

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 SEPTEMBER 2016

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

Present:

Heather Baker,	David Coldwell	Barbara Holyome	Doug Jones
Tom Jones	Gary Marsh	Ian Phillips	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), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) and Stella New (Committee Officer),

Also attended by: Stephen Cantwell (Development Management Lead East), Sarah Nelson (Strategic Planning Lead), Katharine Stuart (Senior Planning Policy Officer) and Dan Ashe (Planning Policy Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

70. The Director of Planning informed those present that:
- Members of the Committee did not represent their appointing bodies on the Authority but, as a Member, were responsible for ensuring that the Authority achieves the National Park Purposes and Duty, and does so in a way that best suits the special characteristics of the National Park as a whole.
 - 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.
71. As both the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee were absent from the meeting (and in line with Standing Order 8.5), the Committee were asked to nominate a Chair for the meeting. Doug Jones was chosen, and presided as Chair for the rest of the meeting.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

72. Apologies were received from, Alun Alesbury, Neville Harrison, and Margaret Paren (ex officio).

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

73. There were none.

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

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

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

75. There were none

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

76. There were none.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

77. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

ITEM 7: SDNP/16/01758/FUL HOME PARK FARM, PORTSMOUTH ROAD, MILLAND, GU30 7JG

78. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the [September update sheet](#) which detailed a revised officer's recommendation.
79. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Nigel Cartwright spoke against the application on behalf of Milland Parish Council.

- Dr Jeremy Cornish spoke against the application on behalf of Liphook Golf Club.
 - Janet Long spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.
 - Isla Denton-Thompson spoke in support of the application on behalf of Terra Firma, the Landscape Architects.
 - Chris Saunders spoke in support of the application on behalf of Motion, the Transport Consultant.
80. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC42/16), the [September update sheet](#), the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The UK's recent success at Olympics highlighted the importance of international standard sports facilities.
 - Their support for the proposal on this site, which replaced a defunct equestrian centre and could benefit the environment as a result of its implementation.
 - The need for careful handling of the conditions relating to detailed matters of design, biodiversity, landscape and drainage to ensure materials and finishes of buildings and hard surfaces had a minimal impact on the surroundings.
 - There were concerns raised that:
 - There would be significant vehicle and pedestrian activity within the site
 - The proposed traffic flow and direction through the site was largely self-regulated and would be difficult to control.
 - The single track road leading into the site which was also used by pedestrians and golf club members, and the potential for conflict of use particularly on Sunday event days which might not be adequately mitigated through the employment of traffic marshals.
 - The passing bays might be insufficient for the volume of traffic.
 - Traffic leaving the site would find it difficult to turn right into fast moving traffic.
81. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The conditions relating to the current application did not allow for the installation of a PA system, which would need to be applied for separately with the required technical details.
 - The biomass boiler could be replaced by the applicant.
 - In response to concerns raised with regard to traffic:
 - A traffic survey had been carried out by the traffic consultant on behalf of the applicant, and the predicted traffic flow of 12 vehicles per hour represented a 1% increase.
 - Manure would be stored on concrete and the effluent filtered before entering the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS). Any remaining material would be removed by the contractor employed by the Equestrian Hospital.
 - The length of the passing places varied from 1-2 car lengths.
 - The Highways Authority considered that the 102 car parking spaces and 150 overflow spaces was an adequate amount.
 - Condition 24 could be amended to include a detailed traffic management plan incorporating the management of event traffic.
82. The Senior Solicitor confirmed that a formal decision could not be taken on the application until the 21 day certificate served on the relevant landowners had expired.
83. The Director of Planning stated that whilst the Highways Authority had recommended that widening of the access road be considered, as the land concerned was not in ownership of the applicant this could be best achieved through informatives seeking to improve the road.
84. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

85. **RESOLVED: SDNP/16/01758/FUL** That authority was given to the Director of Planning to approve the application subject to:
- 1) The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC42/16 and the September 2016 update sheet, with the amendment of:
 - a) Condition 8 to include the design of the SuDS pond, graded edges and soil retention and profiling
 - b) Condition 18 to reflect the later operating hours of lecture demonstrations
 - c) Condition 19 to include details of specific external lights, timing and means by which these would be extinguished
 - d) Condition 24 to include a Traffic Management Plan which should incorporate a detailed event traffic management plan
 - 2) Inclusion of the list of approved drawings at Condition 1.

