

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee
SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 10 MARCH 2016**

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

Present:

Neville Harrison (Chair)	Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones	Tom Jones
Diana Kershaw	Robert Mocatta	Ian Phillips	
Norman Dingemans (ex officio)		Margaret Paren (ex officio)	

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Vicki Colwell (Senior Development Management Officer (East)), Veronica Craddock (Landscape Officer), Claire Potts (Minerals & Waste Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Anna Ludford (Planning Policy Officer), Michael Scammell (Historic Buildings Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

354. Apologies were received from Alun Alesbury, David Coldwell and Gary Marsh.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

355. Tom Jones declared a public service interest in Item 11 as a member of Lewes District Council.

356. Neville Harrison declared a public service in Items 8 and 11 as a member of the South Downs Society.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2016

357. The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

358. There were none

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

359. The Development Manager informed the Committee that following the completion of the SI06 agreement, the decision for South Downs Road in Lewes had been issued on 9 March 2016.

360. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that 88% of voters at the Fernhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan referendum on 2 March 2016 had supported the plan

- The plan included the allocation of the Syngenta site
- Following close work with the community and their agent, the site would be allocated as a mixed use site, including approximately 200 new homes and utilising some of the existing built structures with additional development.
- The Plan would come back before the Committee to be 'made' before forming part of the future Development Plan.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

361. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

SDNPA (WEALDEN)

ITEM 7: SDNP/15/05656/FUL, RATHFINNY ESTATE WHITEWAY ALFRISTON EAST SUSSEX BN26 5TU

362. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the 10 March 2016 Update sheet.

363. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:

- Adrian Moore spoke in support of the application as the agent
- David Hares spoke in support of the application as the landscape architect
- Mark Driver spoke in support of the application as the applicant

364. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC11/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

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

- Their acknowledgement that the new buildings needed to be sited on the estate for reasons of practicality.
- The proposal passed the major development test, and there were no outstanding issues regarding the design, colour, traffic management etc.
- The careful siting of the proposed new buildings and sophisticated design including choice of colour, which minimised their impact on the landscape.
- The benefit of realigning the estate road which would better reflect the landscape contours.
- The exemplary quality of the existing new development as seen by Members on the site visit, and the effort that had been made to harmoniously blend these with the landscape including the use of sculpted mounds.
- The proposal reflected the changing face of farming in the South Downs that could reshape the landscape, and deserved close attention.
- The evolution of the estate, from when it had first been seen by Members in 2010, was exciting, and the exemplary cooperation with the SDNPA to achieve a high quality development, and the production of one of the first Estate Master Plans.
- Viticulture was a growing farm industry in the South Downs National Park that could respond to issues such as climate change, and the SDNPA should support new initiatives.
- The need to preserve the farmed landscape and support farm diversification, which afforded local economic benefit, which sometimes required large scale development.
- Future viticulture proposals could be encouraged to develop a more innovative and aesthetic architectural design approach for new buildings of such scale and mass, rather than simply mitigate.
- Whether the oak cladding of the cattle sheds included in the original permission would be carried out.
- Support for conditioning the inclusion of an optional larger panel for colour testing as outlined in the 10 March 2016 Update Sheet.

365. In response to these comments and other Member queries, officers clarified:

- The differing shades for the roof and walls and proportionate size of the colour blocks would break up the overall mass of the buildings and allow them to better sit in the landscape.
- The roof colour reflected the traditional slate roofs of local agricultural buildings.

366. The Director of Planning stated the multiple benefits secured through the Estate Master Plan, including permissive paths, onsite accommodation for workers and visitors, local employment and small scale natural energy production demonstrated the success of Master Plans, the concepts of which were embedded in the SDNPA Local Plan.

367. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation and include a further condition relating to the preparation of a large sample panel of the roofing material. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

368. **SDNP/15/05656/FUL RESOLVED** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC11/16 and the 10 March 2016 Update Sheet, and a further condition relating to the preparation of a large sample panel of the roofing material, the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning.

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

ITEM 8: SDNP/13/00643/FUL, LAND OPPOSITE ANNINGTON HOUSE ANNINGTON ROAD BRAMBER WEST SUSSEX

369. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the 10 March 2016 Update sheet.

370. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:

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

- Heidi Copland spoke against the application on behalf of Andrew McPhee of Annington House
 - Elizabeth Lawrence spoke in support of the application as the agent
 - Tom Leddra spoke in support of the application as the applicant
 - Joseph Leddra spoke in support of the application on behalf of Lizzie Wilson.
371. The Director of Planning clarified that the only occasion officers had formerly considered that the arcs could require planning permission was when a factor not relevant to the determination of what constituted development was engaged. The impact on the landscape could not be included as a factor in addition to the 3 tests of size, permanence and degree of physical attachment in the consideration of whether the arcs were development.
372. In response to Members' requests for clarification regarding the need to re-consider whether the pig arcs amounted to development, the Senior Solicitor clarified:
- The judgement of Justice Dove had required that the Committee consider the question as to whether the pig arcs amounted to development that require planning permission before considering the planning application.
 - As it was a complex issue, officers had considered it appropriate to firstly ask the Committee to come to a view regarding whether the pig arcs amounted to development and consider the silos application at a later occasion.
 - Whilst the Committee had reached a view in November with regard to the arcs, as the silos application was now before them officers considered it appropriate for them to turn their mind to the question once more and come to a view again before considering the application.
 - The view of officers as outlined in the appended November report remained the same.
 - The Committee were being asked to agree with the officer's recommendation that the pig arcs did not amount to development.
373. The Director of Planning stated:
- Justice Dove had not directed whether the arcs question should be posed separately to the Committee or alongside the silos application.
 - The challenge was for the Committee to consider a planning matter that was not part of a formal planning application.
374. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC12/16) and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- With regard to the pig arcs and whether these amounted to development:
 - The Committee had participated in a full debate of all elements at the 12 November 2015 meeting.
 - Members had observed arcs being moved at the site visit, and had seen no evidence of tethering or digging in.
 - Whilst the arcs had a landscape impact, this was not the issue before the Committee.
 - According to the tests of size, permanence and degree of attachment it was clear that the arcs did not amount to development.
 - It would be preferable to replace the word 'agree' in the officer's first recommendation with 'consider'.
375. It was proposed and seconded to amend the officer's first recommendation to replace the word 'agreed' with 'considered'. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
376. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the amended recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried
377. **SDNP/15/05656/FUL RESOLVED** That the Committee considered the pig arcs placed upon the land do not amount to 'development'.
378. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC12/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

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

- With regard to the silos:
 - There was a clear need for the silos, which had been appropriately sited close to the road and were relatively well screened.
 - The silos had been relocated from Fittleworth which was also in the National Park.
 - The current site was in a sensitive location close to a listed building and adequate screening should be secured whilst the silos remained in place.
 - The need to increase the replacement planting protection beyond 5 years.

