

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

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE 18 JANUARY 2017**

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

Present: Alun Alesbury (Deputy Chair), Heather Baker, Neville Harrison (Chair), Barbara Holyome, Roger Huxstep, Doug Jones, Tom Jones, 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: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee and Member Services Officer), Gill Welsman (Committee Officer)

Also attended by: Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead – West), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects & Performance Manager), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer), Alma Howell (Neighbourhood & Planning Policy Officer), Heather Lealan (Development Management Lead Minerals & Waste), Matthew Bates (Local Plan Lead), Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer), Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer)

Other: Brendan Fisher (Senior Surveyor – Vail Williams)

**OPENING REMARKS**

The Chair informed those present that:

- SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthered the National Park Purposes and Duty. Members regarded themselves first and foremost as Members of the Authority, and would 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**

882. Apologies for absence were received from David Coldwell, Gary Marsh and Robert Mocatta.

**ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

883. Heather Baker declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 7 and 8, as she was acquainted with one of the speakers.

884. Roger Huxstep declared a public service interest in Agenda Items 7, 8 and 10. He also declared that he was acquainted with the speakers for Item 10 and as he had participated in various discussions with them that he would withdraw from the meeting after the presentation for this item.

885. Doug Jones declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10, as he was acquainted with a couple of the speakers.

886. Barbara Holyome declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10, as she was acquainted with one of the speakers.

887. Alun Alesbury declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10, as he was acquainted with one of the speakers.

**ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14 DECEMBER 2018**

888. The minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING**

889. There were none.

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

**ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

890. Rob Ainslie updated the Committee on the previous decision made on the planning application relating to Manor House at Buriton. The decisions had now been quashed by the High Court and it would therefore come back to a future Planning Committee Meeting for consideration and decision.

**ITEM 6: URGENT MATTERS**

891. There were none.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

**ITEM 7: SDNP/I7/03850/CND & SDNP/I7/03856/CND - VERNON HOUSE, WARNFORD ROAD, CORHAMPTON, SO32 3ND**

892. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the January 2018 update sheet. He advised the Committee that since the publication of the Update Sheet, there had been further discussion on viability issues and contributions which resulted in the Authority no longer seeking an increase in affordable housing contribution from £135k, which had already been secured in the original planning permissions, to £172,500.
893. The Case Officer asked the Senior Surveyor from Vail Williams to update the Committee on the discussions following the publication of the Update Sheet. They informed Members that a higher cost of 3% stamp duty of purchasing Vernon House should have been included in the appraisal which they had not previously been aware of, which subsequently impacted upon the benchmark land value. This impacted upon the viability appraisal to the extent that an increase in affordable housing contribution of c.£30k above that already secured in S106 agreements of the original permissions was not feasible.
894. It was therefore the view of the Case Officer that, having considered Vail Williams' advice, a contribution of £135k previously secured was appropriate. The Case Officer advised that each of the recommendations omit the inclusion of a contribution of £86,250 within the Deeds of Variation to be completed.
895. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Peter Legood spoke against the proposal on behalf of residents of De Port Heights.
  - Marie Nagy spoke in support of the proposal as the planning agent for the application.
896. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC01/18), the January 2018 update sheet, the public speaker comments and commented:
- Given the nature of other local narrow lanes that would require access by smaller refuse vehicles, access for an 11m refuse vehicle could be avoided.
  - The increase in traffic using De Port Heights was not a significant increase given that the access to the A32 was designed to meet with Highways Regulations.
  - Questioned the need for new accesses to be of the width as proposed by County Highways, when there was already a double width access in place (i.e. De Port Heights).
  - It was in the National Park's interest for development such as this to be built within a context of a village.
  - That Highways advice constrained the planning process and decision making.
  - That the proposed development had continually evolved, from an initial point where access via De Port Heights had not been considered.
  - That this proposal had been previously considered as two separate sites and was now being reviewed as one larger site.
  - There was further scope for investigation around different options for access to the site and the new information contained in the viability report, and whether this would justify a further deferral.
  - That there were clearly opportunities for small refuse vehicles to be used in this location.