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

ITEM 8: SDNP/16/03706/FUL Hoe Court Farm, Hoe Court, Lancing, West Sussex

86. The Case Officer [presented the application](#) and referred to the [September update sheet](#) which detailed a revised officer's recommendation.
87. Mark Milling addressed the Committee and spoke in support of the application as the Bursar of Lancing College.
88. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC43/16) the [September update sheet](#), the public speaker comments and commented:
- Their support for the application which would be of great benefit to the college and students.
 - Their general support for the development of equestrian learning centres in the National Park.
 - The application was in accordance with the National Park Purposes, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) particularly in relation to education and employment.
 - Relating to landscape, concerns were raised that:
 - Condition 9 relating to Landscape was highly specified and therefore exclusive of other elements of hard and soft landscaping.
 - There was a need for a Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan, including details of the proposed additional tracks, which had management implications.
 - Inclusion of the additional tracks in a Landscape Management Plan would give assurance that matters of landscape had been considered and would remain under consideration.
 - The College was fully aware of their responsibilities to the landscape and requiring details of the additional tracks could be difficult to implement and represented overly rigorous monitoring.
 - There were already laws in place relating to the maintenance of bridleways.
89. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Information was still awaited from the Ecology Officer, hence the recommendation to delegate the final decision to the Director of Planning.
 - The single storey height of the judging box was on a similar scale to the wooden stables.
 - Relating to the concerns raised regarding landscape:
 - The standard landscape condition could be applied
 - The landscape condition adequately covered matters such as levels and their treatment with regard to visual impact and safety.
 - The use of the bridleway would not be excessive as the College would develop a network of tracks to allow variation, and the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) Rights of Way officer was content with the proposal

90. It was proposed and seconded to amend Condition 9 to require a Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan that made no specific reference to the proposed additional new tracks. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
91. **RESOLVED:** That Condition 9 be amended to require a Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan without specific reference to the additional tracks.
92. **SDNP/16/03706/FUL** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation, with the amendment of Condition 9 to require a Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan without specific reference to the additional tracks as resolved at the meeting (minutes 80 and 81). Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
93. **RESOLVED: SDNP/16/03706/FUL:** That authority be given to the Director of Planning to approve the application subject to:
- 1) A response from the County Ecologist and satisfaction with the further ecological review
 - 2) The conditions set out in section 10 of report PC 43/16 and the September 2016 update sheet, with the amendment of
 - i) Condition 9 to require a Biodiversity and Landscape Management Plan without specific reference to the additional tracks
 - ii) Condition 15 to require details of external lights, timing and means by which these would be extinguished
 - 3) Inclusion of the list of approved drawings at Condition 1

STRATEGY & POLICY

ITEM 9 FINDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN DECISION STATEMENT

94. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC44/16) and the [September Update Sheet](#) and commented:
- Their support for the comments made in the Examiner's report, which allowed the Findon NDP to proceed to referendum.
 - The outcome was unfortunate, particularly given the hard work that had been put into the NDP by the Parish Council, and the amount of public funding that had been spent on the project.
 - The letter sent to Planning Committee members from Findon Parish Council querying the Examiner's findings was concerning.
 - Their regret that the residents of Findon would not have the opportunity to vote on proposed housing allocations when the NDP proceeded to referendum.
 - If successful at referendum, even though the housing sites would be allocated by the SDNPA, the Parish Council would receive 25% of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding from new development, rather than 15%.
95. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The NDP as altered in accordance with the Decision Statement could proceed to referendum, although the policies were limited in scope to development management rather than spatial and strategic policies.
 - As the adopted Arun Local Plan 2003 did not allocate housing for Findon Parish, there was no conformity issue and the NDP as revised by the Examiner met the Basic Conditions.
 - As no housing allocations were being made by the NDP, the Examiner had not considered the extension of the NDP by 3 years beyond the emerging South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) to be an issue.
 - No sites had been identified yet, and as there was some concern with regard to the clarity and robustness of the criteria that had been used to identify potential housing sites for the NDP, all potential allocation sites would now be re-assessed.