379. In response to these and other queries, officers clarified:

 - Condition 1 could be amended to require the removal of the silos if farming activity ceased, as requested by the solicitor's letter of 9 March.
 - Condition 5 relating to landscape management could be amended to include a longer replacement protection as part of a long term landscape management plan.

380. It was proposed and seconded to amend the officer's recommendation, with the amendment of Condition 1 to include wording relating to the removal of the silos should agricultural activity cease, and Condition 5 to increase the period for replacement planting through a landscape management plan. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

381. **SDNP/15/05656/FUL RESOLVED** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of Report PC12/16, with the amendment of Condition 1 to include wording relating to the removal of the silos should agricultural activity cease, and Condition 5 to increase the period for replacement planting through a landscape management plan, the final wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning.

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 9: APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT WEST SUSSEX JOINT MINERALS LOCAL PLAN

382. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the 10 March 2016 Update sheet.
383. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC13/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Their support for the plan, which broadened responsibility for minerals sites.
 - The draft plan had been considered extensively by the SDNPA's Local Plan Members Working Group.
 - The need to ensure mitigation efforts were as strong as possible.
 - Whether the SDNPA could seek to influence conservation of the marine environment which could be affected by aggregate dredging.
 - The national demand for silica sand and the cooperation required by other mineral authorities to ensure supplies.
 - Their concerns regarding policy M7 (Hydrocarbons)
 - Whether this could be strengthened, given that underground activity could have other issues including affecting water supply, and considering the different stages and methods of conventional and unconventional extraction.
 - The SDNPA's legal advice indicated that the Ellsworth test applied countrywide, and not just to the target reservoir as stated in Exploration and Appraisal a) (iii).
 - Whether conventional exploration could be extended into non-conventional fracking, and if so that this would not be applicable in a National Park.
 - The need for any associated monitoring and other elements to be included in the policy.
 - This was a crucial policy that was important to the public, and the Government position was not yet clear.
 - It would be helpful to have two separate policies split into conventional and non-conventional oil and gas exploration.

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

- Additional concerns regarding
 - The need to include the protection of aquifers within Strategic Objective 10.
 - The need to strengthen Policy M25 relating to community engagement so that this would only be precluded by exception.
 - Whether proposals for the restoration of sites would be sufficiently flexible to allow for changes in circumstances and the possibility that some sites could benefit from partial restoration.
384. In response to these and other queries, officers clarified:
- Whilst there were currently no dredging ships offloading at Littlehampton, the existing coated roadstone plant and future wharf capacity required protection.
 - Whilst the marine environment was important, licensing processes were in place to protect it, and the SDNPA remained focused on the Joint Plan which directly affected communities within the National Park.
 - Clarification would be sought as to the requirement for monitoring stations along radial drill extensions, as these would need to be included in any application for unconventional oil and gas exploration.
 - Officers would continue working in partnership with West Sussex County Council to take the Committee's concerns into account.
385. It was proposed and seconded to amend the officer's recommendation subject to amendments being made to Policy M7, and other minor changes raised by Members in their debate, the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
386. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee recommended the National Park Authority to:
- 1) Approve the draft West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Appendix 1 of Report PC14/16) at its meeting on 24 March for publication and consultation for eight weeks commencing in April in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, subject to amendments being made to Policy M7, and other minor changes raised by Members in their debate, the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning
 - 2) Authorise the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to agree any further minor changes to the draft West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan with West Sussex County Council.

ITEM 10: CHAPTERS 1 TO 3 AND CORE POLICIES OF THE PUBLICATION OR PRE-SUBMISSION SOUTH DOWNS LOCAL PLAN

387. The Responsible Officers [presented the item](#).
388. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC14/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- With regard to Chapter 1 Introduction
 - Whether figure 1.2 adequately explained Natural Capital and Ecosystems, and further input from the South Downs Partnership could be beneficial.
 - The improvements that had been made particularly to the explanations relating to Neighbourhood Development Plans and Minerals and Waste.
 - With regard to Chapter 4 Core Policies
 - The need for further information and explanation regarding the level and type of information that applicants were required to provide for validation, particularly in relation to sustainability issues.
 - The welcome inclusion of cumulative impact in policy SD1 relating to Sustainable Development.
389. In response to queries, officers clarified:
- The term 'cumulative' included 'in combination'.

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

- It would be reasonable to include the impact of cumulative development of proposals within and on the boundary with the National Park in relation to SD1.
 - The title of SD1 could be amended to remove the wording ‘in the South Downs National Park’ and further wording included in the explanatory text.
 - Consideration of the cumulative impact of proposals outside the National Park in relation to SD3 Major Development was well established.
 - A definition of ‘validation checklist’ would be added to the Glossary.
390. The Committee thanked Planning Policy Officer Anna Ludford for the significant input she had made to the Local Plan, and wished her well in her new post.
391. **SDNP/15/03004/FUL** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
392. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Endorsed the direction of the draft chapters and policies as detailed in Appendix 1 to 4 of Report PC14/16 for inclusion in the Publication or Pre-Submission Local Plan document, subject to any comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed.
 - 2) Noted that the Publication or Pre-Submission Local Plan will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
 - 3) Noted that the Publication or Pre-Submission Local Plan document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority.

ITEM 11: MALLING DEANERY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

393. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the 10 March 2016 Update sheet.
394. Robert Cheesman spoke on the item on behalf of the Friends of Lewes and the South Downs Society.
395. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC15/16) and commented:
- This was a welcome appraisal that was attractive, clear and concise.
 - The need for such detailed documents, which helped to maintain the individual character of conservation areas.
 - Members would benefit from including CAAMP conservation areas in site visits.
396. In response to queries, officers clarified:
- Whilst there was some conjectural and factual evidence to support the extension of the conservation area, extensions were normally made to contiguous areas with similar elements, and in this case there was a large degree of separation between the two sites.
 - Seeking to extend the conservation area was not advisable whilst the outcome of the examination of the Lewes Joint Core Strategy and allocation of the adjacent Old Malling Farm site was not yet known.
397. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
398. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee approved the Malling Deanery Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan attached at Appendix 1 of Report PC15/16 for the purposes of Development Management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partner organisations.