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

- There were still outstanding issues that needed to be resolved, especially with regard to securing the visibility splay.
897. The Committee also raised concerns and requested clarification as follows:
- Clarification with regard to the previous use of the Houghton's Yard site and when it had ceased to be used for this purpose.
  - Clarification relating to the progressing S278 agreement, which had previously been considered to be appropriate. Should there be an issue with the S278 agreement, where permission has previously been granted, would it mean that no development could take place in the future.
  - Concern over the impact of amenity for De Port Heights.
  - Whether the requirement for a development to be able to take the large 11m refuse vehicle applied across East Hampshire.
  - Clarity as to whether there was any legal precedent regarding an expected viability profit of 20% profit.
  - Confirmation that the outstanding issue with regard to emergency access for De Port Heights had been resolved.
  - Confirmation that the access to De Port Heights was compliant with full highway regulations.
  - Concern as to whether informal parking at the entrance to De Port Heights was an issue.
  - Concern about the impact of possible future changes to the junction for De Port Heights and the traffic calming, especially with regard to the proposed use of larger refuse vehicles and increased vehicle movements.
  - That the demolition of Vernon House would enable opportunity for a new wider access point.
  - Concern of a possible trade-off between the impact of amenity for De Port Heights and the funds allocated for affordable housing should viability be impacted by the need for Vernon House to be demolished.
  - Whether the traffic calming on De Port Heights would remain.
  - Whether the required visibility splay would mean that the wall at the front of South Cote would need to be demolished.
  - Whether discussions had taken place with the landowner regarding an easement to allow the visibility splay.
898. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- That Houghton's Yard had previously been used as a haulage depot, the date it ceased to be used for this purpose was not known.
  - The S278 agreement was a matter between the developer and the County Highways Authority agreeing to undertake the work on their behalf, which was another stage in the process of being able to commence works to the highway. The Highways Officers were satisfied with the encroachment of the visibility splay provided that the easement was secured across the frontage of the neighbouring property in perpetuity. Until the visibility splay issue had been resolved the S278 agreement would not be approved by Highways. The Highways Authority would also require the adjacent property owner to be a party to the S278 Agreement.
  - With regard to the height of the wall, there was a typical limitation within visibility splays of obstructions being no higher than 0.6m. The wall appeared to be around that height but it would need to be measured and possibly be lowered.
  - Winchester City Council highways engineers had advised that they applied the standard vehicle size used by contractors to planning applications, in this case 9.4m. Routes where smaller vehicular access was required were addressed by the contractor as appropriate.

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

- Case law for reasonable profit was currently at 20% for GDP based on a Court of Appeal decision in 2016 for a site in Reading. In October 2017 the Court of Appeal in Barnsley determined 17.5% as being reasonable. The Vernon House development equated to 16.67% profit on GDP, lower than case law would suggest if affordable housing contributions were sought on a development which required the demolition of Vernon House.
- Building Control Officers had confirmed that Building Regulations approval had been granted for Houghton's Yard which did not include conditions or concerns relating to emergency fire access.
- The narrowing of the junction of De Port Heights related to a parking bay on the left side of the road, this was set back from the junction. Highways have looked at the junction and had no objection based on highway safety. The traffic calming would remain in place.
- Confirmed the owner had not agreed to an easement.

899. The Director of Planning advised the Committee that there was no objection from County Highways to suggest this was an inappropriate access to serve the total number of dwellings. It was accepted there was information available from residents of De Port Heights that there had been issues and attempts to stop inappropriate behaviour. Notwithstanding there was no technical objection from highways officers about the use of the access, despite this. Were Members minded to refuse the application on the issue of using De Port Heights, they may want to consider the impact of amenity upon residents which would be a judgement based on all the facts. He also reminded the Committee that a decision needed to be made on the proposal in front of them, using the advice and guidance being offered. The advice offered by Highways was that providing access via De Port Heights addressed the issue of access.

900. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised recommendation for both applications that planning permission be granted subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation relating to the S106 Agreement associated with planning permissions SDNP/16/02757/FUL and SDNP/16/02767/FUL to secure the requirements of the S106 agreements to the proposed development, the final form of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, and the conditions set out in paragraph 11.1/11.2 of the report. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the applications with appropriate reasons if the Deed of Variation is not completed within 3 months of the 18 January 2018.

901. **RESOLVED:**

**Recommendation for SDNP/17/03850/CND:** That planning permission be granted subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation relating to the S106 Agreement associated with planning permission SDNP/16/02767/FUL to secure the requirements of the S106 to the proposed development, the final form of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, and the conditions set out in paragraph 11.1 of the report.

