SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 9 MARCH 2017

Held at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:00am.
Present:
David Coldwell Barbara Holyome Neville Harrison (Chair) Doug Jones
Ian Phillips Robert Mocatta

Ex Officio Members for Planning Policy items only (may participate on Policy Items but not vote, no participation on Development Management Items)
Norman Dingemans Margaret Paren.

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) and Rebecca Haynes (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Robert Thain (Planning Policy Lead), Sarah Nelson (Strategic Planning Lead), Chris Patterson (Communities Lead), Matthew Bates (Local Plan Lead), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), Katharine Stuart(Senior Planning Policy Officer), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead West), and Hannah Grimes (Development Management Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

342. The Chair informed those present that:
- SDNPA Members have a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthers the National Park Purposes and Duty. Members regard themselves first and foremost as Members of the Authority, and will act in the best interests of the Authority and of the Park, rather than as representatives of their appointing authority or any interest groups.
- The meeting was being webcast by the Authority and would be available for subsequent on-line viewing. Anyone entering the meeting was considered to have given consent to be filmed or recorded, and for the possible use of images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.
- Items 11 onwards on the agenda would not be considered before 1:30pm

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

343. Apologies were received from, Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker, Tom Jones, Gary Marsh and Amber Thacker.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

344. David Coldwell declared a public service interest in items 7 & 9 as a member of Horsham District Council.
345. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Item 10 as the Ward Councillor for East Meon and items 7, 13 & 14 as a member of East Hampshire District Council.
346. Norman Dingemans declared a public service interest in item 7 as a member of Arun District Council, and that Findon Parish was not in his Ward.
347. Barbara Holyome declared a personal intersect in items 7 as two of the speakers were known to her and Item 10 as she knew the landowner and item 14 as the public speaker was known to her.
348. Doug Jones declared a personal interest in item 7 as two of the speakers were known to him.
349. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in item 12 as a member of the South Downs Society.
350. The Chair explained that one of the speakers for Item 7 was a previous members of the SDNPA and therefore would be known to members of the Committee.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9 FEBRUARY 2017

351. The minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

352. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

353. There were none

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

354. There were none.

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 7 REVISED POLICIES FOR THE PRE-SUBMISSION SOUTH DOWNS LOCAL PLAN

355. The Chair informed the Committee that the chapters had been seen and commented on by the Local Plan Member Working Group and issues raised had been addressed in the version the committee were being asked to consider and that only strategic comments should be made at this stage.

356. The Planning Policy Manager introduced report PC15/17, referred to the update sheet and apprised the Local Plan progress so far:

- The Committee were asked to consider the final set of policies before they were included in the Composite Plan which SDNPA Members would be discussing at the April Local Plan Member Working Group (LPMWG) and June Planning committee before approving at the July NPA meeting.
- The majority of site allocations had been made in Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP). If a NDP had not allocated land for development, or if communities had not completed a NDP the SDNPA would allocate land. The allocation for land for development would always incur difficult decisions, however the spatial strategy for the Local Plan was supported by the public at the preferred options stage and had been endorsed by the Planning Committee in the revised policies of the pre submission. Members were invited on site visits in November and December 2016 and the sites had been discussed three times at LPMWG meetings. The Authority held the sites and settlements consultation with Town and Parish Councils in November 2016.

357. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Cllr Del Henty spoke against proposals for Findon potential housing allocations on behalf of Findon Parish Council
- David Hutchinson spoke against proposals for Findon potential housing allocation adjacent to Elm Rise Findon, on behalf of James Martin and his other neighbours
- Cllr Andrew Shaxson spoke against proposals for South Harting potential housing allocations on behalf of Harting Parish Council and as the Ward Member
- Cllr Sheridan Bowman spoke against proposals for South Harting potential housing allocations on behalf of Harting Parish Council.
- Cllr John Wheelhouse spoke against proposals for Stedham potential housing allocations representing Stedham with Iping Parish Council
- SDNPA Member Karen Roberts spoke with regard to her concerns about some of the land allocations, and that the National Park was giving up too many green fields for development. She commented on the following proposed housing allocation sites:
  - Land at Marriners Farm, Cheriton
  - Land south of London Road Coldwaltham
  - Former Easebourne School
  - Land at Elm Rise, Findon
  - Land at Soldiers Field House, Findon
  - Half Acre Hawkley
  - Land at Stedham Sawmill
  - Land south of Church Road, Steep
  - Waterhall – Gipsy and Traveller Site
  - West Ashling
  - Land at Long Priors, West Meon

