

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE 9 FEBRUARY 2017

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

Present:

Alun Alesbury	Heather Baker	Barbara Holyome	Neville Harrison (Chair)
Doug Jones	Tom 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: Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead West), Vincent Haines (Development Control Officer), Michael Scammell (Conservation Officer), Stephen Cantwell (Development Management Lead East), Robert Thain (Minerals & Waste Lead), Sarah Nelson (Strategic Planning Lead), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager) Chris Patterson (Communities Lead), Matthew Bates (Local Plan Lead) and Dan Ashe (Planning Policy Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

270. 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 1pm

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

271. Apologies were received from, David Coldwell, Gary Marsh and Amber Thacker.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Items 7 & 8 as a member of East Hampshire District Council.

Tom Jones declared a public service interest in Item 11 as a member of Lewes District Council (Lead Member for Planning) and Ditchling Parish Council. As a resident of Ditchling he knew all of the public speakers and had kept an open mind in regard to the application and had not taken part in any discussions at Parish Council meetings on the item.

Doug Jones declared a public service interest in Item 10 as the applicant was a member of the SDNPA Sustainable Communities Fund Panel to which Doug was the Chair.

272. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Items 10 & 11 as a member of the South Downs Society

273. Doug Jones declared a public service interest during item 10 as detailed in minute 302.

274. Barbara Holyome declared a public service interest during item 10 as detailed in minute 302.

275. Margaret Paren declared a public service interest in item 15 as detailed in minute 324

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19 JANUARY 2017

276. The minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017 as amended in the [February update sheet](#) were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

277. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

278. There were none

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

279. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

ITEM 7: SDNP/16/03835/FUL. BROAD VIEW FARM, BLACKNEST ROAD, BINSTED, ALTON, HAMPSHIRE GU34 4PX

280. The Case Officer [presented](#) the application and referred to the [February update sheet](#) which detailed a revised recommendation to include a S106 agreement and amendment to condition 14 and removal of condition 18.

281. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Nigel Barrow spoke against the application on behalf of himself and his neighbours.
- Karen Clark of Hedley Clark Ltd spoke against the application on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Anderson
- Sue Hodder spoke against the application representing Binsted Parish Council
- Stephen Andrews spoke in support of the application as the Agent
- Karen Cullen spoke in support of the application as the wife of the applicant.

282. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC06/17), the [February update sheet](#), the public speaker comments, and commented:

- The scheme was a modest development and an encouraging farm diversification plan. There had been few objections to the farm shop
- The re wilding was not necessary but was encouraging
- The conditions covered the outstanding issues
- A management plan had been provided
- The applicant had worked to mitigate previous objections
- It was pleasing to see more parking provision near to the farm shop
- A 3 metre wide landscape sympathetic access route with the ability to park on the edges would be preferable
- Farm vehicles can use access tracks that were not finished in tarmac
- The areas around the cabins were likely to be boggy during the winter months
- Their concerns regarding:
 - There were too many outstanding issues being controlled by conditions
 - Lack of clarity regarding external lighting which could have a detrimental effect on the area
 - External hard and soft landscaping which was extensive and left to be dealt with by conditions
 - The lack of clarity regarding the extensive engineering works that needed to be carried out in regard to the access route and the levels which would also impact on trees
 - The plans did not show a scheme for root protection of trees
 - The visual impact, scale, materials and levels of the access route. A tarmac 5metre wide road was unsatisfactory in rural surroundings and would adversely affect the landscape
 - Additional works such as hardstanding might be required around the cabins in the winter months and permitted development rights should be removed. Any track or hardstanding between the cabins would have an adverse impact on the landscape

- That dogs would be allowed to stay in the cabins near the sheep farming.

283. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- There were no indications of finished levels for the access route at this stage. The access route would be 5 metres wide
- The Highways response was received on 5 December 2016 there were no concerns regarding safety, however a response in regard to parking provision was provided
- The application did not include lighting for the cabins, however a condition was in place to cover lighting on the farm shop and cafe.
- The emerging South Downs Local Plan contained policies to safeguard disused routes such as disused railway lines for future cycling routes. The application scheme did not impinge on the nearby disused railway line.
- The application did not require an analysis on the effect on nearby small businesses
- The application detailed the use of tarmac for the bell mouth of the access route and porous scalping for the remainder of the access route and car park
- There were no designated recreational areas. Areas around the cabins were grassed and each cabin had a covered seating area
- The re wilding activities were supplementary to farming and were in the gift of the applicant
- The existing definitive footpath runs through the farm where the cabins were proposed
- Informal access to cabins was commonplace
- The Committee have previously granted permissions with a number of conditions to resolve outstanding issues such as hard and soft landscaping.

284. SDNP/1603835/FUL: It was proposed and seconded to delegate the grant of permission to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair in order to:

- Negotiate a variation to the access route to achieve a less negative visual impact on the landscape
- Ensure the deed of variation was completed to amend the site location plan contained in the S106 agreement
- The conditions set out in the report and update sheet, the removal of permitted development rights and removal of the words 'above slab level' in conditions 3 & 4

Following a vote the proposal was carried.

285. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/1603835/FUL: That the grant of planning permission be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair subject to:

1. Negotiation of a variation to the access route to reduce the negative landscape impact in regard to scale, materials and levels
2. A deed of variation to be completed to amend the site location plan contained in the S106 agreement
3. Conditions:
 - (i) As set out in paragraph 11.1 of report PC06/17 and February update sheet
 - (ii) Modifications to conditions 3 & 4 to remove 'above slab level' and
 - (iii) Additional condition to remove permitted development rights in regard to hardstanding.

ITEM 8: SDNP/16/05343/FTP BROAD VIEW FARM, BLACKNEST ROAD, BINSTED, ALTON, HAMPSHIRE GU34 4PX.

286. The Case Officer [presented](#) the application.

287. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Ian Salisbury spoke against the application on behalf of himself
- Geoff Woollen spoke against the application on behalf of himself.

288. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC07/17), the [January update sheet](#) and the public speaker comments.
289. In response to questions, officers clarified that the new proposed footpath did not contain any styles but a new gate and confirmed that the section of the path relevant to the order was correctly shown.
290. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
291. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/05343/FTP: That
1. An order shall be made providing for the diversion of part of public footpath no.55. If no objections received to confirm the order. As shown on the plan at Appendix 2 of report PC07/17.
 2. If after making the order objections are received that cannot be resolved, it shall be submitted to the Secretary of State for a decision.

292. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 11:55am

293. The meeting re convened at 12:04pm

ITEM 9: SDNP/16/04263/FUL & SDNP/16/04264/LIS STANMER HOUSE STABLE BLOCK STANMER VILLAGE STANMER PARK BRIGHTON BN1 9QA

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

295. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Rosie Harrison spoke against the application on behalf of Stanmer Preservation Society.
- Bill Fairhall spoke against the application representing himself.
- Phil Purvis spoke in support of the application as the Agent.

296. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC08/17), the [February update sheet](#), the public speaker comments, and commented:

- There was a need to be satisfied that a thorough investigation had taken place to establish the facts in regard to the loss of historical fixtures and fittings. There was also a need to establish if any historical photos existed
- The public speakers had indicated that additional information and historical photos might exist; therefore the decision should be deferred to investigate.
- Any additional historical information would be highly desirable
- It would be appropriate to defer any decision in order to investigate restoration or recreation options
- Some Planning Committee members had seen the stables in their original state prior to the previous permission for conversion being granted
- There was a need to have the cycle store on site and other options needed to be explored. The proposed arrangements were not appropriate or practical
- The current internal finish of the studio flat was un sympathetic to the surroundings of the historic building

297. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- Any prosecution case would not require the owner to restore the building. The application before the Committee was to be determined on its merits.
- There was a significant loss of the stable stalls with the original fabric gone. Any attempt at a restoration could only be a recreation.
- Listed Building enforcement could seek to recreate the feature. As there was no evidence of the existence of working drawings, photos would need to be used which could be open to challenge as their interpretation might not be entirely correct
- The agent had confirmed that the historical fixtures and fittings had been destroyed during the conversion works.

