

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 10 NOVEMBER 2016**

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

Present:

Alun Alesbury	Heather Baker,	David Coldwell	Neville Harrison (Chair)
Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones	Tom Jones	Ian Phillips
Gary Marsh	Robert Mocatta	Amber Thacker	

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

Margaret Paren Norman Dingemans.

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Rebecca Haynes (Governance Officer) and Dorothy Cox (Committee Officer).

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead West) and Robert Thain (Minerals and Waste Policy Lead).

OPENING REMARKS

148. 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 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.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

149. There were none.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

150. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Item 8 as a member of the South Downs Society.

151. Doug Jones, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker, Tom Jones and Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Item 8 as members of the National Trust.

152. Gary Marsh declared a Prejudicial Interest during Item 8 and withdrew from the meeting room during deliberation and decision as detailed in minute 165

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 OCTOBER 2016

153. The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

154. There were none

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

155. The Committee was informed that in regard to the granted permission for Matterley Bowl the S106 agreement had been secured and the decision notice had been issued.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

156. There were none.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
SDNPA (WEALDEN DISTRICT)**

ITEM 7: SDNP/15/06370/CND LAND AT THE FRIDAYS, GILBERTS DRIVE, EAST DEAN, EAST SUSSEX.

157. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the [November update sheet](#).

158. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Councillor Mike Keller spoke against the application on behalf of East Dean & Friston Parish Council and East Dean & Friston Residents Association.
 - Mark Best spoke in support of the application for Parker Dann Chartered Town Planning Consultants
 - Mrs Tavie Davies-Gilbert spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
159. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC53/16), the [November update sheet](#), the public speaker comments, and commented:
- There was extant planning permission on the site. The Committee would need to consider the merits of the application before them.
 - The amendments were minor but material
 - The re alignment of the houses on the southern boundary was an improvement
 - The appearance of the alterations was acceptable, in keeping with the locality, added value to the development and minimised the development cost of the affordable housing
 - The curving of the flint wall was an improvement on the extant permission, however flint walls also required maintenance
 - There was need to have regard to the adopted East Dean Village Design Statement which stated that external boundaries were usually flint walls
 - There was a genuine desire by the applicant to improve the design and development of the houses to ensure they were more functional and habitable.
 - There were concerns raised regarding:
 - The need to include fenestration colour and material details within the conditions
 - White painted picket fences required a significant amount of maintenance
 - The proposed landscape plan was not sufficient as proposed tree retention and new tree planting was not clear.
 - It was disappointing to see that sections of the boundary flint wall would be replaced with picket fencing, which would differentiate the affordable housing from the rest of the development
 - There was a need for a comprehensive management plan to be submitted to include responsibility for the maintenance of the fencing, landscaping and how all external works would be managed
 - The increase in massing of plots 1, 2 and 5 and the increase of hard standing areas would have a negative impact on the landscape views with a changing landscape.
160. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The pedestrian access to the houses from the car park had not changed from the extant granted permission and the Highways Authority had confirmed that pedestrian and vehicular access was acceptable subject to conditions
 - There were examples within the village to consider picket fences were an acceptable boundary treatment
 - Condition 17 could be amended to include all details of materials including fenestration to be submitted and agreed. An informative could be added to condition 15 for the avoidance of doubt to include a detailed landscape management plan.
161. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with an amendment to condition 17 to include all details of materials including fenestration to be submitted and agreed and an informative to explain what is required in relation to the detailed landscape management plan referenced in condition 15. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
162. **RESOLVED: SDNP/15/06370/CND:** That the Committee:
- 1) Granted permission subject to:
 - a) The conditions set out in paragraph 10 of report PC53/15
 - b) Delegation to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair, the amendment of condition 17 to include details of materials to be submitted and agreed in regard to all key materials including fenestration and to add an informative about what is required in order to comply with condition 15

- c) The completion of a Section 106 agreement to vary the S106 agreement dated 20th October 2015 which secured four affordable dwellings:
- 2) Should the s106 agreement not be completed by 31 January 2017, authority was delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application because the necessary mitigation measures had not been secured to make the proposal acceptable.

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

ITEM 8: SDNP/16/02217/FUL & SDNP/16/02218/LIS. St CUTHMANS SCHOOL, STEDHAM. MIDHURST. GU29 0QJ.

163. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the [November update sheet](#).
164. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
 - Anne Reynolds spoke against the application on behalf of Woolbeding with Redford Parish Council
 - Stephen McGairl spoke against the application on behalf of St Cuthmans Campaign Group
 - Eddie Lintott spoke against the application on behalf of Stedham with Iping Parish Council.
165. Gary Marsh declared a Prejudicial Interest as he had objected to an application by the Durand Academy adjacent to his ward as a member of Mid Sussex District Council. He withdrew from the meeting room during deliberation and decision.
166. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC54/16), the [November update sheet](#), the public speaker comments, and commented:
 - The design and access statement did not supply evidence
 - There was a need to have a clear development and masterplan for the site
 - Whilst recognising the aspirations of the Durand Academy the submitted application was unacceptable
 - There was no justification for building on the hard standing area
 - There were many lost opportunities on the site, especially where the young people at the school could be engaged in their surroundings of the SDNP
 - There were concerns raised regarding:
 - The proposal lacked sensitivity and context within the surroundings, historic building settlement & the landscape and would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the site and its surroundings
 - The access road (at 6 metres) would be twice the width required by the emergency services
 - The landscaping scheme as proposed was insufficient
 - The impact on the dark night skies with the additional lighting was unclear
 - The loss of hard standing play and sports areas
 - The applicant did not make use of the pre application service
 - The proposal lacked details
 - The lack of information regarding the partially demolished building and why it could not be used
167. In response to questions, officers clarified:
 - The time limit proposed by the applicant was 5 years and the Authority would want that to be secured by a S106 agreement
 - The applicant had not made clear why the redundant building could not be used, and were partially demolished however it was thought to be part of the aspirations for the site although a wider management scheme for the site had not been provided
 - The NPPF did not specify details for temporary considerations and the granting of any temporary permission did not give permission in principle.
168. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

169. **RESOLVED: SDNP/16/02217/FUL & SDNP/16/02218/LIS:**
1. That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Paragraph 10.1 of report PC54/16.
 2. That Listed Building Consent be refused for the reason set out in Paragraph 10.2 of report PC54/16.
170. Gary Marsh re-joined the Committee.
171. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 11:45am.
172. The meeting reconvened at 11:53am.

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 9 APPROVAL OF SUBMISSION DRAFT WEST SUSSEX JOINT MINERALS LOCAL PLAN

173. The Committee considered report PC55/16, a [presentation](#) and the [November update sheet](#) which detailed a revised recommendation.
174. The Lead Officer highlighted the email that Committee members had received the afternoon before the meeting from The Mineral Planning Group Ltd. He stated that there was no new evidence, in the view of officers that would demonstrate that the Horncroft site needed to be allocated in the Plan.
175. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- There was a potential need within the Draft Local Plan to make specific reference to minerals safeguarding (re; Shoreham Cement Works)
 - The potential for different types of hydrocarbon proposals was considered during the development of the plan and therefore Policy M7 was split into Policy M7a and M7b to deal with development that involves hydraulic fracturing
 - Any new applications would be assessed against the new Joint Plan, all existing permissions were covered by their current conditions
176. Following Committee discussion the proposed amendments to the Plan to be taken forward by officers were agreed as follows:
- Policy M7a: Supporting text to provide further clarification in regard to:
 - Futureproofing to ensure all technical advances were covered
 - The definition of conventional and unconventional hydrocarbon development
 - Policy M12 & Paragraph 2.3.8: Clarity was required to differentiate between national parks and AONBs and their setting:
 Thee Strategic objective 8 and para 2.3.8 should include:
 Strategic Objective 8: To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of West Sussex and the special qualities of the South Downs National Park and the local distinctiveness and character of the High Weald AONB and Chichester Harbour AONB, and the setting of all protected landscapes
177. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation and the comments made by the Committee as detailed in minute 176. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
178. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee recommended to the National Park Authority to:
- 1) Approve the Submission Draft West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Appendix 1) at its meeting on 29 November 2016 for publication and consultation for eight weeks in January 2017 in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, subject to any comments made by the Planning Committee (minute 176) being addressed
 - 2) Authorise the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to agree any further minor changes to the Submission Draft West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan with West Sussex County Council
179. Margaret Paren thanked officers in producing the technical information that ensure the managed retreat.

ITEM 10: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

180. Thursday 8 December 2016 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 12:40pm.

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee
SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 DECEMBER 2016**

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

Present:

Alun Alesbury	Heather Baker,	David Coldwell	Neville Harrison (Chair)
Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones	Ian Phillips	Gary Marsh
Robert Mocatta	Amber Thacker		

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

Norman Dingemans

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Barry Smith (Senior Solicitor), Rebecca Haynes (Governance Officer) and Dorothy Cox (Committee Officer).