CHAIR

399. The meeting closed at 1.14pm.

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 APRIL 2016**

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

Present:

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

SDNPA Officers: Trevor Beattie (Chief Executive Officer), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Richard Ferguson (Area Development Management Lead (West)), Jody Slater (Design Officer), Claire Potts (Minerals & Waste Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Sarah Nelson (Strategic Planning Lead), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

399. There were none.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

400. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Item 7 as a member of East Hampshire District Council. He knew two of the public speakers against the item, one as a fellow councillor and one through his involvement with the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP), and was also Secretary of the Petersfield Rugby Club which had been sponsored in the past by David Wilson Homes.

401. Doug Jones declared a public service interest in Item 7 as he know one of the public speakers and several of the neighbours living adjacent to the site.

402. Neville Harrison declared a public service in Item 7 as a member of the South Downs Society.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 MARCH 2016

403. With the addition of the minute as detailed in the 14 April 2016 Update Sheet, confirming that Robert Cheesman spoke on Item 11 Malling Deanery CAAMP on behalf of the South Downs Society, the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

404. There were none

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

405. The Development Manager informed the Committee that the Public Inquiry into the application for change of use to agricultural and equestrian use at Brackenwood was due to commence on 17 May 2016 and expected to last 4 days.

406. The Planning Policy Manager informed the Committee with regard to the Lewes District Joint Core Strategy (JCS):

- The Inspector's final report had now been received along with an appendix of Main Modifications. These would be considered by the Committee at the meeting on 12 May 2016 and by the full National Park Authority on 23 June 2016.
- The Main Modifications included the additional strategic site allocation at Old Malling Farm for approximately 240 homes.
- The adoption of the Lewes JCS would provide certainty for the local community who were working on the Lewes Neighbourhood Development Plan. The housing requirement for Lewes remained at 220.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

407. There were none.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
ITEM 7: SDNP/15/05258/FUL, LAND AT CAUSEWAY FARM, THE CAUSEWAY,
PETERSFIELD HAMPSHIRE GU31 4LL**

408. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the update sheet. He informed the Committee that since publication of the update sheet, a further two letters of representation objecting to the application had been received, including one from the Broadway Park Association, raising issues that had already been highlighted in the representations section of the report.
409. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Christopher Napier spoke against the application on behalf CPRE Hampshire and the Petersfield Society
 - Cllr Jamie Matthews spoke against the application as a member of Petersfield Town Council
 - Cllr Ben Bentley spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor
 - Stuart Goodwill spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
410. The Planning Committee Chair stated that the Members of the Committee had visited the site on other occasions including a site visit last week, and were familiar with the landscape and setting.
411. In response to Members' points for clarification, officers confirmed:
- With regard to the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) and sewerage:
 - The sewerage works carried out recently related to a different development.
 - In the previous appeal, the Inspector had not objected to the siting of the SuDS pond adjacent to the Criddell Stream.
 - The location of the SuDS pond was a technical issue and dependent on topography.
 - The SuDS scheme had been scrutinised and found satisfactory by all statutory consultees including Southern Water and the SDNPA Sustainability Officer.
 - Permeable surfacing materials that would satisfy the policy requirements of the PNP could be secured through discharge of the materials conditions.
 - With regard to footpaths:
 - The new footpaths were grassed and proposed to link with the footbridge to the north east of the site.
 - The protection and appropriate upgrading of existing footpaths that were proposed to remain within ownership of the landowner could be secured through delivery of the S106 process.
 - With regard to the proposed Highways Works, the Senior Solicitor clarified:
 - Hampshire County Council had confirmed that all the land upon which the proposed highways works would take place was designated public highway.
 - This meant that whilst the subsoil of the grassed verge might be in the private ownership of residents, the proposed highway works could still be delivered.
 - The housing mix allowed for a greater number of smaller 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings than was required under the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP) policy, and would allow for elderly residents wishing to downsize.
 - The development had passed a Buildings for Life Standards assessment.
 - The size and floor plans of the various dwellings were standard, however the details of external finishing such as canopy porches were bespoke, and had been informed by the Petersfield Pattern Book and Town Design Statement. The site layout was also bespoke, reflecting the site constraints and built environment of Petersfield.
 - The applicant had submitted amended plans following a recent officer-level workshop in order to resolve the concerns raised by the Design Officer.

- Demarcation between private and public space had been built into the design of the boundary treatments to avoid ambiguity for management and maintenance.
- The applicant had carried out two public exhibitions; one for the previous scheme of 159 dwellings and a subsequent event following the Inspector's report on the PNP which had raised the allocation for the site to 200 dwellings.

412. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC16/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

- This was the first time the Committee had considered an application with the policy background of a Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- The PNP was a comprehensive and significant document, and due weight should be given to all of its policies, including the requirement for a high quality scheme on this sensitive site.
- Their support for the development in principle which was in accordance with the Development Plan.
- The local housing need could not be met by windfall, and the need to accept larger housing allocations within the National Park.
- This was a proposal for major development in the National Park, and would set an example for developments of a similar type.
- Their commendation of the applicant's achievement of 40% affordable housing, which ideally should not be rendered to avoid costly upkeep.
- The applicant had worked hard to address the Design Officer's concerns, as demonstrated by the recently submitted plans, however the design detail was still 'work in progress' and the new plans only a statement of intent.
- A view that the development was too high-density, and that one of the 3-storey dwellings could impact the outlook of the Causeway houses.
- A reservation regarding further design iterations which could affect affordable housing viability.
- The attractive design of the proposed eastern facing dwellings that faced onto the open countryside.
- The eastern edge of the development had a stark appearance and the dwellings could be more widely dispersed.
- The location of the SuDS pond was topographically sensible and not inappropriate.
- The SuDS pond only met minimum standards, and there was no evidence that alternative sites had been considered closer to the source.
- Their concerns regarding:
 - The recently amended plans contained significant design changes, and more design detail was required including an overall vision of what the development would look like, particularly the eastern edge streetscape.
 - National Space Standards, which would not be met by 5 of the proposed dwellings.
 - The need to secure the protection and maintenance of public footpaths through provision of a contribution in the S106 agreement, and for the status of these to be clarified.
 - The lack of provision of a cycling route into town that avoided the main Causeway.
 - The sewerage and drainage strategy, including lack of detail regarding surfacing materials, and the siting of the SuDS pond in a sensitive landscape location some distance from the source, which formed part of the PNP's G2 Local Green Space allocation and was visible from a footpath.
 - The lack of detail regarding proposed lighting, particularly on the Eastern edge, in view of the importance of the already thin core and buffer zones of the proposed Dark Night Sky Reserve between Petersfield and Clanfield.
 - The status of protection of the rectangular area of designated Local Green Space that had been excluded from the application, as this had a major impact on the rest

of the development, landscape space and setting, and how this would be accessed by the landowner for maintenance purposes.