- The SDNPA would review the settlement boundary and if necessary extend it to include a housing allocation site.
 - The allocation of housing land would now fall to the SDNPA as the Planning Authority through the emerging SDLP, and the community would have the same opportunity to respond and comment through consultation as would any other community without a NDP.
 - An allocation of 20 homes for Findon over and above windfall sites had been identified in the Preferred Options SDLP, and numbers could increase or decrease depending on evidence and available sites coming forward.
 - 25 homes had been identified in the Housing Needs Study carried out by the Parish Council.
 - Housing Needs Studies were considered an indication, albeit the methodology for assessing these varied.
 - Findon had a Village Design Statement (VDS) which was cross referenced throughout the NDP.
 - The initial aims of the Parish at the outset of the process would have best been met through an NDP, however there had been difficulty in bringing forward development policies during the preparation process, and the majority of the NDP's remaining policies could have been incorporated within a VDS or covered by the current and/or emerging Local Plan.
 - If the NDP did not secure 50% of the vote at referendum, the Parish could choose to return to the Regulation 14 Pre-submission stage and re-draft the NDP.
96. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
97. **RESOLVED: SDNP/16/02767/FUL:** That the Committee
- 1) Noted the Examiner's Report and recommended modifications to make the Findon Neighbourhood Development Plan meet the basic conditions as set out at Appendix 2 of report PC44/16.
 - 2) Agreed the 'Decision Statement' as set out at Appendix 3 of Report PC44/16, which set out the modifications that would be made to the Findon Neighbourhood Development Plan in response to the Examiner's recommendations.
98. The Chair adjourned for lunch at 12.43pm and Committee Member Gary Marsh left the meeting at 12.43pm.
99. The meeting reconvened at 1:20pm

ITEM 10: REVISED POLICIES FOR THE PRE-SUBMISSION SOUTH DOWNS LOCAL PLAN

100. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC45/16), the [September update sheet](#), [the officer's presentation](#), and commented:
- Spatial Strategy and Portrait Chapter
- Their support for the revisions made to the policies, which now flowed better.
 - The additional information on Ecosystems Services was welcome, in particular the reference to EcoServ mapping.
 - How the information could best be made available to the public, as this was dynamic and subject to change.
- Transport Policies
- Their congratulations for the significant improvements made to the policies, which now flowed.
- Understanding and Enjoyment of the National Park Policies
- The wording of SD20 and the supporting text was overly positive, and implied the reuse of all rural buildings was acceptable, whereas some rural buildings were unattractive and their retention undesirable.

- It was reasonable to promote a Year Round economy to promote the rural economy, and the issue of relaxation of controls could be actively dealt with in the supporting text.
- Whilst support should be given to promotion of the rural economy, it was important that policy wording should not be too permissive.

Shop Fronts and Adverts Policies

- Their support for the amended policy wording and changes made.

I01. In response to questions, officers clarified:

Spatial Strategy and Portrait Chapter

- Officers were preparing an evidence based document covering detailed Ecosystems Services proposals for the 5 Broad Areas, consisting of maps, an explanation and a link to the EcoServ handbook, for publication in December 2016.
- The Viewshed Analysis presented similar issues in terms of the dynamic nature of the information, and advice would be sought as to how this could be made available to the public in the future.

Transport Policies

- Disability access was now incorporated into Building Regulations and development policies were no longer required to cover this. This could be addressed through a Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- Public Art had originally been covered by a separate policy, but was well placed in policy SD43 Public Realm and Highway Design following a decision taken by Members last year not to have a standalone policy, and would carry the same weight regardless of whether it was in a separate policy or part of another policy.

Understanding and Enjoyment of the National Park Policies

- The wording 'where appropriate' could be added to SD20 as this had a wide application and would not encourage a tendency to replace buildings.
- The Sustainable Tourism Strategy was a published document with the aim of increasing a variety of longer stay visitors, and not subject to amendment.
- Promotion of a year round economy was one of a number issues raised by the Sustainable Tourism Strategy that the SDLP was seeking to support.
- Relaxation or removal of seasonal planning restrictions was one way in which year round economy could be supported, however including this example in the policy wording gave unnecessary emphasis to this as a single approach.

I02. Summary of proposed changes to be taken forward by officers:

Transport Policies

- Reference to be made to the Manual for Streets 2) in the supporting text, as this had particular application in rural areas.
- Clarity to be sought with regard to the type of electric vehicles that could be charged at the electrical charging points.

Understanding and Enjoyment of the National Park Policies

- The revision of the wording of policy SD20 and supporting text to incorporate the re-use of buildings where this was appropriate.
- The revision of paragraph 3) of SD20 to read 'The Authority will support a year-round visitor economy, while ensuring the facility remains for visitor use.'

I03. The Planning Committee Chair stated that the Local Plan Members Working Group (LPMWG) had provided invaluable help and advice in the preparation of the Local Plan policies, adding value before these were formally considered at Planning Committee, and Planning Committee members should encourage their colleagues to attend LPMWG meetings.

I04. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

105. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- 1) Endorsed the direction of the policies as detailed in Appendices 1 to 5 of report PC45/16 and September 2016 update sheet for inclusion in the Pre-Submission Local Plan document, subject to the changes proposed by the Planning Committee (minute 103) being addressed.
- 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

ITEM 11: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

106. Thursday 13 October 2016 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 2.02pm.

