

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 15 JUNE 2017

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

Present: Alun Alesbury (Deputy Chair), David Coldwell, Neville Harrison (Chair), Barbara Holyome, Tom Jones, Gary Marsh, Ian Phillips, Amber Thacker

Officers: Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robin Parr (Head of Governance), Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Gill Welsman (Committee Officer)

Also attended by: Dan Ashe (Planning Policy Officer), Matthew Bates (Local Plan Lead), David Boyson (Conservation Officer), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Alma Howell (Neighbourhood and Policy Planning Officer), Amy Tyler-Jones (Neighbourhood Planning Officer) Victoria Corrigan (Senior Development Management Officer)

OPENING REMARKS

473. 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 13 onward on the agenda would not be considered before 1:30pm.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

474. Apologies were received from Heather Baker, Norman Dingemans, Doug Jones, Robert Mocatta and Margaret Paren.

ITEM 2: DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

475. David Coldwell declared a public service interest in Items 9 and 10 as a member of Horsham District Council.

476. Amber Thacker declared a public service interest in Items 13 and 17 as a member of Winchester District Council.

477. Tom Jones declared a public service interest in Item 8 as a member of Lewes District Council.

478. Neville Harrison declared public service interests in:

- Item 8 as SDNPA member representative on the Lewes Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group who has attended meetings in an advisory capacity.
- Item 11 as Chairman of Southease Parish Meeting who was involved with initiating the Conservation Area Plan review, and has commented on the item; he had decided he would withdraw from the meeting for this item.

479. Alan Aylesbury declared a public service interest in Item 17 as a member Stoughton Parish Council.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 MAY 2017

480. The minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

481. Tim Slaney informed the Committee that the scheduled date for the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan referendum is 18 July 2017.

482. Gary Marsh advised the Committee that all members had been contacted by residents of Petworth with objections to the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan, Neville Harrison confirmed that he has responded on behalf of the Committee.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

483. Tim Slaney updated the Committee regarding the planning application at Madehurst Lodge. The planning permission is dated 9th June 2017

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

484. There were none.

STRATEGY AND POLICY

ITEM 7: DRAFT PRE-SUBMISSION SOUTH DOWNS LOCAL PLAN

485. The Policy Planning Manager presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet. She also referred to a number of emails that had been received about allocations in Coldwaltham and Easebourne. These will be fully addressed by officers who will feed back to members at the Full Authority Local Plan Review Meeting on 29 June.
486. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Cllr David Caukill speaking against proposals specifically with regard to the allocation of a site, Half Acre, as an authorised site for gypsies and traveller on behalf of Hawkley Parish Council.
 - Karen Tipper spoke against proposals on behalf of Steve Dudman, sole owner of Shoreham Cement Works.
 - Henry Alexander spoke against proposals in Kingston on behalf of the immediate neighbours.
 - John Wheelhouse spoke against proposals as a representative of Stedham and Iping Parish Council.
 - Cllr Keith Budden spoke both for and against on behalf of the residents of Hawkley and Greatham.
 - David Hutchison spoke in support on behalf of Findon Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.
487. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC32/17) and the Chair commended the Officers on the progress that has been made on the plan.
488. Comments and responses were made by Members and Officers as follows.
489. **Thriving Living Landscapes**
- Policy SD4, page 54. The use of the word 'only' is appropriate here. Officers would also review the wording in other strategic policies. SD12, SD13 and SD15 were also suggested however these are not strategic policies.
 - Policy SD5, page 57. No mention of ongoing management. Add references to supporting text.
 - Policy SD9, page 71, paragraph 2(b)i. Use of word Ecological rather than Environmental to be noted and reviewed.
 - Page 81, paragraph 5.106. Add reference to the Viability SPD and review text for tourism policy.
 - Note that wording of phrase 'conserve or enhance' to read 'conserve *and* enhance' was supported.
490. **People Connected To Places**
- Policy SD20, page 98. Historical railways have been safeguarded and recorded as accurately as possible. The policy has been worded to ensure support of purpose 2 and there will always be individual considerations for future development applications. There

is no one single framework available and whilst attempts to standardise will be made future cases will be looked at in their own merit.

- Policy SD21, page 101, paragraph 5. Discussion regarding whether this policy is too supportive of public art, particularly in rural areas. Officers to review policy.
- Policy SD23, 1(g)iii, page 108. Addition of word 'endorse' before Whole Estate Plans.