- A high quality of design was expected in the National Park, particularly for developments of this scale and significance, and uncertainty as to whether the level of design detail still required could be satisfactorily dealt with under condition.

413. In response to Member queries, officers clarified:
- The building density was 32 dwellings per hectare across the site.
 - Details of the proposed Management Company's conveyancing arrangements could be dealt with under the S106 agreement.
414. The Development Manager stated that officers considered the application could achieve the quality of design aspired to by the PNP through condition, and if the Committee was minded to defer the application, Members would need to clearly identify which elements required a greater level of detail.
415. The Senior Solicitor stated that if the Committee was minded to defer the application, officers would bring the application back as soon as possible and hopefully to the next meeting. It was not advisable to set a time frame for this however as new information could come forward and that may require advertising.
416. It was proposed and seconded to defer determination of the application in order for clarification of the concerns raised by the Committee, relating to sewerage system and capacity; the SUDs pond location, reasonable alternatives and boundary treatments; protection and maintenance of public footpaths both on-site and off-site through the S106 agreement, and clarification of their status; provision of cycle access into Petersfield; the quality of design, in particular the eastern outward facing element; the status of the rectangular green space, its impact on the proposed development and access in to it; National Space Standards across the development and lighting provision across the development, to be sought. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
417. **SDNP/15/05258/FUL RESOLVED:** That determination of the application be deferred in order for the following information to be clarified:
- Sewerage system and capacity
 - SUDs pond location and reasonable alternatives along with boundary treatments
 - Protection and maintenance of public footpaths both on-site and off-site through the S106 agreement, and clarification of their status
 - Provision of cycle access into Petersfield
 - Quality of design, in particular the east outward facing element
 - The status of the rectangular green space and its impact on the proposed development and access to it
 - National Space Standards across the development
 - Lighting provision across the development.

SDNPA (ARUN)

ITEM 8: SDNP/15/06447/FUL, AYLINGS BARN, SOUTH LANE, HOUGHTON, WEST SUSSEX BN18 9LN

418. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the update sheet.
419. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Dr Stephen Cass spoke against the application on behalf of himself
 - Dr Stephen Cass read a statement against the application on behalf of Miranda Symington and other neighbours
 - Susan Ayling spoke in support of the application on behalf of herself and her husband as the applicants
 - Richard Sloman spoke in support of the application as the agent.

420. In response to Members' points for clarification, officers confirmed:
- The consent granted in 2011 related to the rebuilding of the existing building for agricultural purposes.
 - Renovation works to the roof and timber frame had been carried out, however the corrugated iron extension predating the permission had not been replaced.
 - No response had been received from Houghton Parish Council.
421. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC17/16) the update sheet, and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Their support for the proposal, which would improve the appearance of the existing structure.
 - The building was sited against a village backdrop and not an isolated rural barn.
 - The contemporary style of the proposal, which had previously worked well in other examples of old building conversions.
 - The change of use of redundant farm buildings to residential was accepted practice.
 - The SDNPA was supportive of farm diversification, and the proposal was aligned with the National Park's Purpose 2.
 - The importance of securing appropriate treatment of the proposed garden and boundary, including hard landscaping, lighting and ancillary structures, given that this was currently 'meadow'.
 - The design of the garden including structures and planting should seek to mitigate the impact of the building on the wider setting of the National Park landscape and conservation area.
 - The extent of the glazing on the southern aspect, and the need to reduce as far as possible the overspill of light through condition, including the use of non-reflective glass.
422. In response to Member queries, officers clarified that the Landscape Officer would be consulted when the landscape plans were submitted.
423. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with the amendment of Condition 4 to include details of proposed hard and soft landscaping. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
424. **SDNP/15/06447/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC17/16 and the 14 April 2016 Update Sheet, with the amendment of Condition 4 to include details of proposed hard and soft landscaping, the final wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning.

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 9: EAST SUSSEX, SOUTH DOWNS AND BRIGHTON & HOVE WASTE AND MINERALS SITES PLAN – REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION

425. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the update sheet.
426. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC18/16).
427. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
428. **RESOLVED:** That the Planning Committee:
- 1) Agreed to the proposed approach to the Objections to the Pre-Submission Waste and Minerals Sites Plan (WMSP), and to the submission of draft Main Modifications to the Inspector as set out in Appendix 3 of Report PC18/16; and thereby alter the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme to reflect the revised programme;
 - 2) Authorised the Director Planning to agree, in consultation with East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council, for subsequent public consultation, the draft Main Modifications and any further Main Modifications arising from the Public Examination necessary to make the Waste and Minerals Sites Plan sound, except where

- any subsequent change would involve a significant shift in the policy approach whereby this would be referred to Planning Committee for approval prior to public consultation;
- 3) Authorised the Director of Planning to make, if necessary, minor changes to the document arising from any views of the East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council, or, arising from the Public Examination; and
 - 4) Noted that all Main and Minor Modifications to the Plan will ultimately be presented to Planning Committee and the Full Authority in due course as part of the Adoption of the Waste and Minerals Sites Plan.
429. The Committee thanked the Minerals & Waste Manager, Claire Potts, for the significant input she had made over the last years, and wished her well in her new post.