That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the applications with appropriate reasons if the Deed of Variation is not completed within 3 months of the 18 January 2018.

**Recommendation for SDNP/17/03856/CND:** That planning permission be granted subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation relating to the S106 Agreement associated with planning permission SDNP/16/02757/FUL to secure the requirements of the S106 to the proposed development, the final form of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, and the conditions set out in paragraph 11.2 of the report.

That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the Deed of Variation is not completed within 3 months of the 18 January 2018.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/17/03849/FUL- VERNON HOUSE, WARNFORD ROAD, CORHAMPTON, SO32 3ND**

902. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the January 2018 update sheet.

903. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Peter Legood spoke against the proposal on behalf of residents of De Port Heights.

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

904. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC02/18), the January 2018 update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- There was no logical basis to refuse the applications given the previous decision.
  - There was a gain for pedestrians and cyclists accessing the A32 safely.
905. The Committee also requested clarification with regard to:
- Clarification as to whether bollards would prevent vehicular access beyond the access to the parking spaces.
906. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Bollards would be used to restrict vehicular access. Access would still be possible between the two sites for pedestrians and cyclists.
907. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the recommendation.
908. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to conditions set out in the Paragraph 11.1 of the report and the January 2018 update sheet.

**ITEM 9: SDNP/17/03513/OUT - LAND EAST OF HARRIER WAY, PETERSFIELD, GU31 4EZ**

909. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the January 2018 update sheet.
910. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Paula Hudson spoke against the application representing herself as a local resident.
  - John Sneddon spoke in support of the application as planning agent for the application.
  - David Boden spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
911. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC03/18), the January 2018 update sheet, the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Clarification on the location of the three storey dwellings.
  - Whether there was any power generation on site and how sustainable the development would be.
  - Clarification as to whether there were to be roof lights that would affect spillage of light.
  - Previously there had been concerns regarding anti-social behaviour, had further responses been taken for the revised proposal.
  - Clarification regarding whether issues around ground water had been checked.
  - Further explanation was required regarding the 10% allowance related to Urban Creep being added of surface water drainage system.
  - Whether the comments from the Environment Agency had been taken into account and what the appropriate solution was.
  - Clarification regarding ownership of the stream at the east of the site and whether the water's edge was within the site.
  - Clarification as to whether there were any transport issues given the proposed use of the site, had adequate thought been given to use of mobility scooters from the site to other local destinations.
  - Whether the landscape would be brought to committee as it was currently a reserved matter.
  - Whether a groundwater condition could be added to the recommendation to ensure that it was addressed.
  - Whether highways concerns raised by public speakers could be shared with the Highways Authority to ensure that they aware of local concerns.
912. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The three storey buildings were located in the middle of the site, the site was predominantly two storey buildings.

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

- Conditions cover energy efficiency. Some parts of the buildings contained photo voltaic panels, there was no district heating system.
  - Some dwellings did have roof lights, measures and use of blinds were covered within the conditions.
  - There had been no consultation with the Crime Reduction Officer as part of this application. The report and discussions from the previous application were included in considerations for this proposal.
  - The reference to Urban Creep was a generic term for taking a green field site and introducing development. Additional allowance has been addressed within the conditions and in details of SUDS and drainage.
  - The stream was outside of the site, there was a watercourse which ran through the site that would be re-opened. There was a condition in place for the future management and maintenance of the stream.
  - The Environment Agency had not provided any comments at this point, issues that were previously highlighted had now been addressed.
  - There was to be an agreement with the Local Authority which would provide pedestrian crossing points across Harrier Way. Footpaths through and in front of the site would enable residents to access local amenities. There was a financial contribution to support improvement of pedestrian routes into the town centre.
  - Communal transport formed part of the proposal and was laid out in a travel plan, this was covered by a legal agreement.
  - Landscaping proposals had progressed well. This would be dealt with under delegated powers which was usual for schemes of this scale.
  - In response to the Officer's clarifications the Committee Members commented:
  - This was a site that had been proposed within the Neighbourhood Development Plan for C2 use.
  - This was a novel development which signposted future development for lifestyle for the over 60's.
  - This proposal was being handled well given the nature of proposed use, and if well managed and well-designed would be viable.
  - There could be further detailing around self-sufficiency and the facilities being provided on site.
  - Concern that the community didn't include younger families, their inclusion could encourage social interaction.
  - There was scope for communal facilities to be accessed by the wider public, not just the residents.
913. The Director of Planning advised the Committee that there were already communal facilities at the leisure centre within walking distance of the site. Condition 27 should be amended to include reference to groundwater.
914. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised recommendation to include an amendment to condition 27 referencing groundwater as well as surface water.
915. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved:
- I. That outline planning permission be granted for application SDNP/17/03513/OUT subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10 of this report, the January 2018 update sheet, with the amendment to Condition 27 to include reference to groundwater and subject to the completion of a S106 agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, with obligations relating to:
    - Securing the C2 use through the details of care package requirements, qualifying occupier/residents and domiciliary care provider;
    - Securing the details of the Travel Plan including the 'communal transport' and £50,000 highways contribution for improved pedestrian and cycle access to

