efficiency of resources and sustainable construction
 - A water framework directive, comprising of Good Ecological Status, relating to biodiversity, rivers, and water quality; and Good Status relating to aquifers.
 - Rivers and water quality would be covered by the Biodiversity policy.
 - Regarding the Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMAs):
 - Visitor pressures would be factored in to the future management of coastal areas.
 - Reference would be made to the Environment Agency's 'Coastal Communities 2150 and Beyond' engagement project.
 - The protection of coastal Rights of Way including the South Downs Way would be covered in the Local Plan Transport Policy as well as national legislation.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

- Shoreline Management Plans would help to define the CCMA's were in the process of being drafted with the District Councils and the Environment Agency, and would offer extra protection against development in these vulnerable areas.
 - There was no requirement for a set buffer zone when establishing boundary lines.
 - Shoreline management plans included 3 options with regard to coastlines namely:
 - Hold the line
 - Advance the line
 - Managed realignment
 - The boundary lines would take into account the appropriate weighting of the preferred approach and measures.
 - The boundary lines would be indicated on the Policies Map.
 - Officers would take the concerns raised by the Committee to the Environment Agency and update the Committee at a future meeting.
530. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, subject to the comments made by the Committee being addressed. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
531. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Endorsed the direction of the draft policy as detailed in Appendix I of Report PC13/15 for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed.
 - 2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
 - 3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

SDNPA (BRIGHTON & HOVE)

APPLICATION SDNP/14/03394/FUL West Hove Golf Club, Badgers Way, Hove, East Sussex BN3 8EX

532. The Case officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
533. The Committee heard from Andrew Macgregor-Boyle, who spoke in support of the application on behalf of West Hove Golf Club Ltd.
534. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC14/15), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The importance of unbroken views of open downland from the A27, and avoiding enclosure of the road with bunds.
 - The current view of the golf course did not represent a negative impact.
 - The proposed bunding would have a minimal impact on the view from the A27, and the Landscape Officer had not objected to the proposal.
 - The proposed view to the north was unclear.
 - Other bunding on the site fitted well with the landscape.
 - The noise reduction achieved by the proposal would be minimal.
 - Noise reduction could also be achieved by the use of low-noise road surfacing.
 - The proposal was primarily of benefit to the golf club.
 - The proposal offered some benefit to the public, who were able to use the golf club as visitors, and make use of the proposed new bridleway link sought by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC) and access land.
 - The proposed bund represented major development and required importation of inert waste.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

- The proposal was a vast improvement on the previous scheme.
535. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The applicant was dealing with the Environment Agency directly regarding the proposed waste recovery materials which was a separate process to the planning application.
 - In accordance with policy guidelines, any use of inert material within the SDNP was required to be for beneficial purposes only.
 - The haulier operated in the West Sussex region and the proposed importation did not represent additional movements in the area.
 - The proposed access route for materials did not conflict with existing rights of way but was crossed by rights of way in 2 places.
 - BHCC had agreed to adopt the proposed new bridleway.
 - The planting condition 16 could be extended to require replacement of damaged trees, shrubs, plants or wildflower planting within a period of 10 years.
 - Concerns raised by Benfield Wildlife and Conservation Group regarding impact on recent planting on the Local Nature Reserve could be addressed through the Biodiversity Mitigation and Management Plan.
536. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with the amendment of Condition 16 to require replacement of damaged trees, shrubs, plants or wildflower planting within a period of 10 years, and the further requirement for the s106 agreement to be completed by 12 May 2015 as detailed in the Update sheet. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
537. **SDNP/I4/03394/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to
- 1) The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC14/15 and the update sheet
 - 2) The amendment of Condition 16 to require replacement of damaged trees, shrubs, plants or wildflower planting within a period of 10 years
 - 3) The completion of a S106 agreement with obligations relating to:
 - i.) The creation of a Public Right of Way (Bridleway) under Section 25 of the Highways Act 1980.
 - ii.) The dedication of the site under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to create Open Access Land
 - 4) Should the s106 agreement not be completed by 12 May 2015 authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application because the necessary mitigation measures have not been secured to make the proposal acceptable.

EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

SDNP/I4/04278/OUT Land East Of Harrier Way Petersfield Hampshire GU31 4EZ

538. The Case officer presented the application and referred to the Update sheet, including the amendments to the report in terms of ecology and the proposed change to the first reason for refusal.
539. The Case officer informed the Committee that a viability statement had been received from the applicant, and a total of 7 further letters of support had been received since publication of the report, including a letter from an East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) Councillor and a letter from one of the trustees.
540. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Michael Gadd spoke against the application on behalf of himself
 - Miss Paula Hudson spoke against the application on behalf of herself
 - Judith Robinson spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant
 - Mrs Pat Crafer spoke in support of the application on behalf of herself
 - John Sneddon spoke in support of the application as the agent

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

541. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC15/15), the Update sheet and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Their sympathy for the points raised by the speakers, who had all spoken very eloquently regarding the well identified need of the community.
 - There was a national need for housing of all types, including this type of supported housing, but nothing about the proposal or this need, is exceptional
 - Their support in principle for the concept of care villages, and for continuing care developments of this nature in Petersfield.
 - The Authority was not required to meet an objectively assessed need where to do so would conflict with paragraphs 115-116 of the NPPF.
 - Petersfield was one of the two largest settlements in the National Park, and it was important that proposals were of appropriate quality.
 - The site was deserving of something more than standard urban development.
 - The location of the site within the National Park in open countryside outside the settlement boundary meant the proposal could not be supported on policy grounds.
 - Their concerns regarding the height, scale, bulk and massing of the proposal, which would dominate the street scene and detract from character of the area.
 - Developments at the edge of settlements should diminish in height and scale in order to blend into the landscape.
 - If minded to approve the application, the Committee would be agreeing to the building heights that had been included in the outline application.
 - The objections of the Landscape and Design Officers.
 - Their reservations regarding the applicant's viability statement as the topography of the site was relatively level, and the greenfield site is very developable.
 - The impact of extra traffic to the site including visitors, staff and residents' mobility scooters.
 - If the site was deemed acceptable for development in future, a traffic calming scheme could improve road safety.
 - Proper consideration should be given to retaining the roadside 'shrine'
 - A Code Level higher than 3 for Sustainable Homes would have been a preferable standard for a development of this scale.
 - A more discreet development could be suitable for the site.
 - The brownfield site to the north of the proposed site had been identified for the use of offices in the draft Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan, and could be suitable for a development of this nature.
542. In response to questions officers clarified:
- Development of part of the site could be acceptable in principle.
 - The scale and height of this proposal, and the need to balance exceptional need against resultant disbenefits.
 - Once complete, the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan would provide a clearer steer as to what type of development could be acceptable on the site.
543. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
544. **SDNP/14/04278/OUT RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC15/15 and the amended refusal reason 1 as set out on the Update sheet.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

SDNPA (ARUN)

SDNP/14/02978/FUL SILOS AT PATCHING FARM, THE STREET, PATCHING WORTHING BN13 3XF

545. The Case officer presented the application.
546. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Adrian Moore spoke in support of the application as the planning consultant.
 - Andrew Goodwin spoke in support of the application as the agent and architect.
 - William Cantello spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
547. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC16/15) and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Their enthusiasm for the innovative design and commending of the applicant and architect for their imaginative approach.
 - Their sympathy for the applicant who had received encouraging advice from other parties.
 - Patching Parish Council's support of the application.
 - Paragraph 55.3 of the NPPF favoured re-use of agricultural buildings providing the development represented an enhancement to the surroundings.
 - The proposal was more a new build than a conversion, and the silos were not of a sufficiently permanent structure to justify the construction of new housing within their frame.
 - The silos and open barn no longer had any economic or agricultural purpose, and their removal represented the best enhancement of the site.
 - The site was adjacent to a public right of way, near the grade I listed church and within the conservation area and the proposal could not be supported on policy grounds.
 - Their concern that a precedent could be set for the conversion of farm buildings in similar settings.
548. In response to questions officers clarified:
- Although the retention of a minimum of 35-45% of the original structure was generally sought in the conversion of agricultural buildings, it was more important to consider the setting and impact of any proposal.
 - The proposed roofing would be zinc rather than glass as noted in the officer's report and light from horizontal glazing could be adequately controlled with screening. Refusal reason 3 regarding the negative impact of additional lighting into a secluded rural area could therefore be removed.
549. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with the removal of Reason 3 regarding additional lighting into a secluded rural area. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
550. **SDNP/14/02978/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC16/15, with the removal of Reason 3 regarding additional lighting into a secluded rural area.
551. The Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:45pm.
552. The meeting reconvened at 1:15pm.

