

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 SEPTEMBER 2017

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

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker, Neville Harrison, Barbara Holyome, Doug Jones, Tom Jones, Robert Mocatta, Ian Phillips

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

Officers: Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee and Member Services Officer), Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Gill Welsman (Committee Officer)

Also attended by: Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Luke Smith (Senior Planner), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead - West), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead), Amy Tyler Jones (Neighbourhood Planning Officer), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager)

OPENING REMARKS

658. 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

659. There were apologies from David Coldwell, Gary Marsh and Amber Thacker.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

660. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Item 8 as East Hampshire District Councillor and would withdraw from the meeting for this item as EHDC also own the land the subject of the planning application. He also declared a public service interest in Item 12 as District and County Councillor for East Meon and informed the meeting that he had not been involved in any of the discussions relating to the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan.

661. Tom Jones declared a public service interest in Item 10 and informed the meeting that he had taken no part in the discussions relating to this item and had abstained from voting at Parish meetings.

662. Tim Slaney declared a personal interest in Item 8, as a Petersfield Squash Club member, and would withdraw from the meeting for this item. He informed the meeting that he had not had any involvement with application or the Officer's report.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 AUGUST 2017

663. The minutes of the meeting held on 10 August 2017 were agreed, subject to the amendment outlined within the September update sheet, as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

664. Tim Slaney advised the meeting that the Local Plan Consultation would commence on 26 September 2017 for an 8 week period. Further information would be circulated to Committee members in due course.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

665. There were none.

ITEM 6: URGENT MATTERS

666. There was an additional item to be considered by the Committee. As this urgent item qualified for exclusion of press and public, detailed within Agenda Item 7, it was proposed to consider the item in the Part II section of the meeting.

ITEM 7: NEED FOR PART II EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

667. It was proposed and seconded to exclude the Press and Public following item 14 as the report for the urgent item, detailed in minute 666, contained exempt information as defined by Paragraph 6 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, being information that revealed that the Authority proposes to make an order or direction under any enactment, and that in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exempt information outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons set out in the report. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

668. Robert Mocatta and Tim Slaney withdrew from the meeting at 10:11.

ITEM 8: SDNP/17/02581/FUL TARO LEISURE CENTRE, PENNS PLACE, PETERSFIELD, HAMPSHIRE, GU31 4EP

669. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
670. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Graham Dawes spoke against the application as Club Captain of Petersfield Squash Club.
 - John Cornell spoke against the application representing himself.
 - David Love spoke in support of the application representing Everyone Active, operating Taro Leisure Centre on behalf of East Hampshire District Council.
671. The Committee considered the report by the Development Manager (Report PC58/17), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The proposal was commercially driven, and fitted in with the public health wellbeing agenda.
 - The need to further improve screening in the existing car park.
 - Opportunity existed for new planting of bigger scale trees to suit the scale of the building.
 - A landscape condition could be added to include relationship between the entrance and car park.
 - The attention given to protect the Dark Night Skies and the potential loss of reserve status.
 - The lack of consideration for landscape enhancements with the National Park in mind.
 - That Petersfield Town Council had not objected to the proposal,
 - That the proposal related to the Committee discussing the enlargement of the entrance.
 - The loss of the squash court would not need planning permission if only internal alternations were needed.
 - The Committee's concerns should lie with the appearance of the building, landscaping and impact on highways.
 - Whether there should be a pre-commencement condition regarding external hard and soft landscaping in the front of the entrance to create more space.
 - The internal organisation and management of commercial business was not for the Committee to consider.
672. The Committee also raised concerns and requested clarification as follows:
- The proposed use of the current play area and whether it would be used for more diverse groups of users.
 - Whether alternative locations for the proposed play area had been considered.

- Pedestrian safety at the front of the building and the lack of space in front of the entrance.
- Whether the land directly outside the building was a public highway or private land.
- Why no comment had been received from the Highways Authority.
- Clarity on the proposed landscaping plans regarding to external works and their relationship to the existing car park and replanting of trees.
- Clarification of paving materials to be used.
- Whether there was an issue relating to policy CP4 as the new provision could not be made available before the loss of the existing provision.
- That the first floor plans of the proposal showed 3 squash courts in existence.
- Whether there could be a future change of use to the area proposed for the play area without further planning consent.
- The lack of external works outlined for what was a substantial proposal. Expectation would be to take the opportunity to improve the surrounding areas.
- Whether enough time has been given for both parties to consider alternative proposals.
- The new play zone appeared to be smaller than the current provision.

673. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- The current play area would be used for alternative projects for the wider community.
- The proposed play area would be two storeys high utilising the space on the first floor.
- That the Highways Authority would have commented on the proposal should they have deemed it necessary.
- That the replacement tree would be located further along the access road, in an area already planted with trees.
- Policy CP4 did not present an issue.
- That the management company could change the use of the proposed play area in future once the external works had been completed.
- Consideration had been given to alternative proposals as outlined in section 8.31 of the report.

674. It was proposed that there should be a rewording of proposed conditions or additional condition to be drafted by the Development Manager, in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee, to reflect the Committees concerns with the landscaping and layout of the site and that this should be approved before commencement of the proposal.

675. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the change as set out in Minute 674 above.

676. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:

1. The conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the report and in the September 2017 update sheet and;
2. The addition of a condition or rewording of condition 6 to provide for the design of the external area of the building to include hard and soft landscaping, the form of words to be delegated to the Development Manager in consultation with the Chair.

677. Tim Slaney and Robert Mocatta rejoined the meeting at 11:10.

ITEM 9: SDNP/16/04613/FUL UPLAND PARK, GARRISON HILL, DROXFORD, HAMPSHIRE, SO32 3QL

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

679. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Jerry Tate spoke in support of the application as the agent.

680. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC59/17), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

- The proposal met with the objectives for sustainable tourism.

- Benefits with regard to riverbank management and Dark Night Skies.
- Screening and landscaping detracted from the development.
- The proposal was a good solution for this site.
- The scheme showed sensitivity to holiday development and accommodation within the National Park.
- The need to be mindful of the future and be sure the proposal was viable.
- Dark Night Skies and the light spillage from lodges; evergreen coverage should be encouraged.
- The location of the car park would make it difficult to change the use of the site in future.
- The importance of the detailing of the timber to be used.
- The site was car dependent, better access would be difficult to achieve.
- The reliance on good management for success of the proposal.

681. The Committee also raised concerns and requested clarification as follows:

- The external finish on the green roofing for the spa was a genuine green roof.
- Whether timber cladding was to be used on the lodges.
- The function of the large chimney in the spa complex.
- The reasoning behind condition 6 regarding the spa not being brought into use until the 11th lodge was completed.
- On the future development of the site, should the proposal not be successful.
- The location of the footpath and how it would link into Droxford village.
- Whether the site, landscape and ecological management was better dealt with under a S106 than a condition in light of future enforcement in 10-20 years.
- Whether the Conservation Officer comments pertaining to the lightweight timber nature of the lodges solidifying into masonry structure in future could be embraced within the conditions?
- The provision for cycle storage.
- Concern surrounding future management of the site.
- Concern about visitors accessing the landscape, and the possible future development of on-site activities.
- The lack of access to the Meon Valley Trail and local cycle ways from the site.
- That the footprint of the proposal was larger than the area currently developed.
- Concern that the developed part of the proposal extended both North-East and South East outside of the previously developed area.

682. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- The 'green' roofs on the spa complex were genuine green roofs.
- The lodges would be timber clad, some having timber shingles, the timber would weather appropriately.
- The officer had concerns that the spa would be built first and used before any other development was undertaken. The inclusion of condition 6 protected the development and ensured that it would be completed; the 11th building is halfway through the development process.
- The proposed footpath would start at Fir Hill and finish within Droxford.
- The proposal was outside of the settlement of Droxford, and there was an issue of access to the village of Droxford from the site. It had been previously deemed not to be appropriate for residential development. Previous applications hold firm into the future.
- Each lodge had provision for cycle storage.

- The conditions were robust enough to ensure compliance with management. S106 was not required at this point as the proposal was manageable by conditions. All of the proposal was within the red line of planning permission, no land was outside of the control of the applicant and should be enforceable into the future.

683. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.

684. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the report and in the September 2017 update sheet.

ITEM 10: SDNP/17/01358/FUL LAND AT KEYMER ROAD, DITCHLING, BN6 6TR

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

686. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Anna Hutson spoke against the application, representing the occupants of Ditchling Court.
- Don McBeth spoke in support of the application representing Ditchling Parish Council.
- Anton Pruden, spoke in support of the application representing Pruden and Smith and other local businesses.

687. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC60/17), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:

- That effective buffer planting would negate the intrusion of privacy to Ditchling Court.
- The Parish Council were best placed to make the decision regarding the surfacing of the car park, parking restrictions and height barrier given their knowledge of the locality.
- The need for further tree planning to reduce the visual impact of vehicles from the South Downs.
- Improvement on parking restrictions within the village were required.
- The change of pathway leading into Ditchling would affect the visual impact on entry to the village.