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

Petersfield Town Centre;

- Securing the details of the 'private estate roads' (i.e. the extent of the roads not being offered up for adoption, management and maintenance details).
  - Creating and maintaining a PROW across the site - to link up with the wider public footpath (Serpent Trail) adjacent to the site, and
  - Securing an employment and skills plan for the construction and operational phases of the development, and
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse application SDNP/17/03513/OUT with appropriate reasons if the S106 agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 3 months of the 18 January 2018 Planning Committee meeting.
916. The Chair proposed to take Agenda Item 16 next given that Public Speakers had been advised that item 10 would not commence before 1pm. The Committee concurred.
917. Margaret Paren and Norman Dingemans joined the meeting for Strategy and Policy item.

**ITEM 16: QUARTERLY UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING**

918. The Neighbourhood & Planning Policy Officer presented an overview to the Committee.
919. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC10/18) and:
- Commended the communities on reaching major milestones and for overcoming difficulties faced during the process.
  - Thanked the Officers for their ongoing support of communities.
  - Agreed that it was encouraging to see the beginnings of commercial activity for Officers.
  - Expressed concern about the reduction of DCLG funding, however confident that this would still cover costs.
  - Queried whether there was an expectation for older Neighbourhood Plans to be reviewed and refreshed.
  - Recognised that the Neighbourhood Plan work of parishes, supported by officers, was helping to guide planning decisions in the National Park both now and in the future.
  - Questioned how the SDNPA compared with other National Parks with regard to the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.
920. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- There were new regulations in place that made it easier for Neighbourhood Plans to be reviewed and modified. A review of a Neighbourhood Plan after 5 years was expected.
921. The Chair of the Authority reminded the Committee that the SDNP was an exception with number of settlements and therefore the amount of housing allocations proposed to support the economic and social wellbeing of communities, hence the reason for the number of Neighbourhood Plans that have been prepared in the SDNP. There is not the same incentive in other National Parks.
922. The Director of Planning added his thanks to the considerable number of Neighbourhood Plan volunteers who had put a lot of work into these plans. The expertise gained by Officers in supporting communities in preparing Neighbourhood Plans was now being shared elsewhere in the form of external work. This commercial activity was proving to be a success and which would continue to progress once the Local Plan had been finalised.
923. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
924. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the progress to date on the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans across the National Park.
925. The meeting broke for lunch at 12:25.
926. Norman Dingemans left the meeting at 12:25.
927. The meeting reconvened at 13:00.
928. On returning to the meeting the Chair asked members to re-state their Declarations of

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

Interests given that the public audience had changed. The Declarations of Interest were as noted in Item 2 with the exception of Neville Harrison, who declared a personal interest in item 10 as he was acquainted with one of the speakers.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/17/04623/FUL - THE LAMBING YARD, CHURCH LANE, HAMBLETON, HAMPSHIRE, PO7 4RT**