OPENING REMARKS

553. The Chair informed the Committee and public that Item 14 had been withdrawn.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

554. Charles Peck declared a Public Service interest in items 13, 15 and 16 as a member of Wealden District Council.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

555. Neville Harrison declared a Public Service interest in item 12 as a member of the South Downs Society.
556. During item 15, Alun Alesbury declared a Public Service interest as a Friend of the Landmark Trust, as detailed in minute 571.

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

SDNP/I4/03805/FUL THE COURTHOUSE FRIARS WALK LEWES EAST SUSSEX BN7 2PG

557. The Case officer presented the application and referred to the Update sheet.
558. The Committee heard from Vic lent who spoke in support of the application on behalf of Save Lewes Architecture
559. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC17/15), the Update sheet and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Legislation was such that different applications could be made for schemes on the same site.
 - Although contracts had already been exchanged for the site, they had not yet been completed, and the Committee would give the application due consideration.
 - The application was a welcome and praiseworthy proposal for a site of considerable public interest.
 - The proposed change of use fitted well with the National Park's Purposes and Duty, and could promote opportunities for the public to enjoy the Special Qualities of the SDNP.
 - The current building had been substantially built and had not reached the 30 year minimum age to be qualified for English Heritage listing.
 - Retaining the current building for public use was supportive of the National Park's principle of sustainability.
 - The current building reflected the architecture of the adjacent Fitzroy House.
 - The scheme previously agreed by the Committee represented a better fit with the town setting than the current building.
560. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The recommendation did not specify that personal permission be granted to the applicant.
 - The application for change of use could not be subject to a condition regarding signage; however an informative had been included to cover potential signage issues.
561. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
562. **SDNP/I4/03805/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for the reason set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC17/15 subject to conditions.

SDNPA (WEALDEN)

SDNP/I4/04291/OUT LAND ADJACENT TO LONGVIEW, MICHEL DENE ROAD, EAST DEAN EASTBOURNE, EAST SUSSEX BN20 0HP

563. The Case officer presented the application.
564. The Committee heard from Glenn Moore who spoke in support of the application as the agent.
565. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC18/15) and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The trees on the site gave an important rural feel the entrance to the estate.
 - Although a house could be built on the plot, it would have a negative impact on the rural aspect and character of the landscape.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

566. In response to questions officers clarified:
- Previous appeals had been refused in the 1990s and although new policies had come into force, the issues and nature of the development remained the same.
 - The existing garage already provided access from the site on to the main road, and no additional response had been received from the Highways Authority.
 - The trees on the site were not currently subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and this could be investigated further by the Tree Officer.
567. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
568. **SDNP/I4/04291/OUT RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC18/15

SDNP/I4/05938/HOUS PRIORY FARM HOUSE, THE STREET, WILMINGTON, POLEGATE BN26 5SL

569. The Case officer presented the application and referred to the Update sheet.
570. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Adrian Moore spoke in support of the application as the agent.
 - Tim Carr spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
571. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/15), the Update sheet and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The greenhouse was of appropriate size and design.
 - The Parish Council had stated that power cuts were uncommon, and the generator would not be employed frequently.
 - It was of some concern that consent had been given for the replacement of a 4 bedroom house with a 6 bedroom house; however this had been build to a high standard.
 - Alun Alesbury declared a Public Service interest in the item as a Friend of the Landmark Trust, who owned the adjacent Wilmington Priory.
572. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The siting of any fuel tank for the generator would be classed as permitted development.
573. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
574. **SDNP/I4/05938/HOUS RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for the reason and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC20/15 and the Update sheet.
575. Committee Member Charles Peck asked for his vote against the proposal to be recorded.

SDNPA (ARUN)

SDNP/I4/05648/HOUS I STEEP CLOSE FINDON WORTHING BN14 0TD

576. The Case officer presented the application.
577. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC21/15) and commented:
- As a National Park planning authority, the SDNPA sought high quality design and improved outcomes wherever possible.
 - Although the design of the proposal was not of high quality, it was in keeping with the surrounding properties, most of which had a range of dormer extensions.
 - Their support for extensions in principle, and their hope that in time a more fitting style of roofscape could be developed and improved.

Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee

578. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
579. **SDNP/I4/05938/HOUS RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for the reason and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC21/15

Chair

580. The meeting closed at 2.45pm.