298. It was proposed and seconded to defer the consideration of the planning and listed building consent application for no more than 6 months from the date of the meeting in order to obtain further information relating to: Details on the historical fixture and fittings and the appropriateness of the proposed cycle store location
299. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/04263/FUL & SDNP/16/04264/LIS: To defer the consideration of planning application reference SDNP/16/04263/FUL and listed building consent application reference SDNP/16/04264/LIS for not more than 6 months from the 9 February Planning committee meeting in order to obtain further information relating to:
1. Details on the historical fixtures and fittings and
 2. The appropriateness of the proposed cycle store location
300. The Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:46pm
301. The meeting re convened at 1:18pm

ITEM 10: SDNP/16/03499/FUL LAUNDRY COTTAGE EAST DANGSTEIN DANGSTEIN ROAD ROGATE GU31 5BZ

302. Barbara Holyome and Doug Jones declared a Public Service interest in this item as one of the public speakers was known to them as an ex SDNPA employee.
303. The Senior Solicitor informed the Committee that the Applicant for the application (Paddy Cox) was known to some members of the Authority as being a member of the SCF Panel and involved in the Heathlands Reunited Project. His involvement in the business of the SDNPA did not in any way influence the determination of the application which must be considered on its merits.
304. The Case Officer [presented](#) the application and referred to the [February update sheet](#) which included an additional reason for refusal. The Committee were reminded that whilst the applicant may have suggested changes to the application they were not to be considered in determining the current application before the Committee.
305. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Dr Mairi Rennie spoke against the application on behalf of the Parish Council and the South Downs Society.
 - Paddy Walker spoke against the application representing himself and his family as longtime residents and 31 other households.
 - Nick Jacobs spoke against the application representing himself, his wife and his children.
 - Nina Williams spoke in support of the application on behalf of Dangstein Conservancy.
 - Nicola Peel spoke in support of the application on behalf of Dangstein Conservancy.
 - Paddy Cox spoke in support of the application on behalf of Dangstein Conservancy
306. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC09/17), the February update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- It was only the additional uses in addition to forestry that required permission
 - Their support in principle for the proposed activities, however the concerns of the community were understandable
 - The aspirations of the applicant were commended. The proposed activities addressed many of the National Park's Purposes and Duty which the Authority would generally encourage
 - All impact assessments had been received from the applicant. The applicant should not be discouraged with his aspirations, but a more detailed application would be required for any future applications
 - Their concerns regarding:
 - The impact of additional vehicle movements
 - The site had the capacity to hold a large number of vehicles and there was a need to set a limit for this

- There was a lack of clarity on the levels of activity which needed to be managed and controlled at a more appropriate level for the local community
- The levels of activity were too high, the parking needed to be reduced and the access issues resolved
- There was a need to provide a clear plan, with assurances and detailed information regarding the level of activities, vehicle access and parking.

307. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- The current use of the land is for forestry (the growing and harvesting of trees which would include the planting for commercial use)
- The applicant does not own, but has rights of access on the Dangstein road access route. The appropriate notices were served with the submission of the application. Any restrictions on access would be a private law matter.
- The applicant had use of the Dangstein Road and Fynings Lane access routes to the site; there were also additional grassed access routes
- There were no public footpaths or bridleways passing through the application site
- There was a hamlet community adjacent to the application site
- Camping would be available for 365 days per year subject to usual limits of tourist accommodation of up to 28 days for one period of stay
- The Highways Authority had requested more robust figures in regard to vehicle numbers

308. The committee concluded that:

- Reason for refusal 1 needed to be clarified. As the level of activities had not been demonstrated the Committee did not have enough information to reach a conclusion therefore the first reason should be prefixed with the words 'it has not been demonstrated that'
- Reason for refusal 2 the word 'inadequate' should be changed to 'unacceptable'

309. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation as amended and detailed in minute 308. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

310. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/03499/FUL: That Planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 11.1 of report PC09/17 as amended in minute 308 and the update sheet.