929. The Case Officer presented the application.
930. Roger Huxstep left the meeting at 13:28.
931. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Caroline Girdlestone spoke against the application representing herself as a local resident.
  - Kevin Brown spoke against the application representing himself as a local resident.
  - Caroline Dibden spoke against the application as a Member of Hambledon Parish Council Planning Committee.
  - Joanne McLeod spoke in support of the application as the Agent for the application.
  - Oliver Howe spoke in support of the application as the Site Manager for Windmill Down Farm.
932. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC04/18), the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Who had responsibility for monitoring the vehicles and how vehicle content was assessed.
  - The length of time rigorous monitoring been undertaken.
  - Clarification regarding the length of time CCTV records were kept for and whether there were measures in place to ensure that the latter parts of the month would be kept for 30 days.
  - Whether there were practical restrictions to prevent the CCTV records from being retained for a longer period.
  - Whether there was any available information regarding tranquillity levels in this area of the National Park and whether there had been any investigations in looking at ways to reduce noise through acoustic screening.
  - Whether Monitoring officers had heard the operating machinery from nearby residential properties in a variety of weather conditions.
  - Whether the recordings taken by the local community had been taken into account by Officers and what conclusions had been reached.
  - Clarification on the location of the Wayfarers Walk PRow in relation to the site.
  - How were tonnage limits monitored and whether a weigh bridge could be used.
933. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- That waste sites were required to keep records of vehicle movements and the content of loads. These records were kept on site and included waste certificates and CCTV monitoring. It was not onerous for them to keep a robust log.
  - Monitoring Officers carried out un-announced spot checks. Sites were required to provide the Monitoring Officer with a full vehicle log, CCTV coverage and waste exemptions.
  - The length of time for CCTV records to be kept had been increased to 1 month, which was robust enough in terms of maintaining practical monitoring. A period of 3 months would become more onerous, any enforcement breach would need to be acted on quickly.
  - Monitoring had commencing in January 2017 and been more rigorous since September 2017.
  - Environmental Health and HCC Monitoring Officers had monitored the screener on site



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

and from properties related to complaints received by East Hampshire District Council.

- Officers were unsure of the exact distance of the Wayfarers Walk from the site.
- The officer was not aware if there had been tranquillity studies undertaken in the area, it was noted that this was also an active site for general farming operations. The timing of operation for the screener had been addressed within the conditions.
- Operators were required to supply returns to the Environment Agency in terms of waste recycled on site and the amount of volume on site. It was understood that not all movements of vehicles would have full loads and the conditions gave flexibility.
- The use of a weigh bridge would be difficult to monitor given the other vehicles that access the site. Vehicles in relation to commercial soil activity could use the second entrance, which was covered by CCTV, and avoid the weigh bridge. The expense of a weigh bridge would be unnecessary. The use of waste returns to monitor was a common method of analysing data.
- There had been no tests with regard to shielding to mitigate the site noise.

934. In response to the Officer's clarifications the Committee Members commented:

- Concern about the impact of tranquillity and qualities of the National Park.
- Concern about the impact of noise for neighbouring properties.
- There was further scope for additional investigations to be carried out with regard to reducing noise.
- Concern that the limitations on hours of operation for the screener did not go far enough to minimise the impact on the area.
- Use and activity of the site is a positive diversification for a farm.
- More mitigation measures may be required.
- Concern that the robust monitoring period had not been lengthy enough.
- A temporary term of 5 years could be appropriate in order to gather further data and analysis.
- Suggestion that the time that CCTV footage was stored be extended to 3 months.
- Whether it would be appropriate to reduce the operating time for the screening machines by an hour at each end of the day to reduce noise impact to local residents.

935. It was proposed and seconded to revise the officer's recommendation to grant temporary permission for a period of 5 years, consider a reduction in the hours of operation of the screener to be delegated to the Director of Planning, extend the period of the CCTV records to be retained to 3 months and an informative around possible noise reduction measures.

936. **RESOLVED:** That temporary planning permission be granted for a period of 5 years subject to:

1. An amendment to Condition 7 so that CCTV records be held for 3 months;
2. Consideration of a reduction in hours of operation of the screener to be delegated to the Director of Planning;
3. Informative around possible noise reduction measures; and
4. The conditions set out in section 10.1 of the report.

937. Roger Huxstep returned to the meeting.

**ITEM 11: SDNP/17/03762/CND - MARKET GARDENS, CLAPPERS LANE, FULKING, BN5 9NH**

938. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the January 2018 update sheet.

939. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Mark Hind spoke against the application at the Vice Chairman of Fulking Parish Council as the Vice Chairman.