491. **Towards Sustainable Future**

- Policy SD22, page 115. Officers to review colour coding to replicate colour on map shown on page 22.
- Policy SD25, SD26 and figure 7.1, page 122. Officers to clarify naming of Cheriton/Hinton Marsh/Kilmeston.
- Policy SD30, page 136. Officers to review caveat regarding small housing to support future planning applications.
- Policy SD32, page 139, 2(e). Add words: "...as a total habitable floor space not exceeding 120m² (gross internal area)..."
- Policy SD38, 4(a), page 160. Officers to clarify and consider wording regarding use and purpose of garden centres.
- Policy SD39, paragraph 3, page 164. Officers to clarify 'continuous disuse'.
- Policy SD43, page 173. Re-word the policy to clarify conversion of village centre facilities into housing followed by applications to build new facilities in the countryside.
- Policy SD45, page 177. There was a discussion on the status of the Green Infrastructure Framework, paragraph 7.243. When the final version is published it will form a background paper for the Local Plan, but will not be a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Definition to be included in Glossary.

492. **Strategic Sites**

- Policy SD56, page 209. Expert advice we have received from both Keith Holland and David Hogger of PINS supported the policy as drafted. There was support for Area Action Plan (AAP), which would provide a good level of scrutiny. Supporting AAP to be produced.

493. **Sites & Settlements**

- Policy SD63, page 235, paragraph 9.40. Add the requirement to retain the cottage to the policy.
- Policy SD64, page 240. Further discussion regarding the designated area is ongoing with the parish.
- Policies SD71 and SD72, pages 259 and 261. Emerging situation is encouraging, some uncertainty as to how will relate to Local Plan.
- Policies SD73, SD74 and SD75 pages 268-277. Member concern for concentration of sites.
- Policy SD75, page 277. Temporary situation referred to in policy has now changed, however the site is appropriate for allocation as it meets the required criteria.
- Policy SD77, page 282. Detailed assessment of site has been carried out, plans are deemed to be an appropriate use of the site.
- Policy SD92, page 331. Careful development of this site would ensure sustainability and integration into the village. Officers will continue to work closely with the parish, inclusion within the Local Plan protects the current provision for commercial space. Site should remain in the Local Plan.
- Policy SD92, page 332, 3(h). Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) will be served as appropriate for areas within the Local Plan.

494. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- The wording of criterion 2c of policy SD56 was deemed to be appropriate as it provided sufficient guidance and flexibility for appropriate land uses on the site. Housing is not

named as an acceptable land use for Shoreham Cement Works, but would be considered along with other land uses if they enabled the environmentally-led restoration of the site.

- The proposed allocation of sites in the new Findon Neighbourhood Plan do not affect the allocation of sites for Findon in the Local Plan. There is a complex history regarding allocation of sites within Findon. There is a requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan to be developed by the Parish Council as the qualifying body, not the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group. A memorandum of understanding between the NPA and the Parish Council has not been signed by the Parish Council. There were various options available to the working group in order to move forward and the SDNPA will continue to work with all parties as they progress the plan.
- The allocation of Gypsy and Traveller sites were capacity based and landscape led,. However there is a need to demonstrate that there have been legitimate attempts to meet provision, which has been fulfilled.

495. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

1. Endorsed the direction of the draft Pre-Submission Local Plan as detailed in Appendix I, subject to the comments made by the Planning Committee being considered.
2. Noted the main issues arising from Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) set out in this report.
3. Recommended that the National Park Authority approve the draft Pre-Submission Local Plan on 11 July 2017 for public consultation under Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 subject to any minor changes that arise prior to the start of the consultation being agreed by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority.
4. Recommended that the National Park Authority delegate authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority to make any minor changes arising from the consultation and submit the Pre-Submission Local Plan to the Secretary of State under regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 for examination.
5. Noted that if major changes are required to the Pre-Submission Local Plan that a further public consultation and decision by the Authority will be required.

Gary Marsh left the meeting at 12:31pm.

ITEM 8: RESPONSE TO THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION ON THE LEWES NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

496. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC33/17), the update sheet and commented:

- The Chair thanked and congratulated the Lewes NDP Steering Group for their endeavour and activity to find appropriate sites and commended their regard to affordable housing. He also thanked the Officers for their support of the steering group.
- Amendment to wording of paragraph 1 on page 54 as past the 'advanced stage'.
- High levels of affordable housing included in the plan which will not attract CIL. Request for definition of affordable housing and how it is applied.
- Effect on numbers of housing and Old Mallings Farm.

497. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- The ambition of Lewes regarding affordable housing is to be commended. 50% is appropriate in certain circumstances and caution is required with regards to moving forward. Officer comments were in the comments to be submitted. The recommendation is to move forward with the SDNP vision for affordable housing as laid out in the Local Plan.
- Old Mallings Farm is a strategic allocation within the Local Plan.

498. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agreed the Table of Comments as set out in Appendix 3 of the report, subject to the correction in the update sheet and comments made by the

Committee, which will form the SDNPA representation to the Lewes Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-Submission consultation.

ITEM 9: AMBERLEY – MAKING OF THE PLAN

499. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC34/17).
500. There were no comments from the Committee.
501. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Noted the outcomes of the Amberley referendum.
 2. Agreed to make the Amberley Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan.