ITEM 11: SDNP/16/05154/FUL LAND AT KEYMER ROAD, DITCHLING, EAST SUSSEX

311. The Case Officer [presented](#) the application and referred to the [February update sheet](#) which included amended conditions 4 & 7.

312. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Shirley Crowther spoke against the application on behalf of the Ditchling Society.
- Crispin Mair spoke against the application on behalf of himself and other residents
- Cllr Phillip Smith spoke against the application on behalf of Ditchling Parish Council
- David Campion spoke in support of the application as the Agent
- Justin Wallden spoke in support of the application as the Applicant and Club President
- Rob Becvar spoke in support of the application as the Club Chairman

313. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC10/17), the [February update sheet](#) the public speaker comments, and commented:

- The trees should be subject to TPO
- 11 Matches per year were not excessive
- The proposals did not encroach on to the strategic green gap
- The Neighbourhood Plan specifically referenced the strategic green gap
- The Landscape Officer had a number of objections

- A 4 year temporary permission would provide the opportunity to monitor any landscape impact
- The proposal was a scaled down development from the previous application
- The Authority should be supporting activities in villages and encouraging sports bodies to be responsible for their own land
- Their concerns regarding:
 - The proposals could have a significant landscape impact
 - The proposed drainage solutions could affect trees and the large oak trees to the south should be protected by a TPO
 - Substantial physical works could be required
 - There were no details on the grass seed to be used or how it would be applied, how the ground would be managed and what reinforcement solutions would be used in the car park
 - There were landscape issues that needed to be addressed
 - Whilst temporary the level of investment required to make the surface usable might require longer than 4 years.

314. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- Officers had no information regarding any offers for the club to have further use of an alternative ground. The application before the committee was to be determined on its merits
- Change of use was required to alter agricultural green space to sports use
- There were a number of physical works to be carried out on site such as a change of levels
- The emerging Ditchling, Streat and Westmeston Neighbourhood Plan was in its pre submission stage and therefore had very little weight in determining the application
- A planning condition would require the ground to be returned to pre permission condition after 4 years if no further planning permission were granted
- In 4 years' time any future application would be considered in relation to future adopted development plan policies.

315. The committee concluded:

- That an additional landscape condition was required to cover:
 - The grass seed to be used
 - A feathering approach should be taken in the seeding
 - The length of the grass
 - The ongoing management of the pitch and car park areas
- To ensure the conditions covered
 - The reinforcement material to be used in the car park
 - drainage solutions

316. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation, to include an additional landscape condition as detailed in minute 315 and for officers to explore the possibility for a conditional TPO. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

317. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/05154/FUL: That planning permission be granted on a temporary basis to allow for use not exceeding four years and in accordance with:

- i) The conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of report PC10/17 and the February update sheet.
- ii) Additional landscape condition to be drafted by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair to cover issues raised in minute 315

ITEM 12 REVIEW OF VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND RELATED CONSENTS

318. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC11/17) and the [February update sheet](#).
319. In response to a question, officers clarified that appendix 2 to report PC11/17 detailed the minimum requirements for each application to be validated; however officers could ask for further information if required.
320. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
321. **RESOLVED:** The Committee approved the revised local list of requirements for validating planning applications and related consents for adoption
322. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 3:45pm
323. The meeting re convened at 4:01pm

STRATEGY & POLICY

324. Margaret Paren declared a personal interest in item 15 as she had participated in the Landscape Character Assessment and Village Design Statement, but had not participated in the production of the Plan.

ITEM 14: SDNPA RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION (REG 16) CONSULTATION ON THE LAVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (LNDP).