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

- Colin Trumble spoke against the application as the Mid Sussex District Councillor for Hurstpierpoint and Downs Ward.
  - Georgina Hearne spoke in support of the application as the Applicant.
940. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC05/18), the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- That the applicant owned the site in question.
  - Clarity as to who was entitled to reside on the site.
  - Whether it was possible to influence the colour of the caravan to reduce the visual impact from the South Downs.
  - Confirmation that the site was the appropriate size to house two pitches.
  - Clarification that whilst Mid Sussex did not have a need for further gypsy and traveller sites, that there was still a need across the National Park.
  - What would happen to the site once the current residents were not in habitation.
941. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The applicant did own the site.
  - Only the four named individuals and their resident dependents were entitled to reside on the site.
  - The use of land related to the siting of mobile homes. The Authority did not have control over colour within the conditions, however there was scope for further discussions with the applicant.
  - The site was an appropriate size for two pitches and comparable to the site neighbouring the property which already had two pitches.
  - There was a need for further sites for travellers across the whole of the National Park.
  - The application related to the personal circumstances of the applicant's son and daughter in law. Any future application for the use of land would need to be considered on its own merits.
942. In response to the Officer's clarifications the Committee Members commented:
- The positive addition of landscaping conditions that had been raised previously would improve the visual impact of the site.
  - This was a generous site which could accommodate the extra caravan and day room.
  - Whilst there was not a local need for gypsy and traveller site, there was a need for more provision across the National Park.
  - Improved landscaping would mitigate adverse comments regarding colour.
943. Becky Moutrey advised the Committee that a request had been made to the Secretary of State to call in the application, therefore the recommendation should be amended accordingly.
944. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the recommendation with the addition of wording to reflect the possible calling in of the application by the Secretary of State.
945. **RESOLVED:** That subject to confirmation from the Secretary of State that the application is not called in for their determination that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10 of the report, the January 2018 update sheet.
946. Margaret Paren joined the meeting for the Strategy and Policy items.

**ITEM 12: DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR LAND SOUTH OF LONDON ROAD, COLDWALTHAM**

947. The Chair reminded the Committee that they were not considering the acceptability or otherwise of site allocations (which were being considered through the Local Plan process) but rather whether the content of the draft Development Briefs was appropriate.
948. The Development Brief team presented an overview of Part One of the Draft Development Briefs (General Design Principles) which were the same for Agenda Items 12, 13, 14 and 15.

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

949. The Development Brief team presented the report for the site of Land South of London Road, Coldwaltham.
950. Heather Baker left the meeting at 15:15.
951. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Jim Glover spoke against the Development Brief on behalf of the Coldwaltham Meadows Conservation Group.
  - Chris Yeardsley spoke against the Development Brief on behalf of the Coldwaltham Meadows Conservation Group.
  - Christine Skinner spoke against the Development Brief on behalf of the Coldwaltham Meadows Conservation Group.
  - Jeremy Farely spoke in support of the Development Brief on behalf of the land owner.
952. The Committee considered the generic section of the draft Development Briefs and made comments and asked for clarifications pertaining to Part One as follows:
- Concern regarding the wording of paragraph 31 on page 16 of the report, the use of the word 'pastiche' and the need to conserve and enhance the cultural heritage in the National Park could mean that a more traditional build would be appropriate in some locations. It was understood that some locations would suit a more contemporary approach.
  - Suggested that reference be made to biodiversity within paragraph 9 on page 9 and that biodiversity should be included in the list of constraints.
  - There was a need to improve the use of language to make the briefs more accessible, a more basic approach to language was required.
  - There was scope to improve cross referencing across the document.
  - If the briefs were aimed at developers and communities there was further work to be done to make the briefs easier for communities to engage with.
  - Clarification sought regarding the reason for the draft Development Briefs being produced before the emerging Local Plan had been examined.
953. In response to the comments and clarifications Officers:
- Confirmed that wording would be addressed as appropriate with regard to improving the language to make the documents more accessible and removing references to the term pastiche.
  - The Briefs were primarily aimed at developers and then local communities, however wording would be reviewed and simplified.
  - There was a desire to express concepts within the Briefs which had been reviewed by Members and local communities. Character was important to detail in terms of architectural style, both traditional and contemporary styles would be valid dependent on the location.
  - The concern regarding the lack of reference to biodiversity as a constraint would be rectified.
  - It was appropriate to have Development Briefs in place in readiness for the potential allocation of sites within the emerging Local Plan. This was an appropriate procedure. If a Development Brief is produced too late it loses its opportunity to influence given the draft allocations and what may happen.
954. The Director of Planning summarised the three main areas that needed to be looked at in relation to the General Design Principles sections of all four draft development briefs: the need to make the briefs more accessible for all target audiences, improved references to biodiversity and references to contemporary, its importance and the suitability of appropriate design to the place.
955. The Committee voted on and approved the General Design Principles in each of the draft Development Briefs, subject to the changes already outlined. It was proposed that the delegated authority include consultation with the Chair of the Authority.

