

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

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

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

Present:

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

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Vicki Colwell (Senior Development Management Officer (East)) David Boyson (Historic Buildings Officer), Michael Scammell (Historic Buildings Officer), Amy Tyler Jones (Neighbourhood Policy Officer), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

140. The Chair informed all present that the meeting would be webcast, and that a member of the public wished to record the meeting.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES

141. Apologies were received from ex officio member Margaret Paren.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

142. Doug Jones declared a Public Service interest items 7 and 8, which were both in the Petersfield area, as the SDNPA Member representative on the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and a Parish Councillor for a neighbouring parish.

143. Robert Mocatta declared a public service in items 7 and 8 as a member of East Hampshire District Council, and having been involved in a peripheral manner with the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan, and in item 12 as a resident of East Meon.

144. David Coldwell declared a public service in item 10 as the Ward Councillor for the area and the farm concerned.

145. Neville Harrison declared a public service in item 9 as a member of the South Downs Society.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 8 OCTOBER 2015

146. The minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

147. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

148. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that the hearing of the Lewes Joint Core Strategy would resume on Wednesday 16 December 2015.

- Strategic Housing sites including Land at North Street would be considered on the afternoon of 16 December
- The allocation of Old Malling Farm would be considered on the morning of 17 December.
- Members were encouraged to attend the hearings.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

149. There were none.

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

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

150. The Senior Solicitor clarified that following concerns raised with regard to prematurity, there was no legal reason why items 7 and 8 on the meeting agenda should not be considered prior to the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP) referendum the following week, and delaying the applications on this account would be unreasonable. The applications did not require the Committee to consider the question of referendum but rather the weight to be afforded to a policy within the Plan, alongside other policies and material considerations.
151. In response to a Member query, the Director of Planning stated that Members could debate how much weight should be given to the relevant policies in the emerging Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan and whether prematurity could be perceived to be an issue.

ITEM 7: SDNP/15/01296/FUL SITE SOUTH OF LARCOMBE ROAD PETERSFIELD HAMPSHIRE

152. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
153. In response to Member queries, the Case Officer clarified:
- Following their initial objection, the Highways Authority had amended their response to no objection as outlined in report PC72/15.
 - Additional landscape plans had been submitted with the application which set out private and public areas, and the roads would be maintained to adopted standards by the proposed management company.
154. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Cllr Ben Bentley spoke against the application on behalf of Peter Conochie
 - Martin Reed spoke against the application on behalf of himself and other residents of Test Close and Orwell Road
 - Neil Hancock spoke against the application on behalf of himself
 - Ryan Johnson spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Applicant Persimmon Homes.
155. The Chair welcomed Stephen Jenkins, East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) Highways Manager.
156. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC72/15), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- With regard to highways and access:
 - Their frustration that access for the site could not be considered in broader terms.
 - The access was considered acceptable for a development of this scale and was not dependent on other access points.
 - The high volume of additional traffic movements in proportion to current levels.
 - The informal traffic calming afforded by parked vehicles.
 - The need to ensure any that the repair costs of damage to the road surface and soft verges caused during construction would be met by the developer.
 - Their concerns regarding:
 - Lack of details in the conditions relating to:
 - Details of construction materials.
 - The proposed hours of operation and delivery, size of vehicles, storage of materials and wheel washing arrangements.
 - The proportionate phasing of hard and soft landscaping.
 - The ongoing management and funding of the Landscape Management Plan and areas covered.