ITEM 10: WOODMANCOTE – MAKING OF THE PLAN

502. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC35/17).
503. There were no comments from the Committee.
504. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Noted the outcomes of the Woodmancote referendum.
 2. Agreed to make the Woodmancote Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan for the part of the neighbourhood area that lies within the South Downs National Park.
505. Deputy-Chair Alun Aylesbury proposed that Item 12 be taken before Item 11, the Chair concurred.

ITEM 12: EAST CHILTINGTON CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

506. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC37/17).
507. There were no comments from the Committee.
508. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Approved the proposed extensions to the Conservation Area boundary as set out in paragraph 6.5 and shown on Figure 14, of the Appraisal and Management Plan.
 2. Adopted the East Chiltington Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, attached as Appendix 1 to this report, for the purposes of Development Management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partners.

Neville Harrison left the meeting at 1:10pm and handed the Chair to Alun Aylesbury.

ITEM 11: SOUTHEASE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

509. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC36/17)
510. There were no comments from the Committee.
511. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1. Approved the proposed extensions to Southease Conservation Area, as set out in paragraph 6.4, and shown on Figure 24, of the Appraisal and Management Plan.
 2. Adopted the Southease Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, attached as Appendix 1 to this report, for the purposes of Development Management and to inform the wider activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partners.

The Deputy Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 1:15pm.

The meeting reconvened at 1:50pm and Neville Harrison re-took the Chair.

ITEM 13: SDNP/16/05360/FUL MANOR FARM, ALRESFORD ROAD, ITCHEN STOKE, SO24 0QT

512. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
513. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Rebecca Prior spoke against the application representing herself and her family, as the owner of Itchen Stoke Manor.

- Alex Munday spoke against the application on behalf of the owner of Itchen Stoke Manor.
 - Mark Baring spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
 - Jeremy Higgins spoke in support of the application as a representative of the applicant.
514. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC38/17), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The arena size was very large, however it could be required for certain equestrian activities which were not clearly outlined.
 - Whether this constituted a major development, whereby tests of paragraph 116 of the NPPF would apply.
 - Clarification regarding the position of the railway line and whether the proposal safeguarded the route.
 - Acknowledgment that this was an ‘on balance’ recommendation from the Officer.
 - Wording of landscape conditions requires reviewing.
 - Need to secure the Public Right of Way (Watercress Line).
 - Little attempt of proposal to use renewable energy.
515. Their concerns regarding:
- The building being overly large and in a conservation area was raised by several Members.
 - The proposal appeared large compared to the size of the existing equestrian enterprise and whether consideration needed to be given to the business expanding.
 - Potential transport issues from increased vehicular traffic, especially at the junctions at Kingsworthy and Arlesford Road.
 - Concern that the architectural design didn’t enhance the area.
 - Conflict of use of Watercress line as a future cycleway as identified in the Pre-submission version of the Local Plan.
 - Concern regarding loss of tranquillity, increased lighting and the impact on local area.
516. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The size of the proposed building in relation agricultural permitted development rights.
 - Section 6.4 of the report outlined considerations with regard to whether officers felt that this was a major development and confirmed that context is important. If the application were to be considered for the purposes of Para 116, then officers would need to give consideration as to whether the proposal meets the exception tests set out in Para 116.
 - The Watercress Line is safeguarded within the Pre-submission version of the Local Plan.
 - The indoor arena would secure all year round use and enable multiple activities to run concurrently.
 - Indoor arena would be of a functional design in keeping with the adjacent portal frame barn and rural agricultural buildings generally.
 - Determining whether a development is ‘major development’ is a matter of planning judgement based on all the circumstances, taking into account the local context and the potential impact that the development may have on the National Park by reason of its scale, character or nature.
517. It was proposed and seconded to defer full consideration of the proposal, in order to obtain further information relating to: whether the development was considered to be ‘major’ and if so, whether it meets the tests set out in Para 116, the impact of the development on the Watercress Line and safeguarding that could be provided, the highway impact of the development in relation to the Kingsworthy junction with the Basingstoke Road and the Alresford Road junction.
518. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/05360/FUL: That determination of the planning application reference SDNP/16/05360/FUL be deferred for the following reasons:

1. To consider whether the proposals are major development and paragraph 116 of the NPPF applies.
2. To consider the impact of the development on the Watercress Line and any safeguarding that can be provided.
3. To further consider the highway impact of the proposed development particularly in relation to the Kings Worthy Junction (Basingstoke Road) and the Alresford Road Junction.