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

956. **RESOLVED:** That subject to the comments of the Planning Committee being addressed (the wording of which is delegated to the Director Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and Chair of the Planning Committee) approve the General Design Principles section of the draft Development Briefs for Land South of London Road Coldwaltham, Land at Pulens Lane Sheet, Holmbush Caravan Park, Midhurst and the West Sussex County Council Depot and Former Brickworks site, Midhurst.
957. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC06/18) and requested clarification and commented as follows:
- Understood the concerns representatives from Coldwaltham had regarding the preparation of draft Development Briefs, given that the site had not yet been allocated within the emerging Local Plan. However reassured the public speakers that their concerns would be considered through the Local Plan process.
  - Reminded those present that the Committee were looking at how satisfactory the draft Development Brief was, not at whether the land was being allocated.
  - Concern about the wording relating to architectural appearance on page 44, specifically the reference to the wording 'contemporary and innovative approach'. This wording was unnecessary as a more traditional style would also be considered in any forthcoming proposals.
  - Consistency was required for the generic wording of the vision statement on page 19. There needed to be site specific information as well as generic references. This particular brief had the weakest vision of all the briefs being considered.
  - More attention and detailing needed to be given to the important areas of vision and biodiversity.
  - A map detailing national and international protected sites close to the allocation would be useful.
  - It was important that the new public open space on site was kept in perpetuity. Given the proximity to environmental designations any future development should consider their impact on such areas through management plans.
  - Connectivity should be onto a PRoW with access to the site, concern that reference to 'trails' would encourage informal access to protected areas.
  - Concern that informal access of the public into the SSSI and SPA from this site could diversely impact the protected areas. There was opportunity for information to be given to public at the entrance to the SSSI which would enable visitors to access the sites in an informed and appropriate way.
  - The site itself was not an internationally recognised or designated site.
  - Concern regarding the general recommendation for green roofs as habitats, this may not be appropriate for all sites or architectural styles. Further site specific guidance would be useful.
  - Reference to Village Design Statements would provide further information regarding appropriate materials for development.
  - The briefs outlined the Authority's expectations for development of sites and provided guidance. Any future development scheme would be expected to go through the Authority's pre-application procedure.
958. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation, with the addition that the delegated authority include consultation of the Chair of the Authority.
959. **RESOLVED:**
1. Subject to the comments of the Planning Committee being addressed (the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and Chair of Planning Committee) approve this draft Development Brief for consultation.
  2. The Committee delegated authority to the Director Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and the Chair of the Planning Committee, to consider the results

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

of the consultation, make any minor changes and then approve the Development Brief for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. If major changes are required as a result of consultation a further report would be presented to the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 13: DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR LAND AT PULENS LANE, SHEET**

960. The Development Brief team presented the report for the site of Land at Pulens Lane, Sheet.

961. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Nicholas Law spoke against the Design Development Brief representing Stocklands Field Residents Action Group.

962. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC07/18) and requested clarification and commented as follows:

- This site had huge potential given the river frontage, the brief could be more inspirational to ensure inspired development.
- Opportunity needed to be given for visitors to be able to explore the river frontage whilst protecting the sensitive habitats and biodiversity of the River Rother.
- The brief needed details that would protect the habitat from visitor pressure, which might affect the wildlife infrastructure. This could be conserved through a management plan.
- The wording relating to architecture should be reviewed to ensure that developers were encouraged to explore both contemporary and inspirational traditional design, the current wording was too restrictive.
- Concern as to how developable the site was, however this would be addressed by the emerging Local Plan.
- Reference to public art in this document had a better approach than within the other briefs.
- There were potential opportunities for the public to be able to enjoy the landscape without disturbing the sensitive habitat, for example, through the introduction of look out towers.

963. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation, with the addition that the delegated authority include consultation with the Chair of the Authority.