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

- Boundary treatments and fencing.
 - The comments made by the Hampshire Constabulary relating to the higher risk of crime associated with increased permeability, however permeability was considered beneficial by experts in other fields.
 - Considering the application after the PNP referendum would have been preferable.
 - The determining of planning applications was a statutory duty of the SDNPA.
 - The site had been a reserved Local Plan allocation for 10 years, and had a long standing status of being considered suitable for development.
 - The development was supported by the policies in the PNP.
 - The benefit of the provision of 40% affordable housing.
 - The lack of chimneys, and the need for schemes to follow the Petersfield Town Design Statement.
157. In response to questions officers clarified:
- With regard to highways and access:
 - The EHDC Development Brief considered the site in 2009 for approximately 100 dwellings with access from Larcombe Road, with potential limited access via Test Close and the Causeway.
 - The timing for additional access was dependent on adjacent sites coming forward, and the proposed layout had been designed to allow for future access and permeability.
 - The Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan had identified the site within areas H4 and H7 but these were not required to come forward together.
 - The initial reasons for refusal were standard responses based on a projected 140% morning and 150% evening peak increase.
 - Following a more detailed survey, the road was considered capable of accommodating a higher volume of traffic due to:
 - The adequate width of largely 5.1m, with narrower sections of 4.9m
 - The low speeds, helped by the presence of parked cars
 - The straight road alignment which afforded good forward visibility
 - The tidality and low volume of vehicle movements
 - The absence of any evidenced safety issues.
 - With regard to flood risk:
 - The Environment Agency had categorised the site as Flood Zone 1 (low probability)
 - The plans had been scrutinised by the Water Authority and EHDC Drainage Officer and found to be acceptable subject to the drainage conditions both for the site and elsewhere.
 - Contamination and remediation issues had been scrutinised by the Environment Agency Health Officer and Conditions 20-22 considered sufficiently robust.
 - The design and layout had resulted from pre-application advice that had been through both the Design Officer and the Design Review Panel
 - A panel of materials had been submitted, and clarification of design details including the bridge were covered by the conditions.
 - The design and layout of the proposal had been landscape-led taking into account to the stream and green swathes, with a reduction in dwelling numbers due to the landscape setting.
158. The Director of Planning informed Members that if they were minded to refuse the application on the grounds of prematurity, that clear indication would need to be given with regard to how giving permission for the application could prejudice the plan making process.

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

159. The Director of Planning summarised that if Members were minded to permit the application, the following amendments could be made:
- A Section 59 agreement could be included to cover reparation of any damage to the highway caused by construction traffic.
 - Condition 3 could be amended to include details of facing materials.
 - Condition 4 relating to the Construction Method Statement could be amended to cover hours of operation and delivery, storage of materials and materials, and wheel washing.
 - Condition 10 could be amended to include the phasing of soft landscaping and the ongoing management and funding of the Landscape Management and areas covered
 - Condition 11 could be amended to include phasing of hard landscaping, and 1.8m boundary fencing which would mitigate concerns raised by the Hampshire Constabulary.
160. It was proposed and seconded to delegate to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair the decision to grant planning permission subject to the completion of the legal agreements outlined in report PC72/15; the conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of report PC72/15, and the informative relating to the management of Land Contamination as set out in the 12 November 2015 Update sheet, with the amendments of Condition 3 to include details of facing materials, Condition 4 to include hours of operation and delivery, storage of materials, and vehicle arrangements, Condition 10 to include the phasing of soft landscaping and the ongoing management and funding of the Landscape Management and areas covered, Condition 11 to include phasing of hard landscaping, and boundary fencing; a Section 59 agreement to cover reparation of any damage to the highway caused by construction traffic; and the authority to refuse the application, with appropriate reasons if the s.106 agreement is not completed within 3 months of the 12 November 2015 Planning Committee meeting. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
161. **SDNP/15/01296/FUL RESOLVED:**
- 1) That the Committee delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair the decision to grant planning permission subject to:
 - a) The completion of a section 106 and section 59 legal agreement to secure:
 - A provision of 32 dwellings (40%) on site for affordable housing
 - A provision of on-site construction jobs
 - A contribution of £359,047 towards Primary Education
 - A contribution of £43,082 towards Public Open Space
 - A contribution of £298,855 towards Highways Infrastructure
 - A contribution of £103,140 towards Community Facilities
 - A contribution of £61,763 towards employment opportunities (if requirements set out in the Agreement to provide on-site construction jobs is not met)
 - Repair for any damage caused to the highway caused by construction traffic; and
 - b) The conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of report PC72/15, and the informative relating to the management of Land Contamination as set out in the 12 November 2015 Update sheet, with the following amendments:
 - a) Condition 3 to include details of facing materials
 - b) Condition 4 to include hours of operation and delivery, storage of materials and vehicle arrangements
 - c) Condition 10 to include the phasing of soft landscaping and the ongoing management and funding of the Landscape Management and areas covered
 - d) Condition 11 to include phasing of hard landscaping, and boundary fencing.
 - 2) The authority to refuse the application, with appropriate reasons if the s.106 agreement is not completed within 3 months of the 12 November 2015 Planning Committee meeting.