  Her concerns included:
  - Some of the housing numbers were not reflecting neighbouring density, nor the location of a site at the edge of a settlement
  - Allocations would be approved today despite issues raised

- There was a disconnect between the Planning Department of the National Park, the Members and the public
- The NP was taking a paternalistic approach and imposing on settlements what they considered villages needed
- There was a disconnect between the aspiring and inspiring policies of the emerging Local Plan and the allocations of sites

Karen concluded that the National Park should take a position of being far more robust in protecting its landscape and in view of the many issues she raised, the land allocations should not be progressed. There was a danger that if a site was included in the Local Plan and could not be fulfilled, then a developer would be able to get Planning permission on the basis that the National Park could not meet the housing requirement it identified in a settlement. The information she tendered in respect of various sites was through her own research.

It was unacceptable in her view to provide specific policies on protecting tranquillity, views, dark night skies, biodiversity and landscape overall, to profess cooperation with communities and forge ahead regardless.

Members were invited to pause to provide time for site visits where there were objections to consider the issues raised. Collectively there were too many issues to move forward with confidence.

358. The Committee considered report PC15/17 the March update sheet: and were taken through each of the policies in regard to:

- Sites and Settlements
- Strategic Sites
- Affordable Housing
- Green Infrastructure
- Water
- Climate Change
- Design

359. The committee commented:

General:

- The Authority did not seek to impose allocations on settlements, but supported communities to make their choice through the Neighbourhood Development Planning process. Where NDP did not include site allocations or where communities chose not to make a NDP the Authority was tasked with allocation of sites
- Much consultation and community engagement had taken place to get to the position we were in
- There were policies in the emerging Local Plan to support smaller housing developments
- Brownfield sites would always been the first choice for a site allocation, but in order to allow growth that communities supported some green field sites could be considered on a landscape led approach
- The SDNPA was not meeting the housing need in the SDNP and the NPPF gave a justified reason for national parks not meeting this need. The SDNPA has however done its best to meet the need where possible
- Settlement policy boundaries will through the new Local Plan be constrained in the National Park and the Authority had, as afar as was reasonable, prevented greenfield sites being developed. The NDP process had identified the need to use greenfield sites for development
- The allocation of sites had been driven by landscape capacity and not what or how many would fit in each community

Sites and Settlements:

- SD66: Improvements to the Cowdray Works site was welcomed

- HA70 & HA71: The SDNPA had encouraged Findon Parish to produce a NDP and the Parish chose not to include any allocation sites, therefore it was up to the Authority to allocate
- SD72: It was pleasing to see that a shop could potentially be provided on the site
- SD73: There was a need to have a 400metre buffer between development and a Special Protection Area (SPA). . Development at the site would likely need to provide suitable mitigation.
- SD79 A masterplan for the two proposed strategic housing allocation sites in Midhurst was welcomed
- SD83: Protection for the trees on the site was supported. It would be preferable to limit age restriction on the site for the older generation given the proximity to the towns facilities
- SD91: The community building in Stroud was welcomed

Strategic Sites

- SD56: It was pleasing to see flexibility within the policy. The site could provide an opportunity for inspiring development within the National Park. The Area Action Plan was eagerly awaited

Affordable Housing

- The bold innovative approach was welcomed
- The SDNPA was the Planning Authority and not the Housing Authority and therefore would have to work in partnership with HA's and other provides to negotiate housing provision
- Rental provision should be the priority

Green Infrastructure

- SD14: Policy could be more positive in its wording with 'a requirement to provide' or 'should provide'.

