

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE 10 SEPTEMBER 2015

Held at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:01am.

Present:

David Coldwell	Neville Harrison	Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones
Tom Jones	Diana Kershaw	Robert Mocatta	Ian Phillips
Norman Dingemans (ex officio)			

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead), Isla Denton-Thompson (Consultant Landscape Architect), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES

86. Apologies were received from Alun Alesbury and Gary Marsh.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

87. Doug Jones declared a Public Service interest in item 7 as a member of the National Trust, and in Item 10 as the SDNPA Member representative on the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.
88. Tom Jones declared a Public Service interest in item 8 as a member of Lewes District Council and of Ditchling Parish Council, and that he knew the public speakers for the item.
89. Robert Mocatta declared a Public Service interest in item 8 as the secretary of another Rugby Club in the National Park.
90. Neville Harrison declared a Public Service interest in item 7 as a member of the South Downs Society and the National Trust.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 AUGUST

91. The minutes of the meeting held on 13 August 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

92. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

93. The Director of Planning updated the Committee with regard to the Inspector's modifications of the Lewes Joint Core Strategy, which had been considered at the July Planning Committee.
- The proposed modifications included old Malling Farm as an allocated housing site and Members had resolved to support the possibility of a further hearing to allow further discussions on the implications of this.
 - Officers had received confirmation that the Inspector had proposed a further hearing for the week commencing 14 December 2015, which Members were encouraged to attend.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

94. There were none

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

ITEM 7: SDNP/15/01024/FUL, BRACKENWOOD TELEGRAPH HILL MIDHURST WEST SUSSEX GU29 0BN

95. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet. He informed the Committee that the 92 neutral responses had been identified as the result of a hacking incident that had been sustained by the applicant's campaign website.

96. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Councillor Roget Lovett spoke against the application representing Woolbeding with Redford Parish Council
 - Councillor Adrian Hearle spoke against the application representing Woolbeding with Redford Parish Council
 - Nick Clarke spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant
 - Malcolm Kilbey spoke in support of the application as the Director of local supplier Farm and Stable Supplies
 - Diana MacKay spoke in support of the application as a local neighbour.
97. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC65/15), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Their understanding of the applicant's ambition to compete internationally, and the associated requirement for adequate facilities.
 - A view that the application was aligned with the National Park's Purposes and Duty as it supported the equestrian cultural heritage of the area.
 - The development taking place at the nearby King Edward VII site, had compromised the tranquillity of the site, however the associated noise and disturbance would abate once the construction phase was completed.
 - The significant public support expressed for the proposal.
 - The need for consideration of the National Park's statutory purposes and the wider public interest.
 - The importance of considering the comments made by the landscape officer.
 - The lack of sensitivity of the development site that was adjacent to a historic assart, trees on the parish boundary and public rights of way.
 - The scale and appearance of the development and in particular the American barn was uncharacteristic given the landscape character, tranquillity and relative remoteness of the site.
 - The visual impact of the barn, partially mitigated by the aggregation of buildings and trees, was more noticeable in winter.
 - The damage caused to the historical ditch by infilling, and whether this could be remedied.
 - The Inspector's decision, which had found the previous development, to which the current application was not dissimilar, had not conserved the historic landscape or scenic beauty and was contrary to paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
98. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The public rights of way adjacent to the site formed part of the longer Serpent Trail and New Lipchis Way routes
99. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
100. **SDNP/15/01024/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reason set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC65/15.

LEWES DISTRICT COUNCIL

ITEM 8: SDNP/15/01682FUL LAND AT KEYMER ROAD DITCHLING EAST SUSSEX

101. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
102. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Don McBeth spoke against the application as the Chair of Ditchling Parish Council
 - Tom Dufty spoke against the application representing himself as a resident of Ditchling
 - Crispin Mair spoke against the application representing himself as a resident of Ditchling