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

162. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11.50am

163. The meeting reconvened at 11.55am

ITEM 8: SDNP/14/04736/FUL PARIS HOUSE FRENCHMANS ROAD PETERSFIELD HAMPSHIRE GU32 3AW

164. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet. The Case Officer informed the Committee of additional letters of objection, and that the amended plans had minimal changes.

165. In answer to Member queries, the Director of Planning informed the Committee that it was increasingly common for roads within developments not to be adopted by Highways, which could afford the opportunity for securing improved landscaping schemes.

166. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:

- Tony Struthers spoke against the application on behalf of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
- Charles Mills spoke in support of the application as the agent.

167. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC73/15), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

- The ideal location of the site near to the railway station for smaller, starter business or live-work units, which were needed in Petersfield and the district as a whole.
- The high local demand for good quality office space.
- The design was innovative and striking, and suitable within a town context.
- The design was austere and lacked character.
- Their concerns regarding:
 - The loss of employment land, which was contrary to policy in the existing Development Plan and the emerging PNP.
 - The lack of any marketing of the site which was required by existing policy.
 - The relationship of the proposed buildings with the boundaries and surroundings, in particular
 - The loss of light due to trees sited on the Western boundary
 - The reliance on adjoining boundaries that were in multiple private ownership.
 - The available area of open space and habitable rooms close to boundaries which could result in potential conflict
 - The proximity to the industrial site on the Southern boundary and potential noise impact.
 - The change of recommendation at short notice, although this related to the level of affordable housing.
 - The unacceptably low level of affordable housing that had been offered.
- The need to have regard to National Park Purposes in all areas including industrial sites.

168. In response to questions officers clarified:

- There was ambiguity in the criteria contained within the EHDC saved policy, which dated to 2006, relating to viability and formal marketing activity.
- Whilst policy aspired to 40% affordable housing, this was subject to viability and following assessment the amount had been raised to 28%.
- Residents of neighbouring properties had expressed concern over potential loss of their boundary treatments and officers had considered no intervention was required to ensure security and privacy.

169. The Director of Planning summarised that if minded to refuse the application, Members had raised the following concerns that could be given as reasons for refusal:

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

- The change of use and loss of employment land which was against existing and emerging policies.
 - The unacceptable relationship of the proposed buildings with the adjacent boundaries
 - The low level of affordable housing offered.
170. It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application for the reasons of the loss of employment land which was against current and emerging Development Plan policies, the inappropriate relationship between the layout of the proposal and the adjacent boundary and the inadequate provision of affordable housing. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
171. **SDNP/14/04736/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons, with the final form of words being delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee:
- 1) The loss of employment land which was contrary to the policies outlined in the East Hampshire District Council District Local Plan: 2nd Rev (2006) and the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (adopted by East Hampshire District Council (May 2014) and South Downs National Park Authority (June 2014)), and the emerging Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan.
 - 2) The inappropriate relationship between the layout of the proposal and the adjacent boundary
 - 3) The inadequate provision of affordable housing.

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL

ITEM 9: SDNP/15/03672/FUL LAND AT LYONS WAY BROADWATER WORTHING WEST SUSSEX ARIS HOUSE FRENCHMANS ROAD PETERSFIELD HAMPSHIRE GU32 3AW

172. The Case Officer presented the application.
173. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC74/15) commented:
- Their thanks to the officer for a clear presentation and report.
 - The importance of protecting the National Park boundaries.
174. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
175. **SDNP/15/03672/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC74/15.

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

ITEM 10: LAND OPPOSITE ANNINGTON HOUSE, ANNINGTON ROAD, BRAMBER, WEST SUSSEX

176. The Responsible Officer presented the item and referred to a letter that had been sent to the Committee Members by DMH Stallard.
177. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Heidi Copland spoke against the item on behalf of Mr Andrew McPhee, owner of Annington House
 - Lizzie Wilson spoke in support of the item on behalf of the National Pig Association
 - Mrs Elizabeth Lawrence spoke in support of the item on behalf of Mr T Leddra
 - Thomas Leddra spoke in support of the item on behalf of himself and Leddra Farms LLP.
178. The Director of Planning reminded Members that in terms of total area the arcs should be considered both singly and cumulatively and the manner in and extent to which they were placed, and the question of visual or landscape impact was not a matter before the Committee.