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead West), Vicki Colwell (Major Planning Projects Officer), Veronica Craddock (Landscape Officer), Sarah Nelson (Strategic Planning Lead) and Michael Scammell (Conservation Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

181. 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.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

182. Apologies were received from Tom Jones and ex-officio member Margaret Paren.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

183. The Senior Solicitor advised that as the applicant for item 7 was the SDNPA, it would be taken as read that all Committee members present declared a public service interest in the item as members of the South Downs National Park Authority. The Committee were reminded that the application should be considered as with any application and taking regard of relevant policy. Any decision should be made on the merit of the application and to disregard any benefits which the Authority may derive from an approval of the application.

184. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Item 8 as a member of the South Downs Society and as a former member of the Stanmer Park Board.

185. Norman Dingemans declared a public service interest during item 10 as detailed in minute 210.

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

186. The minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

187. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

188. The Committee were updated on the outcomes of two Inspectors appeal decisions:

- Brackenwood SDNP/15/01024/FUL: The appeal was allowed and planning permission granted for change of use of land to mixed agricultural and equestrian (dressage) use, retention of barn in reconfigured form, retention of horsewalker, washdown area, manure ramp, hay store, access track, parking and manoeuvring areas and exercise track and landscaping of the site.
- Land North East of Flyover, Steyning Road, Shoreham-by-Sea: The appeal was dismissed and the enforcement notice was upheld for breach of planning control.

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

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

189. There were none.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

ITEM 7: SDNP/16/05352/FUL EMPSHOTT GRANGE, CHURCH LANE, EMPSHOTT, LISS GU33 6HT.

190. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the [December update sheet](#).
191. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Nigel James spoke in support of the application on behalf of the South Downs National Park Authority.
192. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC56/16), the [December update sheet](#), the public speaker comments, and commented:
- A Committee member shared the concerns with the EHDC Ward Councillor comments as detailed in the update sheet; however the application was consistent with the East Hampshire District Joint Core Strategy (2014), particularly CP6 and CP19.
 - The change of use would provide two benefits to both the SDNPA and the building which would otherwise be left unused and at risk of falling into disrepair.
193. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- There was secure onsite parking for Authority's vehicles in the garages and workshops.
 - Maintenance of the grounds was the responsibility of the Rotherfield Park Estate.
 - Additional traffic movements were likely to be minimal as the Volunteer Ranger Service would continue to use the existing base at the Queen Elizabeth Country Park.
194. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
195. **RESOLVED: SDNP/16/05352/FUL:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10 of report PC56/16.

SDNPA (BRIGHTON & HOVE)

ITEM 8: SDNP/16/03927/FUL & SDNP/16/03928/LIS. STANMER PARK, BRIGHTON BNI 9SE

196. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the [December update sheet](#) which included amended conditions and consultee comments. It was stated that there were a further 58 representation letters however no new issues were raised in these.
197. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Steve Ankers spoke against the application on behalf of the South Downs Society and Sussex CPRE.
 - Rob Dumbrill spoke in support of the application on behalf of Brighton and Hove City Council.
 - Anne Bone spoke in support of the application on behalf of the South Downs National Park Authority.
198. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC57/16), the [December update sheet](#), the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The SDNPA had an area office with the ground of Stanmer Park
 - Car parking arrangement was a sensitive issue
 - There was a clear need to manage parking within the Park and to improve parking arrangements the proposals were a worthy compromise. The removal of car parking along the access drive was welcomed. There was a need to remove and prevent informal parking throughout Stanmer Park.
 - The current parking around the lodges were an blot on the landscape and improvements there were necessary

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

- Stanmer Park would benefit from the proposal and was a treasure and an asset within the South Downs National Park
- In order to encourage more visitors to the Park and for them to enjoy the facilities at the top of the Park area, parking provision at that end of the Park was necessary
- Parking facilities was an enabling development to ensure the sustainability of the Park
- It was hoped that ways might be found of encouraging visitors to use public transport to access the park, however it was noted that it was an unrealistic expectation to expect all visitors to use public transport.
- Their concerns regarding:
 - Considerable detail was still required. Condition 13 was not enforceable and therefore should be a pre-commencement condition
 - The parking provision needed to be adequate to prevent the applicant returning in the future to request further parking arrangements
 - The increased amount of hardstanding in the Park, its visibility and lack of information regarding the materials to be used
 - The garden centre business should be tied to Plumpton College to prevent a commercial garden centre acquiring the site

199. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- Numerous Management Plans were required during the HLF bid stage. The Authority required a Plan specifically relating to the application.
- The Heritage at Risk Register was a national register prepared by Historic England. The reason Stanmer Park had been included on the register was a combination of factors including; the poor condition of individual elements within the Park that form a cumulative impact and the impact of informal parking. Not all historic parks attracted the same copious level of visitors as Stanmer Park.
- There was no recorded number for levels of informal parking within the Park, however there were a substantial number on event days.
- Parking arrangements formed part of the submission bid for HLF funding
- The height of the bunds along the main drive would be between 0.5m and 1m and had been designed to prevent informal parking in this area.
- Funds from parking within the Park could be used for general upkeep of the Park
- Condition 13 could be amended to be a pre commencement condition
- The movement of vehicles within the Park and a travel plan could be included within the conditions.
- It was noted that there was still work to be completed regarding hard and soft landscaping conditioning.
- The words ‘approve’ in recommendation 1 and ‘grant’ in recommendation 2 could be changed to read ‘determine’.