ITEM 10: MAKING OF THE FERNHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

430. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#).
431. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/16) and commended the Fernhurst community for achieving the creation of one of the fore-running Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs), and satisfactorily resolving the issues that had been identified by officers.
432. In response to Member queries, officers clarified:
- The weather on the referendum day was very bad and had likely affected voting turnout.
 - The Syngenta application was in the early stages of pre-application advice, and as with any pre-application, officers encouraged developers to engage with the stakeholder community.
433. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
434. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Noted the outcomes of the Fernhurst referendum
 - 2) Agreed to make the Fernhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan

ITEM 11: SDNPA RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION (REG 16) CONSULTATION ON THE FINDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

435. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the 14 April 2016 update sheet.
436. The Committee heard from Cllr Peter Goldsworthy, who spoke in support of the Plan on behalf of Findon Parish Council.
437. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Their recognition of the huge amount of time and effort involved in making a NDP, and understanding of the disappointment expressed by the Parish Council, however that the comments made by officers and Members were constructive.
 - Their sympathy for the position of the Parish Council, given that large housing allocations were not usually expected in a National Park.
 - National Parks were required by the 2010 National Parks Circular to deliver affordable housing, and large new developments did occur in other National Parks.
 - The need for communities to heed advice given by officers to ensure NDPs would be consistent with the emerging South Downs Local Plan, and in the case of Findon, there were particular issues relating to inconsistency of site assessment, affordable housing provision and duplication of policies.
 - The risk that the Inspector would find the site surveys inconsistent, as had recently occurred with the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan.
 - It was in the interest of the community to identify housing sites as responsibility for this would otherwise be taken by the SDNPA.

- It might be possible to identify infill sites that could provide the requisite number of new houses.
- Existing footpaths would be best dealt with under policy GA2 relating to the Footpath and cycle path network, rather than policy GA1 relating to Sustainable Transport.

438. In response to queries, officers clarified:

- The only requisite of a NDP is that it conforms to the extant Local Plan. Whilst NDPs were not required to make allocations, this raised an issue of longevity as without allocations the Findon NDP would not conform with, and soon be superseded by, the emerging South Downs Local Plan.
- The SDNPA had carried out a number of calls for sites, with the most recent towards the end of 2015.
- The sites that had come forward had not yet been fully assessed, and whilst it was the aim of the SDNPA to have assessed all sites for NDPs approaching submission, the Findon Plan had already been submitted.
- Although assessment of the sites could be carried out in the next few weeks, the lack of consistency in approach to the site assessments carried out by the Neighbourhood Planning Group remained an issue, and it could take a number of months for the requisite evidence to be collated.
- Neighbourhood planning groups could allocate smaller sites of 5 dwellings or less in order to meet housing requirements, and thereby have input into the process.
- The consultation was due to close on 15 April 2016, and the SDNPA would collate all representations and background documents before sending these to the Inspector.
- The community could choose to consider options before proceeding straight to examination, otherwise the examination would take place in May 2016, with the Inspectors report due in June or July 2016.

439. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the recommendation, and to include in the Table of Comments the exclusion of reference to footpaths in policy GA1 relating to Sustainable Transport, as this was covered by policy GA2 relating to the Footpath and cycle path network. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

440. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- 1) Agreed the Table of Comments as set out in Appendix 3 of Report PC20/16 and the 14 April 2016 Update Sheet, which will form SDNPA's representation to the Independent Examiner of the Findon NDP, with a further amendment removing reference to footpaths in policy GA1
- 2) Noted that the SDNPA will seek to allocate sites as necessary in the emerging South Downs Local Plan to meet the development requirements for Findon.

ITEM 12: SDNPA RESPONSE TO PRE-SUBMISSION (REG 14) CONSULTATION ON THE LAVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

441. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the 14 April 2016 update sheet.

442. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:

- Cllr Robert Newman read a statement on behalf of Cllr Ian Hutton in support of the Plan as the Chair of Lavant Parish Council
- Cllr Robert Newman spoke in support of the Plan as a member of Lavant Parish Council.

443. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC21/16), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and commented:

- The effort put in by the Parish Council into creating a very attractive document.
- Their reservations regarding:
 - The proposed relocation of the playing field into the Local Gap, particularly in light of the policy CNDP which aspired to protecting the Local Gap site and not allowing its diminution.

- The proposal to develop the industrial estate which currently provided economic rental solutions for small businesses although current occupancy was unclear.

444. In response to queries, officers clarified:

- Clarity was being sought with regard to occupancy of the industrial site.
- Policy CNDP relating to protection of the Local Gap could serve to prevent incremental increase of ancillary structures relating to the re-sited playing field such as parking areas and pavilions.
- As this was the pre-submission stage, there was adequate time to address the issues that had been highlighted.

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

446. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed the Table of Comments as set out in Appendix 3 of Report PC21/16 and the 14 April 2016 Update Sheet which will form the SDNPA representation to the Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan pre-submission consultation.

ITEM 13: ADOPTION OF EAST DEAN AND FRISTON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT AS A SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

447. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#), highlighting two further amendments to the statement including revision of the status of the Clergy House to delisted (DL), and a modification to the Map on p34.

448. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/16) and commented:

- This was an excellent Village Design Statement, and it was commendable that communities saw value in producing this type of document which was cost effective compared to NDPs.
- Support for the village of Friston which had opted to retain no street lighting.

449. In response to queries, officers clarified:

- There was no requirement to replace the word 'must' with 'should' as this was not statutory policy and the meaning was identical.
- The community had focused their time and effort on the built area of the Parish and had not considered the issues of erosion and potential engineering intervention at Birling Gap.

450. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with the revised delisted (DL) status of the Clergy House and modification to the Map on p34 as outlined in the officer's presentation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

451. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee approved the adoption of East Dean and Friston Village Design Statement as a Supplementary Planning Document, as amended to include the revised delisted (DL) status of the Clergy House and modification to the Map on p34.

452. **CHAIR**

453. The meeting closed at 3.10pm.

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 MAY 2016**

Held at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:02am.