688. The Committee also raised concerns and requested clarification as follows:

- The surface to be used on the car park.
- The boundary structure between Ditchling Court and the car park.
- Confirmation of the length of the screening between the house and car park.
- The timing of the application, given that this was a proposed site within the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- Whether the height barrier required separate planning permission.
- Impact of height barrier in relation to restricting the parking of larger tourist vehicles such as camper vans and the wider parking implications within Ditchling.
- How parking spaces would be unobtrusively marked.

689. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- Two plans had been submitted with regard to the surface of the car park, both had been considered. Grasscrete would have a softer appearance, however gravel would be more appropriate for heavy use.
- Cleft and rail fencing was to be used for the perimeter of the site.
- Boundary screening would be sufficient to address the screening issues.
- The current hedging did not extend across the whole perimeter.
- The site had been identified several years ago as an appropriate location for a car park.
- The height barrier was covered within condition 3 of the report.

690. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the rewording of condition 3 in relation to the surfacing.

691. **RESOLVED:**

- I. That planning permission be granted subject to:

- i) the conditions set out in Section 10 of this report and in the September 2017 update sheet.
 - ii) the rewording of condition 3 in relation to the surfacing, the form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair.
 - iii) the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure highways improvements including a financial contribution for the amendments of an existing Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application, with appropriate reasons if the S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made on the agreement within 3 months of the 14 September 2017 Planning Committee meeting.
692. The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:55.
693. The meeting reconvened at 13:31.
694. Margaret Parent and Norman Dingemans joined the meeting at 13:31 for the Strategy and Policy items.
695. Margaret PAREN declared an interest in agenda item 11 as a resident of Liss Parish who didn't have any links to the neighbourhood planning group or related groups associated with the item.

ITEM 11: LISS NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN DECISION STATEMENT

696. The Communities Lead presented an overview to the Committee.
697. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Cllr Roger Hargreaves spoke on behalf of Liss Parish Council.
698. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC61/17) and:
- Commended the Parish Council on the speed with which they have produced the plan.
699. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
1. Noted the Examiner's Report and recommended modifications (Appendix 2) to make the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan meet the basic conditions.
 2. Agreed the publication of the 'Decision Statement' as set out at Appendix 3 of the report, which sets out the modifications that will be made to the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan in response to the Examiner's modifications.

ITEM 12: EAST MEON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN DECISION STATEMENT

700. The Communities Lead presented an overview to the Committee.
701. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC62/17) and:
- Commended the Inspector on the plan and on the recognition of the landscape capacity for housing.
702. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
1. Noted the Examiner's Report and recommended modifications (Appendix 2) to make the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan meet the basic conditions.
 2. Agreed the publication of the 'Decision Statement' as set out at Appendix 3 of the report, which sets out the modifications that will be made to the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan in response to the Examiner's modifications.

ITEM 13: SDNPA RESPONSE TO THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION ON THE ROGATE AND RAKE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

703. The Neighbourhood Planning Officer presented an overview to the Committee.
704. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC63/17) and:
- Commended the Parish Council on the plan.
 - Expressed concern as to the impact on the plan should the garage site not be available.

- Whether the green spaces within the plan should be designated as Local Green Space.
- The need to soften the frontage of the housing development along the roadside at the Rake site given the prominence of its location.

705. In response, Officers clarified:

- The issue of the availability of the garage site had been raised in order for alternative sites to be located by the Parish.
- Public open spaces have been highlighted within the plan and green spaces designated. All are getting Local Green Space designation with the exception of the playground. This designation would restrict future changes to the playground.
- Officers have highlighted the need for any future development of the Rake site to reflect the surrounding wooded area.

706. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the Table of Comments as set out in Appendix 3 of the report which will form the SDNPA representation to the Rogate & Rake Neighbourhood Development Plan pre-submission consultation.

ITEM 14: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED FROM 1-29 AUGUST 2017

707. The Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager presented an overview to the Committee.

708. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC63/17) and commented:

- This was a useful agenda item, quarterly seemed the appropriate timing for the report to come to Committee.
- Concern that, in some cases, there was no reference made in the Inspectorate's report to the sites being within a National Park.
- Request that future reports should show whether the applications subject to appeal were originally decided by Committee or delegated.

ITEM 15: WITHDRAWN FROM THE COMMITTEE

ITEM 16: NEED FOR PART II EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC – URGENT ITEM

709. The Committee moved into private session (Part II) for the Urgent Item as outlined in agenda items 6 and 7 and excluded from the meeting any members of the public and press.

ITEM 17: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

710. Thursday 12 October 2017 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 14:20.