360. In response to questions officers clarified:

Sites and Settlements:

- SD65: The policy would set out a requirement to respect Wayfarers Walk. The Walk does currently pass through the village. Notwithstanding a vehicle access solution, officers considered the site to be the most appropriate. If a vehicle access solution could not be found the site could reduce its capacity.
- HA70: The SDNPA Landscape Officer concluded the site was of medium sensitivity and considered the site fitted neatly within the village.
- As the Findon NDP had not allocated sites the SD Local Plan would not be subject to a Judicial Review (JR) on the basis of allocation in principle. The Authority were currently processing viability statements and therefore the Local Plan allocation reduces the likelihood of a developer saying a site was not viable. The Planning Committee papers were published 5 clear working days before the meeting (in line with statutory guidance), however, a sites settlement consultation was undertaken with parishes last year and Findon had the chance to allocate sites within their NDP
- HA71: The site had been previously developed and occupied by a modern house which was visually prominent with associated structures (tennis court and swimming pool). The SDNPAs Landscape Officer has considered the site to be of medium sensitivity. The Authority was looking to achieve a modest scheme with scope to improve the landscape setting. The site was within the setting of a listed building but was not within a conservation area. The policy would clearly set out, where relevant, that any proposals would need to address any ground water issues. The housing mix was set out in the affordably housing and mix scheme policy. Any applications should comply with all relevant policies.
- SD72: There was no guarantee that a retailer would be interested however there night be interest in a community shop. Officers were confident that the SPA mitigation could be delivered.

- SD73: Temporary permissions are granted to enable the exploration of Gypsy and Traveller (G&T) sites through the Local Plan process. This assessment of sites has now taken place and this site remains in the list
- SD74: Littering issues on public footpaths was a matter for the County Council enforcement team
- SD78: The current wording regarding storage tanks reflected the existing planning permission
- SD79: There was an opportunity to set out in supporting text where dark night skies areas needed additional lighting assessments
- SD80: It might not be possible to overcome the viability and practical issues of having a high pressure gas pipe through the site, therefore this site might have to be removed from the plans and it will not be possible to find a suitable G&T site within the Brighton & Hove area
- SD87&SD89: 14 residential units between 2 sites was not considered excessive for the village of South Harting; the issue of access for farm vehicles was noted.
- SD87: The Authority would be required to liaise with the Parish Council to ascertain the status of green space land, which could incorporated into the Local Plan if all relevant evidence and assessments could be completed in time
- SD88: 2b: Policy wording needed to be clarified
- SD89: It was the intention of the Authority to exclude a specific housing need policy, however one could be brought forward at any time. The number of people on the housing list could go up or down
- SD90: The SDNPA was in dialog with the Trustees of the Charity and the site had community support

Strategic Sites

- SD56: There would be specific policies / proposals for each zone within the site
- SD57: The policy would be updated to reflect the changes to the affordable housing policy

Affordable Housing

- The Government Housing White Paper might have implications on the affordable housing section of the Local Plan and any outcomes of the consultation would be reflected in the Plan
- Officers were confident that there could be appropriate mechanism in place to defend viability challenges
- Evidence states that rental provision was needed however feedback from the recent landowners conference suggested that rental might not be required and policy should not be too restricting

Green Infrastructure

- SD36: local green spaces can only be designated at the time of making or amending a Local Plan. There were tests within the NPPF for sites to achieve to be listed as local green spaces

Climate Change

- SD48: County Councils as Lead Local Flood Authorities have regulatory responsibilities for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Long term management was dependent on the planning obligation in place.