Present:

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

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Richard Ferguson (Area Development Management Lead (West)), Jody Slater (Design Officer), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead), David Boyson (Historic Buildings Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

454. There were none.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

455. Tom Jones declared a public service interest in Item 11 as a member of Lewes District Council.
456. Doug Jones declared a public service interest in Item 7 as he knew people living adjacent to the site, and was familiar with the names of the public speakers.
457. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Item 7 as a member of East Hampshire District Council, and knew one of the public speakers against the item. He had contributed to the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP), and was also Secretary of the Petersfield Rugby Club which had been sponsored in the past by David Wilson Homes.
458. Neville Harrison declared a public service in Items 7 and 11 as a member of the South Downs Society.
459. Margaret Paren declared an interest in item 10 as detailed in minute 488.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14 APRIL 2016

460. The minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

461. There were none

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

462. There were none

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

463. There were none.

464. Committee Member Barbara Holyome joined the committee at 10:10am.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**ITEM 7: SDNP/15/05258/FUL, LAND AT CAUSEWAY FARM, THE CAUSEWAY,
PETERSFIELD HAMPSHIRE GU31 4LL**

465. The Case Officer [presented the application](#), which focused on the deferred issues from the previous meeting, and referred to the update sheet.
466. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Cllr James Deane spoke against the application as a member of Petersfield Town Council
 - Christopher Napier spoke against the application on behalf CPRE Hampshire
 - Richard Barnes spoke against the application on behalf of the Broadway Park retirement park
 - Stuart Goodwill spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
467. In response to Members' points for clarification, officers confirmed:
- With regard to paths

- The paths indicated on the plans linking with Footpath 37 would become dedicated public footpaths maintained by the applicant.
 - The process of dedication could be achieved through the S106 agreement, following which the paths would be added to the definitive maps by the Highways Authority.
 - With regard to surfacing
 - Due to traffic volume permeable surfaces had not been considered practical for adopted roads within the site.
 - The statutory consultees had not required permeable surfacing to be used, however officers could seek to secure further permeable surfaces where possible through negotiation and condition.
 - With regard to cycle routes
 - Traffic speeds would be low, and there were no proposed new cycle routes within the scheme.
 - The existing cycle access would be maintained, and improvements made to the existing routes along the Causeway and beyond the Tesco's crossroads.
 - The new footpaths would be surfaced with hoggin.
 - The disposal of excavated soil from the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) pond was covered in Condition 19 relating to the Construction Management Plan.
 - All hedges were outside the palisade fence boundaries that demarcated private ownership, and therefore would be protected through the Landscape Management Scheme.
 - The access from the Causeway had been redesigned with further landscaping to appear less engineered, and maintained current trees, footpaths and cycle links
468. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The deferral of the application had been a worthwhile exercise and had resulted in a much better scheme
 - Their commendation of officers and the applicant who had worked hard to make significant, valuable and worthwhile improvements, in particular:
 - The design of the areas of public realm
 - The public right of way status of the footpaths.
 - The need for the SDNPA to exact a high quality and standard of design from large scale developments.
 - A better design and layout could be achieved when highways were unadopted
 - Painted brickwork should be avoided on the affordable housing to avoid unnecessary cost to the Housing Association.
 - A request for mixed native species to be used for the hedgerows.
 - The siting of the SuDS pond was reasonable and acceptable.
 - The SuDS pond should have been contained within the site, and locating it in open countryside introduced an unnecessary urban feature.
 - The lack of consideration for cyclists, which was contrary to the SDNPAs objective to encourage sustainable transport and cycling, and whether the footpath on to Sussex Road could be made into a cycle path to improve connectivity.
 - Formalising the footpath into a cycle link could have an urbanising effect on the open countryside and increase the pressure of further development.
 - The community's work and effort that had gone into making the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan (PNP), and a concern that the scheme did not comply with some of the policies and permission to develop could undermine the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) process.
 - The scheme was good but not excellent, and further improvements could be made, including

- The wider use of permeable surfacing throughout the site, including wider textured, porous tarmac.
 - Increased tree planting to improve the urban design by adding focal points, avenues and views.
 - The need for Condition 3 relating to materials and finishes to be carefully discharged to ensure a finished development that all could feel proud of.
 - The need for the careful discharge of Condition 6 to ensure there was no erosion of the Dark Night Sky buffer zone around the nearby narrow strip of the recently designated International Dark Night Skies Reserve.
469. In response to these and other queries, officers clarified:
- Conditions 4 and 15 could be amended to seek to secure permeable surfacing for hard surfaces where possible under delegation to officers as this could have wider drainage and SuDS implications and would require further negotiations with the developer, the Highways Authority and the water company.
 - Condition 4 could be amended to seek to increase the number of trees, and the inclusion of a conditional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on all trees to ensure long term protection.
 - The Dark Night Skies officer was comfortable with the scheme, and Condition 6 could be amended to include mention of the newly designated International Dark Night Skies Reserve.
 - Condition 4 could be amended to require details of underground services within verges to be submitted to the SDNPA.
 - An informative could be included to request removal of the developer's signage on completion of the scheme.
470. The Director of Planning explained that planning decisions required careful consideration and balancing of all relevant development policies (Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan) and material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework, , some of which could conflict. Therefore the approval of this scheme did not undermine the value of Neighbourhood Plans in principle or in detail.
471. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that the Secretary of State was currently considering whether to call the application in for decision in which case the Committee's decision would become a recommendation.
- If the Committee were minded to approve the application, it would therefore be preferable to include within the resolution refusal of the application should the s106 agreement not be completed within 6 months from a decision being reached by the Secretary of State to not call in the application.
472. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with the amendment of Condition 4, to require details of underground services within land being adopted by the Highways Authority to be submitted and approved in writing, and reference to conditional Tree Preservation Orders to be placed on all trees planted within the development; Conditions 4 and 15 to seek to consider permeable surfacing for hard surfaces where possible; Condition 6 to include mention of the newly designated International Dark Night Skies Reserve; an informative relating to the removal of the developer's signage on completion of the development, the final wording of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning and the Planning Committee Chair; and that the application be refused if the s106 agreement is not completed within 6 months from a decision being reached by the Secretary of State to not call in the application for decision. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
473. **SDNP/15/05258/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
- 1) The completion of a legal agreement to secure the following, which is delegated to the Director of Planning:
 - 80 affordable dwellings on site
 - A contribution of £700,000 for transport infrastructure improvements and secure their implementation.