200. It was proposed and seconded to vote on:

- The officers recommendation and the amended conditions as detailed in the update sheet
- To include movement of vehicles and a travel plan within the conditions
- Replace the words ‘approve in recommendation 1 and ‘grant’ in recommendation 2 with ‘determine’.

201. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

202. **RESOLVED: SDNP/16/03927/FUL & SDNP/16/03928/LIS:** That

- I. Authority was given to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to determine the planning application, subject to the receipt of further information relating to the Lower Lodge car park screening and layout (including tree removal) and as identified in the report, the conditions set out in the December

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

- update sheet and paragraph 10.1 of report PC57/16, the amendment of condition 13 to require a landscape plan to be provided prior to commencement of any of the car parks or buildings being brought into use, and the agreement of a travel plan.
2. Authority was given to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to determine listed building consent, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of report PC57/16.
203. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 11:33am.
204. The meeting reconvened at 11:38am.

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 9 MAKING OF THE FINDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

205. The Committee considered report PC58/16 and [presentation](#). The Lead Officer highlighted a couple of typographical errors within the Neighbourhood Development Plan:
- page 46 referenced appendix 4 which should read appendix 5
 - Page 63 referenced policy HD7 which should be HD8:
 - The West Sussex Parish appointed Member commended the parishioners of Findon in completing a viable Neighbourhood Development Plan.
206. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
207. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Noted the outcomes of the Findon referendum.
 - 2) Agreed to make the Findon Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan.

ITEM 10: MAKING OF THE ALDINGBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

208. The Committee considered report PC59/16, [presentation](#) and noted that the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Area was predominantly outside the National Park.
209. The West Sussex Parish appointed Member commended the parishioners of Aldingbourne in completing a viable Neighbourhood Development Plan.
210. Norman Dingemans declared a public service interest during this item as he lived within the Neighbourhood Plan map area.
211. In response to a question, the lead officer clarified that the Authority always included a policy on the setting of the SDNP as this Plan did not include this policy, it would be the Arun Local Plan that referred to the setting of the SDNP
212. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
213. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Noted the outcomes of the Aldingbourne referendum.
 2. Agreed to make the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan.

ITEM 11 LYNCHMERE CONSERVATION AREA CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

214. The Committee considered report PC60/16, [presentation](#) and commented:
- The local community were to be congratulated on completing the Conservation Area Appraisal.
 - The inclusion in the Conservation Area of Danley Farm, one of the oldest holdings in the settlement, was supported.
 - The committee welcomed the approach in the development of CAAMPs with the involvement of the local community and commended the parish for their involvement
 - The area was important and required additional protection

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

215. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The local community were strongly in favour of the proposed extension
 - The setting of the inter-war houses in relation to Lynchmere Green was important. As they were pre-Second World War they were considered heritage assets. .
 - Permitted Development rights within Conservation Areas were tighter and therefore designation would provide additional protection. If it were considered that proposed developments would be harmful an Article 4 direction could be imposed to remove specific householder development rights.
216. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
217. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Approved the Lynchmere Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan at Appendix I of report PC60/16 for the purposes of development management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partner organisations.
 2. Approved proposed extensions to the Lynchmere Conservation Area as shown on the proposals map attached to the Appraisal at Appendix I of report PC60/16.

ITEM 12 FERNHURST CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

218. The Committee considered report PC61/16, [presentation](#) and commented:
- The local community were congratulated on the completion of the CAAMP, which would benefit the community and the village
 - Cultural Heritage was important to the SDNPA
219. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The SDNPA identified buildings which might qualify for eventual 'Local List' status as it appraised Conservation Areas. Statutory listing applications were supported by the National Park where merited but nominations were not always successful. It was necessary to balance the resource implications against the outcomes.
220. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
221. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Approved the Fernhurst Conservation Area Conservation and Management Plan at Appendix I of report PC61/16 for the purposes of development management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partner organisations.
 2. Approved a proposed extension to the Fernhurst Conservation Area as shown on the proposals map attached to the Appraisal at Appendix I of report 61/16.

TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

222. Thursday 19 January 2017 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 12:33pm.