361. Following Committee discussion the proposed changes to be taken forward by officers were agreed as follows:

Sites and Settlements

a) Eco System symbols: were a good way to bring eco system services into housing allocations but would need further explanation and clarification. Other eco system services such as biodiversity were important to the SDNP. Clarification was required as to how to take forward

b) There was a need for consistency in regard to the number of allowed units; the Old Malling Farm policy was highlighted as a good example to follow

c) HA70: To clarify it would not be appropriate to develop past the site.

d) HA71: To investigate the possibility of applying for a Tree Protection Order (TPO) on the beech hedge

e) SD73: To determine if it is possible for development to be permitted within 400 metres of a SPA

f) SD78: To change wording in policy to reflect up to date terminology especially in regard to storage tanks

g) SD83: To investigate the possibility of applying an age restriction to the site or a mix

h) SD89: Parking solutions to be explored along with agricultural options

General

i) To explore all policies to include where additional lighting assessments would be required in regard to dark night skies

j) Where sites mention the protection of trees a TPO should be sought prior to the adoption of the SD Local Plan to safeguard their future

Affordable Housing

k) Policy should be clear that there was an expectation for affordable housing to be provided on site

l) SD24: To remove repetitiveness of 'financial contributions in lieu'. To strengthen wording to ensure provision was kept in perpetuity

Green Infrastructure

m) SD14: Policy 1b to be clarified and more positively worded

n) SD36: references to the NPPF in the supporting text should include up to at least paragraph 81

Water

- SD16: To remove the wording 'where appropriate' from policy 1, and specify where required to ensure clarity
- SD10: Layout to be reviewed to ensure clarity around policy 1a (i)

Climate Change

- SD46: Policy 1 to use the word 'encourage' in regard to new development incorporating sustainable design features
- SD47; A reference to in perpetuity was required as there was a need for long term flood risk management and resources
- SD49: 1(a) should be worded more positively e.g., 'should conserve'. 2(a) required clarification required a negative wording such as in 2(f). The grammatical error in 2(e) needed addressing. 1h required the addition of grade 3(a)

Design

- SD6: There was no need to reference agriculture environment. 1(d) required clarity with a change of wording. 1(j) needed strengthening with 'every effort to avoid' rather than 'due consideration'. 1(f) needed to enable good modern design

362. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

1) Endorsed the direction of the policies as detailed in Appendices 1 to 7 of report PC15/17 and update sheet, for inclusion in the Pre-Submission Local Plan document, subject to any comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed as detailed in minute 361

2) Noted that the Pre-Submission Local Plan would be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and

3) Noted that the Pre-Submission Local Plan document would be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority

4) Agreed to support option 1 in regard to affordable housing provision as set out in appendix 3 to report PC15/17

363. The Committee commended officers for their work to date on the production of the South Downs Local Plan

364. The Chair adjourned the meeting for Lunch at 1:23pm

365. The meeting re convened at 2pm

ITEM 8 MAKING OF THE WALBERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

366. The Committee considered report PC16/17 and commented that Arun District made the Plan but did not accept all of the examiners recommendations:

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

368. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

1) Noted the outcomes of the Walberton referendum

2) Agreed to make the Walberton Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPAs Development Plan

ITEM 9: AMBERLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN DECISION STATEMENT

369. The Committee considered report PC17/17, and commended Amberley Parish on their Plan and their disappointment with some of the inspector's comments was understood.

370. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- If the land owner was supportive it might be possible to add a local green space to the SD Local Plan, however this was not believed to be the case and therefore more time was needed to gather further evidence to support the designation. This can't currently be done in the time that is available. Authority Rangers have offered support to the Parish Council with completing assessments and surveys which may support a future allocation of the sites as local green spaces
- The car park was not allocated and the land owner objected. The site was currently used as a temporary car park for Amberley open days. Issues would be raised if an application came forward but these would have to be considered against the community benefit of such a proposal.

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

372. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

1) Noted the Examiner's Report and recommended modifications to make the Amberley Neighbourhood Development Plan meet the basic conditions as set out at Appendix 2 of report PC17/17.

2) Agreed the 'Decision Statement' as set out at Appendix 3 of report PC17/17, which set out the modifications that would be made to the Amberley Neighbourhood Development Plan in response to the Examiner's recommendations.

ITEM 10: SDNPA RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION (REG 16) CONSULTATION ON THE EAST MEON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (EMNDP)

373. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC18/17) and the March update sheet and commented that a great deal of work had gone into the development of the Plan with a significant number of people engaged in the project.