- Highways works and Travel Plan.
 - Provision and management of public open space on site and SuDS.
 - A contribution of £80,284 towards off site public open space.
 - Provision and maintenance of public footpaths to link with footpath no.37
 - Landscape management and maintenance across the site
 - A contribution of £200,000 towards community facilities.
 - Provision of employment and training opportunities for local people during construction or a financial contribution of £118,775 in lieu.
 - A contribution of £50,000 for a community support officer to help integrate new residents into the community.
- 2) The conditions as set out in Paragraph 11.1 of Report PC24/16 and the 12 May 2016 Update sheet, and the following amendments, the final wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair:
- Condition 4, relating to details of hard and soft landscaping:
 - To require details of underground services within land being adopted by the Highways Authority to be submitted and approved in writing
 - To reference the fact that conditional Tree Preservation Orders will be made on all trees planted within the development
 - Conditions 4 and 15, relating to details of hard and soft landscaping, to seek to consider permeable surfacing for all hard surfaces
 - Condition 6 relating to lighting, to include mention of the newly designated International Dark Night Skies Reserve
 - An informative relating to the removal of the developer's signage associated with the development upon completion of the development.
- 3) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the S.106 Agreement is not completed within 6 months of a decision being reached by the Secretary of State not to call in the application for decision.

474. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:45am

475. The Chair reconvened the meeting at 11:55am

WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

ITEM 8: SDNP/15/05227/FUL, HOUGHTONS TRANSPORT (WICKHAM) LTD, WARNFORD ROAD, CORHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE, SO32 3ND

476. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the update sheet. He informed the Committee that since publication of the report, a further 8 representations had been received.
477. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
- Peter Legood spoke against the application on behalf of the residents of De Port Heights, Corhampton
 - Robert Upton spoke against the application on behalf of himself
 - Cllr Patrick Rowe spoke against the application on behalf of the Corhampton & Meonstoke Parish Council
 - Tom Francis spoke in support of the application as the applicant
478. In response to Members' points for clarification, officers confirmed:
- The recommendation to delegate the grant of planning permission if no further material representations were received before the end of the consultation period was necessary as the consultation period ended on 13 May 2016.
 - The application had been called in by officers because of the cumulative effect of another application on an adjacent site
 - Notwithstanding the application was separate and contained within its own red line, and could be considered on its own merits
 - Officers had worked on both applications respectively and in relation to each other

- Whilst consideration by the Committee of both applications together might have been desirable, this had not been practicable.
 - The site was outside the Conservation Area.
 - Details of the scheme previously considered by Winchester, which was currently the subject of an appeal, had been included for comparison.
 - A response had been received from the Highways Authority, who had no objection with regard to the proposed parking and access.
 - The road frontages were in 3rd party ownership and it had not been possible to improve the walking route through the village through this scheme, however the adjacent application could offer improvements in this respect.
 - The land was contaminated with heavy metals, fuels and other chemicals and would be treated on site or removed, screened and returned, which could allow the opportunity to address levels.
479. The Director of Planning stated that whilst the emerging South Downs Local Plan, in which 11 dwellings were considered to be a suitable number for the area as a whole, carried modest weight, the number was not absolute and brownfield schemes in particular should be considered on their merits.
480. The Senior Solicitor clarified that given the close deadline of the consultation period, further material representations were considered unlikely, however the Committee had been recommended to delegate grant of permission in the case that further material representations were received that could affect a decision.
481. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/16) the update sheet, and the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Support for the principle of high density development within villages, however the design needed to be congruent with the surrounding village.
 - The lack of clarity regarding the amount of soil being removed due to contamination, and uncertainty with regard to finished levels.
 - Dissatisfaction with the use of Deport Heights for access, as this could be more satisfactorily achieved through the existing wide access.
 - Their unease with regard to the procedural aspect of delegating grant of permission before the end of the consultation period.
 - The risk of rushing a scheme through without being able to consider the adjacent application and the overall cumulative impact, which had been the reason for call-in.
 - Their concerns regarding:
 - The layout, which was cramped, and represented over-development, and the need for lower density, smaller dwellings.
 - The height, type and massing of the proposed buildings, which were at odds with the surrounding village area.
 - The height and orientation of the proposed dwellings, which overlooked Deport Heights, in particular No 2.
482. In response to these and other Member queries, officers clarified:
- The Highways Authority had not objected to the proposed access and sight lines through/from Deport Heights.
 - The uncertainty regarding finished levels could be controlled through condition, and did not represent a reason for refusal.
 - The housing mix complied with Policy CP2 of the Winchester Joint Core Strategy.
483. The Director of Planning stated that deferment on the basis that the Committee would prefer to consider both sites together was not practicable due to separate red lines and an existing 'ransom strip' between the two sites.
- Deferment was unlikely to sufficiently address the concerns raised by the Committee, which would ideally require a different scheme, and new consultation.

484. It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application, due to the density of the design layout, which was cramped and out of context with the surrounding village area; the design of the buildings, which did not reflect the immediate village context or wider area; the height and massing of the buildings, given the uncertainty with regard to finished ground levels, and issues of overlooking nearby properties in Deport Heights, in particular No 2; the final wording of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
485. **SDNP/15/05227/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
- 1) The density of the development, which was cramped and out of context with the surrounding village area
 - 2) The design of the buildings did not reflect the immediate village context or wider area
 - 3) The height and massing of the buildings, given the uncertainty with regard to finished ground levels
 - 4) The issues of overlooking nearby properties in particular No 2 De Port Heights
 - 5) Layout and access
- The final wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair.
486. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:23pm
487. The Chair reconvened the meeting at 1:58pm

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

488. Margaret Paren declared an interest in Item 10 as a resident of Liss Parish, and whilst she had not been involved with the development of the Liss NDP, she had been involved in the Community Landscape Character Assessment referred to in the Plan.
489. Neville Harrison declared a public service in Item 11 as a member of the South Downs Society.
490. Tom Jones declared a public service interest in Item 11 as a member of Lewes District Council.