- Tezel Bahcheli spoke in support of the application as the Agent
 - Justin Wallden spoke in support of the application as the Applicant.
103. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC66/15), the update sheet, the public speaker comments and commented:
- Their sympathy for the applicant, and the rugby club, which was of great value and benefit to the community and young people in particular.
 - Their support for the expansion of sporting activities especially in rural areas.
 - Their commendation of the applicant's attempts to mitigate the impact of the proposal.
 - The difficulty of identifying a suitable alternative site within the settlement boundary.
 - The issues associated with siting of the pitches on a flood-plain, when even well-drained pitches could be subject to flooding during winter months.
 - With regard to the proposed carpark
 - Whether the capacity would be sufficient for the proposed usage
 - Whether it be required if the application for the proposed Lewes District Council carpark to the north of Keymer Road was agreed.
 - The concerns raised by the ecology and highways officers.
 - The importance of maintaining the semi-natural land that formed the settlement gap between Keymer and Ditchling villages.
 - The emerging Ditchling Neighbourhood Plan, and the importance of considering the community's desire to preserve the integrity of the settlement gap.
 - The impact of the proposed development, which would be especially visible whilst in use.
 - The urbanising influence of the proposal which would alter the rural character of the landscape, and was not sensitive to the setting or the National Park as a whole.
104. In response to questions officers clarified that whilst the response from Natural England had made reference to 'standing advice' the officers were confident the response was sufficiently pertinent to the application.
105. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
106. **SDNP/15/01682FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Paragraph 10.1 of report PC66/15 and the 10 September 2015 update sheet.

APPEALS

ITEM 9: SDNP/14/03650/HOUS & SDNP/14/03651/LIS OLD CHEALES BARN, THE VILLAGE, ALCISTON, POLEGATE, EAST SUSSEX

107. The Case Officer presented the appeal, and informed the Committee that officers would continue liaising with the applicant to address the issues raised by the Inspector, and keep the Parish Council apprised of progress.
108. The Director of Planning stated the importance of local community attendance at appeals which could give greater weight to the views they had expressed.
109. The Committee considered the report (PC67/15) and commented that decisions made by the Committee were being upheld at appeal, which gave assurance that a high quality of development could continue to be achieved.
110. In response to questions officers clarified that Inspectors decide the format for appeals, the majority of which are carried out via written representation.
111. The Director of Planning stated the scale and nature of the applications considered by the Planning Committee meant a significant number of related hearings and public inquiries, the results of which demonstrated a record of good decision making.
112. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee noted the report.

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 10: PETERSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (PNP) DECISION STATEMENT

113. The Responsible Officer presented the item.
114. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC68/15) and commented:
- Their congratulations to the community of Petersfield for producing an exemplary plan which could be used as a model for other communities wishing to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan.
 - The level of detail, quality, work and effort on behalf of the community and SDNPA officers that had gone into producing the Neighbourhood Development Plan, which was an intensive and relatively costly process compared to producing a Village Design Statement.
 - The frustration that the plan which had taken the community three years to produce could be amended according to the view of the Examiner.
115. In response to questions officers clarified:
- The Examiner had expressed concern with regard to the deliverability of the proposed 112 self builds, but had allowed their inclusion, and the deliverability of a number of other sites in the PNP. The Examiner identified a number of modifications to the PNP to ensure adequate housing was delivered and an appropriate level of social rented affordable housing was achieved in Petersfield,.
 - Local green spaces had been afforded the highest possible level of protection against development.
 - Work was being done with the Western Downs Area Team to consider management of a number of green spaces including grazing.
 - If the Committee were minded not to accept one or more of the Examiner's proposed modifications, a further consultation would need to take place and an Examiner appointed to review the evidence and feedback from the consultation.
116. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
117. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Noted the Examiner's Report and recommended modifications to make the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan meet the basic conditions.
 - 2) Agreed the 'Decision Statement' which sets out the modifications that will be made to the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan in response to the Examiner's recommendations

ITEM 11: ADOPTION OF WORLDHAM VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT AS A SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

118. The Responsible Officer presented the item.
119. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC69/15) and commented:
- Their thanks to the community of Worldham for the time and effort put in to producing the Village Design Statement.
 - The importance of Village Design Statements within the National Park with regard to defining and preserving local distinctiveness and character.
 - Their encouragement for local communities including Worldham to review the draft SDNPA Local Plan, and make representation with regard to local green spaces.
120. The Senior Solicitor clarified that the National Park Authority had delegated authority to the Planning Committee to approve the adoption of Village Design Statements.
- Clarification would be sought as to how adopted community led plans and other Supplementary Planning Documents would be linked to the SDNPA Local Plan, once this was adopted.

121. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
122. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee approved the adoption of Worldham Village Design Statement as a Supplementary Planning Document.

Chair

The meeting closed at 12:37pm.