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

179. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC75/15), and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The similar scenario of the cumulative impact of allotment sheds which may not be considered to be development in planning terms.
 - The farmer had gone to considerable lengths to respond to concerns expressed by walkers on the South Downs Way.
 - The assessed standards of good animal husbandry required reasonable space to be provided, and the density of arcs could not be above the required levels.
 - The exemplary nature of the farming practices undertaken on the farm were welcome, and whether further mitigation could be undertaken in future.
 - This was a legitimate free-range livestock farming activity in the National Park, of which 80% was farmed or managed land.
 - The thorough research that had been undertaken by officers and evidence gathered from other authorities.
 - The arcs were transportable and regularly moved, not attached to the ground, and not permanent structures.
 - The question being asked of Members related to a decision given by the Committee to permit silos, which had been quashed by the High Court, and the answer given by Members would be a view rather than a statutory decision.
180. In response to Member queries, the Director of Planning clarified:
- The Judge had not been prescriptive as to how the decision on whether pig arcs as placed constituted development should be taken.
 - The decision had been put before Members separately as the process for determining the various matters was complex, and the application for the feed silos would be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.
181. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
182. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed the pig arcs placed upon the land do not amount to 'development' as set out in Report PC75/15 and concluded at para 5.4'.
183. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 2.00pm
184. The meeting reconvened at 2.30pm

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 11: DROXFORD CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

185. The Responsible Officer presented the item and referred to the 12 November 2015 Update sheet.
186. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC76/15), and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The excellent work done by officers to collate the appraisal and their support for the proposed extensions to the Conservation Area.
187. In response to queries, officers clarified:
- The survey had identified new buildings of significance
 - Officers aspired to the creation of a Local List of Historic Buildings that extended across the National Park, which would require the assistance of local communities in identifying buildings according to a formal selection of criteria.
 - Potential additions to the Local List had been identified through the survey and would come back in a centralised form in due course.

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

188. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
189. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Approved the Droxford Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan attached at Appendix I of Report PC76/15 for the purposes of development management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partner organisations.
 - 2) Approved the proposed extensions to the Droxford Conservation Area as shown on the proposal map, attached at the end of Appendix I of Report PC76/15.

ITEM 12: EAST MEON CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

190. The Responsible Officer presented the item.
191. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC77/15), and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The need to monitor the state of the Old Forge, which was currently of a more dilapidated appearance than shown in the appraisal's photo.
192. In response to queries, officers clarified:
- Unless informed of a significant deterioration by the local community, officers carried out site visits to the Old Forge on a 6 monthly basis
193. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
194. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee approved the East Meon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan attached at Appendix I of Report PC77/15 for the purposes of development management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partner organisations.

ITEM 13: EXTON CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

195. The Responsible Officer presented the item.
196. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC78/15), and the public speaker comments, and commented their support for the proposed extensions to the Conservation Area.
197. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
198. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Approved the Exton Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan attached at Appendix I of Report PC77/15 for the purposes of development management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partner organisations.
 - 2) Approved the proposed extensions to the Exton Conservation Area as shown on the proposal map, attached at the end of Appendix I of Report PC77/15.

ITEM 14: FERNHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN DECISION STATEMENT PLAN

199. The Responsible Officer presented the item.
200. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC79/15), and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Their thanks to the officer for a clear report.
 - The welcome progress made to date with the Plan, and the positive influence of the Inspector on the plan making process.

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

- The exceptional quality of development that was required for the National Park’s strategic sites.
 - The Syngenta site allocation which now outlined an excellent proposal and set of principles.
201. In response to queries, officers clarified that the viability analysis undertaken for the Syngenta site had demonstrated that 40% affordable housing was achievable, and that 50% was being sought as it related to a long-term policy and delivery mechanism with the site due to come forward at a later date.
202. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
203. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Noted the Examiner’s Report and recommended modifications to make the Fernhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan meet the basic conditions.
 - 2) Agreed the ‘Decision Statement’ set out at Appendix 2 of Report PC79/15, which sets out the modifications that will be made to the Fernhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan in response to the Examiner’s recommendations, with Authority delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to agree and make minor modifications prior to publication.”

CHAIR

204. The meeting closed at 4.17pm.

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