ITEM 14: SDNP/17/01088/OUT LAND SOUTH OF BARLAVINGTON WAY, MIDHURST, WEST SUSSEX, GU29 9TG

519. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
520. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Rev David Coote speaking against application as a representative of Midhurst Town Council.
 - Jeremy Higgins speaking in support of the application as a representative of the applicant.
521. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC39/17), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The site is attractive and is regenerating as heathland with ecological potential
 - This is a rural site, although not agricultural, which is surrounded by woodland.
 - It was acknowledged that there is a need for housing but not in unacceptable locations within the National Park.
522. Their concerns regarding:
- The reason for the site having already been extensively cleared with loss of some mature trees.
 - The design having a lack of reference to the character of Midhurst.
 - This was an unnecessary development.
 - The development being outside of the settlement boundary.
 - Intrinsic harm to the landscape needs to be considered as well as visual impact.
523. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- No specific reasons for clearing the site were cited, however the site had previously been poorly managed.
 - A Provisional Tree Preservation Order had been served on the land.
524. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/17/01088/OUT: Planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the report and within the June update sheet.

ITEM 15: 16/06305/FUL PARK HOUSE HOTEL, BEPTON ROAD, BEPTON, GU29 0JB

525. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the June update sheet and a revised recommendation following an application for appeal for non-determination by the applicant.
526. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Jonathan Stern speaking against the application representing his father the owner of Green Meadows.
 - Mary Stern speaking against the application representing her father-in-law the owner of Green Meadows.
527. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC40/17), the June update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- Revised scheme had increased the landscaping but failed to address the underlying factors regarding the impact on the landscape.
 - The proposal intruded into the Park's qualities and did not support them.

- Considered that this is a reason to increase lighting, which would be completely wrong in this location.
- Having visited the site were convinced that the hotel could, within their landholding, provide a less harmful location for parking.

528. Their concerns regarding:

- Increased lighting.

529. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/06305/FUL: That the Planning Committee would have been minded to refuse the planning application for the reasons set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the report and that these reasons are agreed as the Authority's position in defending the appeal.

ITEM 16: SDNP/16/03035/FUL LAND BEHIND 33 WIVELSFIELD ROAD, SALTDEAN, BRIGHTON, BN2 8FP

530. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.

531. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Ken Bodfish speaking against the application as a resident of Rottingdean Parish Council and representative of Rottingdean Preservation Society.
- Cathy Gallagher speaking against the application on behalf of the residents of Saltdean Residents' Association.
- Chris Briggs speaking in support of the application as the applicant

532. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC41/17), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

- This was a difficult decision and understood the applicant's perspective.
- Caution should be taken as this sets a precedent.
- Encroachment of the national park boundary.
- The applicant had expressed a desire to open their 'garden' to the public, clearly a change of use.
- There is a steep gradient drop over several levels through the current garden.
- The regular mowing of paths does not demonstrate the desire of use to be a wildflower meadow, use of mower should be once or twice a year, not maintenance of pathways.

533. Their concerns regarding:

- This plot, and others, being taken out of agricultural use.
- The prevention of further encroachments of the boundary of the National Park

534. **RESOLVED:** SDNP/16/03035/FUL: Planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the report.

ITEM 17: SDNP/17/02057/ADV, SDNP/17/02058ADV, SDNP/17/02059/ADV, SDNP/17/02060/ADV DISPLAY OF NON-ILLUMINATED BOUNDARY MARKERS ACROSS THE NATIONAL PARK

535. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet, in particular relation to the withdrawal of advert HCC2/3a (Hambleton Road, Clanfield).

536. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC42/17), the update sheet, and commented:

- Which signs were double sided and whether they had a 'thank you for visiting' on the reverse as people were leaving the National Park.
- Signs are clearly boundary markers. Resolution passed by SDNP in 21016 stated that signs would be in exemplar sites.
- Whether the Clanfield application has only been temporarily withdrawn for de-cluttering purposes or whether another location was being looked at? Would changes require a further application?

537. Their concerns regarding:

- Location of Chilcomb sign was at a potentially dangerous junction.
- Who was responsible for the maintenance of signs and clearing surrounding vegetation.
- Single sided, smaller signs located on one side of the road may not be seen.

538. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- That implications and purpose of double sided signs have been considered and are acceptable to planning officers
- Relocation of Clanfield sign is being investigated with the Parish Council, who are keen to use a site that would de-clutter a location. Changes would be subject to new application.
- All road safety requirements have been passed by the appropriate Highways Officers.
- Maintenance of signage does not form part of the approval. Officers will follow up to ensure maintenance is covered.

539. **RESOLVED:** That advertisement consent be granted for applications SDNP/17/02057/ADV, SDNP/17/02058/ADV, SDNP/17/02059/ADV and SDNP/17/02060/ADV subject to the conditions, set out in Paragraph 9.1 and the removal of sign HCC2/3a from application SDNP/17/02059/ADV.

ITEM 18: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

540. Thursday 13 July 2017 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 4:45pm.

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