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 9: MAKING OF THE CLAPHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

491. The responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the update sheet.
492. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC25/16) and the update sheet and commented:
- The commendable speed of the process in this case, although on other occasions this might not always be achievable or desirable for reasons of consultation and evidence gathering.
 - Their congratulations of the parish and officers for a good piece of work.
493. In response to Member queries, officers clarified that in the absence of a settlement policy boundary, the notion of a village envelope had been agreed with the Examiner for reasons of clarity.
494. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
495. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Noted the outcomes of the Clapham referendum
 - 2) Agreed to make the Clapham Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan

ITEM 10: SDNPA RESPONSE TO THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION ON THE LISS NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

496. The responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the update sheet.

497. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC26/16) and the update sheet, and commented:
- Substantial work had been carried out, and excellent progress made to the plan, which was clear and concise.
 - Their commendation to officers for their work in getting the plan to this stage.
 - The introduction would benefit from clarification with regard to individual settlements which make up the Parish of Liss and their position within the Parish, in particular with regard to Rake village.
 - To give greater weight to the policy on Gaps, the introduction could be expanded to include further explanation of the sensitivity of the landscape and development constraints, including
 - The topography and tree cover as reasons for the hidden nature of the settlement
 - The River Rother which dissected the settlement and had an impact in terms of flooding
 - Greater reference to the nearby Special Protection Area (SPA)
 - The structure of the plan could benefit from being reorganised to align more with the emerging South Downs Local Plan, commencing with the Landscape policy, and perhaps a further policy on Biodiversity.
 - Liss Policies 8 and 17 could benefit from the inclusion of soft landscaping for all new development, including small, infill sites, in order to protect and retain the green and open spaces within the urban centre.
 - Their reservations with regard to the inclusion of the Brows Farm allocation, which was outside the original settlement boundary.
498. In response to Member queries, officers clarified:
- Local Gaps could be designated through the NDP process.
 - Any re-ordering of policies was at the discretion of the Liss NDP Group.
 - The Brows Farm allocation site had been proposed following discussions with the some officers and landowner, and located close to the hedgerow to protect views into the site, including the Church, from the wider area.
499. The Director of Planning stated that in future site visits could be arranged at the stage of Regulation 14 pre-submission where appropriate, to view allocation sites of the larger NDP areas, given the concerns expressed over Brows Farm.
- Whilst it was not the role of the Committee to object to an allocation site, it would be appropriate for Members to raise concerns about the inclusion of individual sites at this stage of the process, given the need for conformity and the primacy of National Park status.
500. It was proposed and seconded to highlight Members' concerns regarding the allocation of Site 5, Land at Brows Farm, and the potential landscape impact, in the SDNPA's pre-submission response. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
501. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed to highlight concerns regarding the allocation of Site 5, Land at Brows Farm, and the potential landscape impact, in the SDNPA's response to the Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) Consultation on the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan.
502. In response to further Member queries, officers clarified:
- Officers would include Members' concerns in the pre-submission response.
 - The plan would come back to the Committee at submission stage, and any modifications proposed by SDNPA would be considered by the Independent Examiner and could relate only to the plan meeting the basic conditions
 - If the community decided to remove the site and find an alternative, a further Regulation 14 consultation may need to be carried out.
 - Modification of the Development Brief for Site 5 to allow mitigation of the site's sensitivity would not require further Regulation 14 consultation.

- At submission, any amendments to the Plan made in response to Regulation 14 consultation were a matter for the Examiner to consider.
503. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, the 12 May 2016 update sheet, the submission of comments made about the introduction, and the inclusion of the Committee's concerns as resolved at the meeting with regard the allocation of Site 5, Land at Brows Farm and potential impact upon the landscape and settlement pattern. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
504. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed the Table of Comments as set out in Appendix 3 of Report PC 26/16 and the 12 May 2016 Update Sheet, which will form the SDNPA representation to the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan pre-submission consultation, with the inclusion of the Committee's comments about the introduction paragraphs and concerns as resolved at the meeting regarding the allocation of Site 5, Land at Brows Farm and potential impact upon the landscape and settlement pattern.

ITEM 11: ADOPTION OF THE LEWES DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN: PART 1, JOINT CORE STRATEGY

505. The responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the update sheet. She informed the Committee that the part of the plan relating to the area outside the National Park had been adopted yesterday by Lewes District Council.
506. The Committee heard from John Templeton, who spoke about the Plan on behalf of South Downs Society.
507. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC27/16), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The typo at the top of Map 4 of Appendix 4, which should read Seaford.
 - The Inspector had increased the housing number for the whole district to 6,900 and Old Malling Farm had been included as a strategic site.
 - Their deep disappointment at the inclusion of the Old Malling Farm site, which had been unanimously opposed on previous occasions by the Committee and National Park Authority.
 - The large housing number on the site, which included the nature reserve and public access area that the Committee had recommended conserving.
 - The substantial evidence put forward at the Public Hearing, which had not carried any weight with the Inspector.
 - The Authority Chair stated that she would raise the allocation of the site and landscape impact with the local MP, Maria Caulfield.
 - The need to ensure major developments in Lewes, especially on sensitive sites such as this, were exceptional in quality.
508. In response to queries, officers clarified that the nature conservation area was within the red line of the Old Malling Site, and could not be challenged in the Local Plan.
509. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
510. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Recommended to the Authority that it adopt the Lewes District Local Plan: Part 1, Joint Core Strategy, as amended by the Inspector's recommended main modifications to the Plan, as the basis for the planning of the National Park within Lewes District up to 2030 or until superseded by the South Downs National Park Local Plan; and
 - 2) Recommended to the Authority to delegate to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to make any other inconsequential changes to the text.

511. Committee Member Gary Marsh left the meeting room at 2:55pm.

ITEM 12: CASTLE GORING CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN

512. The Responsible Officer [presented the item](#) and referred to the update sheet.

513. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC28/16) and the update sheet and commented:

- Any proposal for major development in a conservation area would be required to either preserve or enhance the existing character and appearance of the conservation area.

514. In response to queries, officers clarified:

- The only impact to the landowner in respect to the current farming activities was that 6 weeks' notice would need to be given for any works to non TPO protected trees.
- Designation of the Conservation Area would assist officer-led discussions and the formal SDNPA consultee response regarding the adjoining area outside the National Park boundary, which was the subject of a large housing application, and its impact on the views in and out of the conservation area.
- Action 6 relating to screening mitigation could be amended to include the 'onward march of suburban Worthing', along the South and South Eastern boundaries.

515. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, and to include an amendment to Action 6 to extend landscape screening along the south and south eastern boundaries to mitigate the impact of development on views in and out of the conservation area. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

516. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- 1) Approved the proposed extensions to Castle Goring Conservation Area as set out in paragraphs 6.3 – 6.6 of Report PC28/16 and shown on Figure 20 of the Appraisal and Management Plan
- 2) Adopted the Castle Goring Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, attached as Appendix 2 to Report PC28/16 and the 12 May 2016 Update Sheet, for the purposes of Development Management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partners, with the amendment of Action 6 to extend landscape screening along the south and south eastern boundaries to mitigate the impact of development on views in and out of the conservation area.

TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Thursday 9 June at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 3.15pm.