964. **RESOLVED:**

1. Subject to the comments of the Planning Committee being addressed (the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and Chair of Planning Committee) approve this draft Development Brief for consultation.
2. The Committee delegated authority to the Director Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and the Chair of the Planning Committee, to consider the results of the consultation, make any minor changes and then approve the Development Brief for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. If major changes are required as a result of consultation a further report would be presented to the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 14: DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR HOLMBUSH CARAVAN PARK, MIDHURST**

965. The Development Brief team presented the report for the site of the Holmbush Caravan Park, Midhurst.

966. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Gordon McAra spoke in support of the Design Development Brief representing Midhurst Town Council as the Chair of the Planning Committee.

967. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC08/18) and requested clarification and commented as follows:

- It would be a privilege for a developer to develop this site within the National Park.

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

- An amendment to the wording on page 138 relating to contemporary schemes needed to be revised to enable a breath of styles to be proposed by developers.
  - That architecture should draw inspiration from the landscape character, this could be an exemplar site within the National Park.
  - Consideration needed to be given in relation to how the public and communal/private space was distinguished. Given the attractive nature of this site, public access would be beneficial.
  - There was scope to sensitively and creatively explore public engagement with the water on this site.
968. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation, with the addition that the delegated authority include consultation with the Chair of the Authority.
969. **RESOLVED:**
1. Subject to the comments of the Planning Committee being addressed (the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and Chair of Planning Committee) approve this draft Development Brief for consultation.
  2. The Committee delegated authority to the Director Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and the Chair of the Planning Committee, to consider the results of the consultation, make any minor changes and then approve the Development Brief for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. If major changes are required as a result of consultation a further report would be presented to the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 15: DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL DEPOT AND FORMER BRICKWORKS, MIDHURST**

970. The Development Brief team presented the report for the site of the Holmbush Caravan Park, Midhurst.
971. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Gordon McAra spoke on the draft Development Brief representing Midhurst Town Council as the Chair of the Planning Committee.
  - Steven Smallman spoke on the draft Development Brief as the agent representing the Cowdray Estate.
  - Vincent Gabbe spoke on the draft Development Brief on behalf of West Sussex County Council.
972. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC09/18) and requested clarification and commented as follows:
- There was scope to improve details of complementary uses for the site within the wording of the policy.
  - The wording of the policy supported the form of words used within the draft Development Briefs.
  - Clarification as to whether any viability analysis had been carried out on the briefs.
  - There was mention in the brief of complementary uses for the site, there was still scope to improve the detail for potential design standards for commercial structures.
  - The wording around architectural styles needed to be reviewed to enable developers to look at a diverse range of proposals.
  - Whether 3 weeks was appropriate for the consultation to be effective.
  - Clarification of the status of these briefs once they were adopted.
973. In response to the public speaker and Member comments Officers clarified:
- There were different methods that could be used for consultation, the preferred method for the National Park was to consult with developers and local communities at the same time. If development schemes are submitted in the future the Authority will

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

seek broad conformity with the requirements of the brief.

- The wording within the policy was deliberate, there was not the evidence to support safeguarding particular areas of the site for employment. There were other sites in the area, either existing or proposed, that provided employment opportunities. However, this did not preclude employment use of the site.
- There had been no viability analysis undertaken at this point on the draft Development Briefs (although the emerging Local Plan had been subject to viability testing), developers would be included in the consultation process.
- The three week consultation period was considered appropriate and is similar to the period of time given to comment on planning applications.
- The Development Briefs would not become Supplementary Planning Documents but would have a significant weight as material considerations when considering proposals.

974. The Development Team Lead thanked the Members for their comments and assured them that they would be addressed before the public consultation. The public consultation process may well bring further changes to the documents.

975. The Director of Planning advised the Committee that advice had been taken regarding emerging Local Plan key areas including viability. Therefore if the Briefs conformed with the Local Plan which had been checked for deliverability having regard to viability, then there was no obvious reason why the aspirations set out could not be delivered. The desired quality was vital in order to meet the National Park purposes.

976. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation, with the addition that the delegated authority include consultation with the Chair of the Authority.

977. **RESOLVED:**

1. Subject to the comments of the Planning Committee being addressed (the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and Chair of Planning Committee) approve this draft Development Brief for consultation.
2. The Committee delegated authority to the Director Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority and the Chair of the Planning Committee, to consider the results of the consultation, make any minor changes and then approve the Development Brief for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. If major changes are required as a result of consultation a further report would be presented to the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 16: THIS ITEM WAS TAKEN BEFORE ITEM 10**

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

978. Thursday 8 February 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

**CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 17:20.

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