325. Robert Newman spoke in support of the LNDP as the Parish Councillor and in particular highlighted the support and assistance given to the Neighbourhood Planning group by officers of the National Park especially Nat Belderson
326. The Committee considered report PC13/17, and commented:
- Lavant Parish Council were congratulated for their balanced approach to the Plan
 - Their support for the Plan and Welcomed Cllr. Newman's statement expressing appreciation of Officers assistance
 - Some concern was raised over the loss of the Eastmead Industrial site and it was questioned whether the existing occupants would be able to remain as part of any mixed use scheme.
327. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Some communities were raising levels of parking provision through their Neighbourhood Development Plans, Lavant's wish to do so arises from a recently constructed scheme which is felt to have resulted in local parking problems.
 - Lavant had evidenced a housing need and that the employment site was potentially the only option available. A mixed use development on the site was a local solution that had been assessed by the District Valuer and officer. It should not be seen as setting a precedent elsewhere.
328. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
329. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed the table of comments as set out in Appendix 3 of report PC13/17 which would form The SDNPAs representation to the Independent Examiner of the Lavant NDP.

ITEM 15 SDNPA RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION (REG 16) CONSULTATION ON THE LISS NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (LNDP)

330. The Committee considered report PCI4/17 and commented:
- Liss Parish Council were congratulated on the development of their Plan and for demonstrating collaborative working
 - SDNPA officers were congratulated for their work with the community to reach the submission stage.
 - Amendments to the introduction may be required to ensure it accurately represents how the Parish is made up of individual settlements, with important gaps separating these individual parts of the Parish. It was hoped this could be resolved through discussion during the examination of the LNDP
331. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The Authority had previously made significant representations at the Pre Submission stage. The focus of these representations was in relation to the allocation of land at Browns Farm, officers reported that the neighbourhood Planning Group had prepared a development brief to deal with these concerns
 - Some policies would duplicate policies in the South Downs Local Plan or East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy. Whilst this duplication was a concern officers and Members appreciated that some policies were included to demonstrate that the community's aspirations were reflected in the LNDP. However if a wording of a Neighbourhood Plan were different to that in the Local Plan; that duplication could cause issues.
332. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised officer's recommendation. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.
333. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the table of comments as set out in Appendix 2 of the report which will form SDNPAs representation to the Independent Examiner of the Liss NDP.

ITEM 13 REVISED POLICIES FOR THE PRE-SUBMISSION SOUTH DOWNS LOCAL PLAN

334. 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
335. The Committee considered report PCI2/17 the [January update sheet](#): and were taken through each of the policies in regard to:
- Development Strategy
 - Homes (strategic)
 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
 - Employment
 - Town Centres and Retail
 - Infrastructure
 - Implementation and Monitoring Chapter
336. Norman Dingemans left the meeting at 16:51pm
337. Concern was raised around the approach that was being taken to wording policies. The Director of Planning confirmed that when the whole plan was produced further consideration would be given to the positive nature of policies.
338. Following Committee discussion the proposed changes to be taken forward by officers were agreed as follows:
Development Strategy: There were still amendments to be made to the text on settlements outside the National Park'

Homes: an alternative word was needed to replace housing 'requirement'

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: an explanation was needed to explain why the numbers didn't match those in the supporting text

Town Centres and Retail: Policy SD31: 5, 6, 7 & 8 needed to be reorganised and clarified. The introduction for Town and Villages showed some inconsistencies which required amendments. Members were asked to send their views to the Officer responsible for the text.

Infrastructure: Green Infrastructure needed to be cross referenced in more sections than the introduction

It was to be clarified why Public Houses were not included in the list of community facilities in policy SD43

339. Margaret Paren and Alun Alesbury left the meeting at 5:28pm

340. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1) Endorsed the direction of the policies as detailed in Appendices 1 to 7 of report PC12/17 for inclusion in the Pre-Submission Local Plan document, subject to the comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed as detailed in minute 338.
- 2) Noted that the Pre-Submission Local Plan will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
- 3) Note that the Pre-Submission Local Plan document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority

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

341. Thursday 9 March 2017 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 5:46 pm.