374. It was agreed that in regard to site B9 it would be more appropriate for the access route to avoid the vegetation and should have a curved approach; this would also allow the access to be in keeping with other access in the immediate vicinity. This should be added to the SDNPAs submission response.

375. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation as amended during the meeting. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

376. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the table of comments as set out in Appendix 2 of report PC18/17 and to include access to site B9 as detailed in minute 374 which will form SDNPAs representation to the Independent Examiner of the EMNDP

377. Margaret Paren and Norman Dingemans left the meeting at 2:27pm.

378. For the benefit of new members of the public in attendance at the meeting the Chair asked Committee Members to repeat their declarations of Interest for the remaining items on the agenda.

379. Barbara Holyome declared a personal intersect in item 10 as she knew the landowner and item 14 as the public speaker was known to her.

380. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Items 13 & 14 as a member of East Hampshire District Council.

381. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in item 12 as a member of the South Downs Society.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

ITEM 11: SDNP/16/05558/FUL RETENTION OF MARQUEE STRUCTURE AND ANCILLARY LANDSCAPING WORKS (RETROSPECTIVE) STANMER HOUSE, STANMER VILLAGE, STANMER PARK, BRIGHTON, BN1 9QA

382. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the March update sheet which included a revised recommendation and amended condition 5.

383. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:
- Alex Proud spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

384. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/17), the March update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- There was a need to ensure a landscape management plan was in place for restoration of the historic gardens once the temporary permission had ended
- The 3 year permission timescale was correct to allow for a business plan to evolve
- They understood the need for a large ballroom

385. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The 3 year temporary permission was recommended to be parallel with the end date for the temporary permission already granted for the car park
- A plan showing the landscaping in the fountain garden had been submitted as part of the application, and that included the paving. Most of the works had already been carried out and the application was therefore retrospective.

386. SDNP/16/05558/FUL It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officers' recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

387. **RESOLVED:** That, temporary planning permission be approved subject to conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of report PC19/17 and March update sheet.

ITEM 12: SDNP/16/05602/FUL & SDNP/16/15603/LIS STANMER HOUSE, STANMER VILLAGE, STANMER PARK, BRIGHTON. BRIGHTON & HOVE, BN1 9QA

388. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the March update sheet which included an amended condition 3.

389. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:
- Alex Proud spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

390. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/17), the March update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Tourism and visitors to Stanmer Park was important to the National Park and the future of the House as was local employment opportunities

- The application supported the restoration of a historic building to a high quality standard and should be supported

391. It was agreed that condition 5 of the listed building application was seeking a method statement. It was also very important to be aware of the design in how they were going to install the new drainage and ventilation, what they would install and what it would look like in case there was an effect on any external elevations

392. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- Officers and the applicant had been working with Historic England and their concerns regarding sub division of the rooms on the second floor in b5 and b4 had been addressed with amended plans and in the inclusion of a wall that was not of ceiling height
- The only new external alterations planned were the fourteen vents in the roof
- The internal courtyard was outside of the application site therefore an informative on landscaping could not really be added
- An element of risk was regarded as low in regard to the development of new car parking as part of the wider Stanmer Park Plan

393. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officers' recommendation and an amendment to condition 5 to include the design of, and how the drainage and ventilation would be installed. Following a vote the proposal was carried

394. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/05602/FUL & SDNP/16/15603/LIS:

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, set out in Paragraph 10.1 of this report and March update sheet.
2. That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions, set out in Paragraph 10.2 of this report and condition 5 as amended in minute 391.

ITEM 13: SDNP/16/05594/FUL. LAND EAST OF LYSS PLACE, HAWKLEY ROAD, LISS, HAMPSHIRE

395. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the March update sheet which included an additional condition.

396. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:

- Andie Timms spoke against the application on behalf of himself and his wife
- Frances Cosgrove spoke against the application representing herself
- John Brindley spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant Liss Athletic Football Club

397. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC21/17), the March update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

- The application was a desirable way forward however there were concerns in regard to landscape impact
  - Car park, portaloo and storage layout had a landscape impact and had the potential to be permanent, which could lead to a pavilion type of structure
  - The car park might require further engineering works
  - Intensification of use might be required by the demographic of the area
- The grant of temporary permission for 3 seasons might be more appropriate to allow time to consider landscape impacts and to apply greater robust design solutions
- The layout and design of the car park should be conditioned rather than only requesting materials
- The site was far enough away from the village to require access by vehicle.

398. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- There was a condition to allow for appropriate signage on the bridge just inside the red line area to warn of access. Any signage would be sympathetic to the rural aspect of the road

- The site was free drainage and no drainage solution was proposed. The site was only proposed to be used on Saturday morning and Sunday afternoons
- The class use was for sports provision and this could be conditioned for specific sports
- The impact on the location and landscape was carefully measured and it was considered that a temporary permission to allow time to assess any impact was not required. The site would only be in use for 64 days per year with cars parked for a few hours per week. The grant of temporary consent would need proportionate car parking requirements
- The entrance gate would be chained when the site was not in use

399. It was proposed and seconded to vote to delegate to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair the grant of temporary permission to allow for use not exceeding 3 years subject to the conditions set out in the report, update sheet, amended condition 3 for approval of layout design and materials to be agreed and restoration of the site. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

400. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/05602/FUL & SDNP/16/15603/LIS: That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair to grant temporary planning permission to allow for use not exceeding 3 years subject to:

1. The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC21/17 the March update sheet and amended condition 3 for approval of layout design and materials to be agreed
2. An additional condition for the restoration of the site after the 3 year period the wording to be drafted by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair.

401. The chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 4:03pm

402. The meeting re convened at 4:15pm

ITEM 14: SDNP/16/06381/FUL LAND AT FARNHAM ROAD, SHEET, PETERSFIELD, GU32 2AS

403. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the March update sheet which included the removal of reason for refusal 2 and a revised recommendation.

404. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:

- Tony Burton spoke in support of the application as the applicant
- Henry Edberg spoke in support of the application representing Nos 15-18 School Lane Sheet
- Cllr Brian Bird spoke in support of the application on behalf of Sheet Parish Council

405. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/17), the March update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

- If minded to approve the landscaped area would need to be mirrored to adjoining application
- The application was finely balanced
- A more significant affordable housing contribution might be appropriate; the level offered was disappointing as a higher level would have been achievable had the two schemes been presented as one application which was frustrating
- Community engagement had clearly been demonstrated and as the Parish Council were supportive of the development that indicated clear community support for the venture. It would therefore be difficult to refuse the application on the ground of lack of community support
- The application site was an appropriate place for further development which had been designed to join the previous development. The site was not in the countryside, in the laymans sense, and there was an apparent lack of opposition
- It would be preferable to have solar roof tiles than panels

- It might be appropriate to defer the application to fully considered and clarify the level of community support for the development and to consider appropriate conditions if minded to approve the application.

406. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- Current policy does not define garden land as previously developed land
- The application considered the L shaped area as public open space for the new development
- The applicant held a separate consultation on the current application
- The proposal mirrored that of the previous development and if the Committee were minded to approve the application appropriate conditions could be used from application SDNP/15/05485/FUL
- Caution should be taken with a deferment as the application might come forward to the same standard, or be built at the same time thereby causing more disturbance, and would be affected by CIL which will be implemented on 1 April.

407. It was proposed and seconded to vote to delegate to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair the grant of planning permission subject to securing 4 off street car parking spaces for 15-18 school lane and an affordable housing contribution to be negotiated by the Director of Planning and appropriate conditions similar to application SDNP/15/05485/FUL. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

408. **RESOLVED:** That the grant of planning permission be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the planning Committee Chair subject to:

1) A unilateral undertaking to secure 4 off street car parking spaces for 15 – 18 School Lane and a apporpraite contribution towards affordable housing in leiu of on site provision. The value to be negiotiated by the Director of Planning.
2) Appropiate conditions, the wording of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair. The conditions shall include appropiate conditions from application SDNP/15/005485/FUL

ITEM 16: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

409. Thursday 13 April 2017 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 5:07 pm.