

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 DECEMBER 2017**

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

Present: Alun Alesbury (Deputy Chair), Heather Baker, David Coldwell, Neville Harrison (Chair), 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

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), Victoria Corrigan (Senior Planner), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead - West), Stella New (Development Management Officer), Rob Thain (Planning Policy Lead), Stephen Cantwell (Development Management Lead – East), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead)

### **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**

817. Apologies for absence were received from Gary Marsh and Margaret Paren.

### **ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

818. Doug Jones declared a public service interest in Item 7 as the applicant was known to him and one of the speakers was a member of the South Downs National Park Authority Sustainable Communities Fund Panel to which he was Chair. He informed the meeting that the application and site had never been the subject of any discussions or decisions made by the panel so there were no conflicts of interest.
819. Tom Jones declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 8 as a member of Lewes District Council.
820. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Item 7 as he was acquainted with Christine Seward, one of the speakers, through her work running the Sustainability Centre in East Meon and was also one of his constituents. He also declared a public service interest in Item 9 as Keith Budden, one of the speakers, was a fellow District Councillor.
821. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Items 7 and 8 as a member of the South Downs Society who had commented on these items.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9 NOVEMBER 2017**

822. The minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING**

823. There were none.

## ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

824. Rob Ainslie updated the Committee on the previous decision made on the planning application relating to Park House Hotel, Bepton. The Appeal Inspector had dismissed the appeal concluding that; the development would be harmful to the living conditions of local residents, the on-street overflow parking had potential to have some adverse visual effects in the area but that this would be of less significance than the permanent visual harm to the National Park and the setting of the conservation area arising from establishing a permanent car park.

## ITEM 6: URGENT MATTERS

825. There were none.

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

### ITEM 7: SDNP/I7/03623/FUL - DANGSTEIN CONSERVANCY, C/O LAUNDRY COTTAGES, DANGSTEIN ROAD, ROGATE, GU31 5BZ

826. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the December 2017 update sheet and verbally updated the Committee on comments that had been received overnight from the Ravens Archery Club relating to the pre-commencement conditions.
827. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Paddy Walker spoke against the application as a local resident, representing himself.
  - Elizabeth Brown spoke against the application on behalf of Rogate Parish Council.
  - David Campion spoke against the application as the agent representing Mr Nick Jacobs and other objectors.
  - Christine Seward spoke in support of the application representing herself and the Sustainability Centre.
  - Peggy Field spoke in support of the application representing herself and the Friends of Dangstein Conservancy.
  - Paddy Cox spoke in support of the application as the application representing the Dangstein Conservancy.
828. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC76/I7), the December 2017 update sheet, the public speaker comments and commented:
- There was considerable reliance on proposed management plans sought by conditions.
  - That by meeting the pre-commencement conditions, an indication of the future effective management of the site would be demonstrated.
  - That a clearer distinction between the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and the Ancient Woodland management was required.
  - The site management plan needed to ensure that access via the gate on Fynings Lane be restricted to key times.
  - Issues over Access and the Management Plan had not been sufficiently addressed since the previous refusal.
  - That there was still no site Management Plan in place and that these plans should be seen before a new decision was made given that historically the site had not been well managed.
  - Assurance that nothing would be commenced on site until the plans had been approved.
  - That the planning terms were unclear with regard to access of the site.
  - The level of activity was detrimental to the nearby residential properties.
  - Not enough weight was being given to the conserving the natural beauty and heritage of the Park.
  - There was a positive impact of the proposal on the restoration of the heathland and woodland education.
829. The Committee also raised concerns and requested clarification as follows:

- Concern regarding the impact of the proposal on the special quality of tranquillity in this area of the National Park.
  - Clarification as to whether there was an extent planning permission limiting access use or whether the access was just a private matter.
  - Concern over access and noise disturbance.
  - Whether the buildings that were currently on site, which did not have planning permission, would still be removed if the Committee refused this application.
  - Whether enforcement was still the responsibility of Chichester District Council or whether it was now the responsibility of the Authority.
  - Concern that the level of activity was too intense.
830. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The planning permission granted limited use of access for Laundry Cottage and for forestry operations.
  - Some of the structures currently on site were unlawful and therefore action would follow pending this decision, but Members had to make a decision based upon the application in front of them.
  - That enforcement was undertaken by Chichester District Council as agent for the SDNPA. The National Park consistently assisted and supported the District Council with enforcement.
831. It was proposed and seconded to vote on a revised officer recommendation with amended wording to Condition 13 relating to woodland management and clarification surrounding the pre-commencement conditions.
832. The revised recommendation was not carried by the Committee. The Committee discussed possible reasons for refusal.
833. It was proposed and seconded to refuse the grant of planning permission for the reason that the proposed uses of the site would cumulatively lead to a level of activity which, through noise and disturbance including from traffic arriving and departing the site, would not conserve or enhance the National Park landscape and its tranquillity. The proposals therefore did not accord with saved policies R2 and RE12 of the Chichester District Local Plan 1999, policies SD4 and SD7 of the South Downs Pre-Submission draft Local Plan 2017, the 1st Purpose of a National Park, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The final form of wording of the refusal were to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
834. **RESOLVED:**
- To refuse the grant of planning permission for the following reason:
- The proposed uses of the site would cumulatively lead to a level of activity which, through noise and disturbance including from traffic arriving and departing the site, would not conserve or enhance the National Park landscape and its tranquillity. The proposals therefore do not accord with saved policies R2 and RE12 of the Chichester District Local Plan 1999, policies SD4 and SD7 of the South Downs Pre-Submission draft Local Plan 2017, the 1st Purpose of a National Park, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
- The final form of words being delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/17/03100/FUL - LAND AT UNITS 6-8 BROOKS ROAD, LEWES, EAST SUSSEX**

835. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the December 2017 update sheet and verbally updated the Committee on matters relating to drainage of the site and land registration relating to site access.
836. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Robert Cheesman spoke against the application representing the Friends of Lewes.
  - Paul Burgess spoke in support of the application as the agent.
  - Paul Fender spoke in support of the application as the architect.

- Chris Oakley spoke in support of the application on behalf of Cross Stone Homes.
837. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC77/17), the December 2017 update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- That the principal of mixed use development was to be encouraged in towns within the National Park.
  - The buildings within the proposal were a good design and appropriate to Lewes.
  - The development of this type would fulfil a local need.
  - There was concern over the uncertainty of the access rights for the proposal.
  - The layout of the development was poorly designed, specifically with regard to the neighbouring service yard.
  - To refuse this proposal seemed premature; there was opportunity to improve the proposal.
  - There was concern over the lack of affordable housing being provided within the scheme, the percentage should be higher.
  - Parking was not an issue for this site.
  - This was a sustainable development.
  - There was scope to challenge the viability assessment that had been put forward by the developers.
  - The site had been dormant for several years, this development would add something different into the location.
  - Site viability would improve with securing access to the site.
  - The external landscaping could be improved as it was dominated by parking.
838. The Committee also requested clarification with regard to:
- Whether the marketing of the site, which had been on the market for a considerable time, was robust.
  - Concern over the uncertainty of access to the site, especially with regard to the unregistered land.
  - Clarification regarding which policies applied to this area of land and what weight could be given to the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).
  - How the Committee could feasibly address the lack of affordable housing.
  - Whether the affordable housing was time limited or in perpetuity.
839. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Further advice would need to be sought with regard to access from the unregistered land and the access from the current Tesco site.
  - Officers referred to the report regarding policy. Regeneration was encouraged, this proposal met with policy as it provided business units within the site as part of the development.
  - The NDP was in pre-submission draft form. Some weight had been given to this emerging plan. This site had not been included in the plan as other sites had been deemed more suitable by the NDP steering group.
  - It would be possible to carry out an independent viability assessment to consider whether there should be an increase percentage of affordable housing.
  - The affordable housing was now in perpetuity.
840. It was proposed and seconded to vote to defer the application so that further assessments of affordable housing, access grounds and the need for improvement of external landscaping can be undertaken and considered by Members.
841. **RESOLVED:**
- That consideration of planning application SDNP/17/03100/FUL be deferred in order that further assessment on the following be obtained to better inform a decision:

- 1) Viability (to include increase of affordable housing provision)
  - 2) Access (to include confirmation of all means of access to the site)
  - 3) Landscaping (improvement of external landscaping).
842. The Committee took a short recess at 12:46.
843. Robert Mocatta left the meeting at 12:46.
844. The Committee reconvened at 12:52.
- ITEM 9: SDNP/17/00873/CND & SDNP/17/01406/FUL - MOBILE HOME 1 HALF ACRE, HAWKLEY ROAD, LISS, HAMPSHIRE, GU33 6JS**
845. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the December 2017 update sheet.
846. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Cllr Keith Budden spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor for Hangers and Forest Ward.
  - Geoff Brighton spoke against the application as the Chair of Planning, Hawkley Parish Council.
  - David Lentaigne spoke against the application as a local resident.
847. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC78/17), the December 2017 update sheet, the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Whether the hedgerow on the northern boundary was within the control of the applicant and whether the landscaping was sufficient.
  - Clarity sought regarding the personal permission for the resident dependents and the extent of this condition
  - Whether it would be possible to grant temporary permission given the status of the site within the emerging Local Plan.
  - Clarity sought regarding granting temporary permission and whether the site would automatically be deemed an allocated gypsy and traveller site if the current residents relocated.
  - Whether the Authority had control over the colour of the proposed mobile homes.
  - Whether it was possible to place a temporary permission on what would be deemed a permanent structure.
848. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Further landscaping within the blue line had been requested. There was scope along the northern boundary to move pitches and mobile homes to accommodate further screen planting.
  - A condition specifically detailed those named and referenced their dependents who may or may not currently live on site.
  - Some weight had been given to the emerging Local Plan. There was an argument for temporary permission, however the current health issues of individuals would not change.
  - The Authority did not currently have control over the colour of mobile homes, just the number of static mobile homes located on the site. This would not change through the proposed conditions.
  - Placing a temporary permission on a building would be the same as some permissions that were given for agricultural buildings and as such reasonable in the circumstances.
849. The Director of Planning advised the committee that the proposed conditions meant that should the current residents relocate, or the health issues no longer be an issue, the use of the site could not under this permission be retained.
850. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the grant of a temporary planning permission for application reference SDNP/17/00873/CND for a period of 6 years subject to the conditions set out in report reference PC78/17.

851. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved:  
To grant temporary planning permission on application **SDNP/17/00873/CND** for a period of 6 years subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC78/17; the final form of words which is to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee in order to address the grant for a temporary period.
852. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the grant of temporary planning permission for application reference SDNP/17/01406/FUL for a period of 6 years subject to the conditions set out in report reference PC78/17.
853. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved:  
To grant temporary planning permission on application **SDNP/17/01406/FUL** for a period of 6 years subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of report PC78/17 and the December 2017 update sheet; the final form of words which is to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee in order to address the grant for a temporary period.
854. The meeting broke for lunch 13:30.
855. Tom Jones left the meeting at 13:30.
856. The meeting reconvened at 14:02.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/17/00001/TPO - SOLDIERS FIELD, SOLDIERS FIELD LANE, FINDON, WORTHING, BN14 0SH**

857. The Case Officer presented the application.
858. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC79/17) and commented:
- This was an excellent specimen which could however impact on any future development.
  - Whilst the tree was out of character with the natural landscape it could significantly enhance a future urban environment.
  - The TPO would not be a block to future development but could ensure that consideration would be given to replacement planting or landscaping.
859. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
860. **RESOLVED:** That the provisional Tree Preservation Order SDNP/17/00001/TPO made on 29 June 2017 be confirmed.

**ITEM 11: THE MAKING OF EAST MEON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

861. The Communities Lead Officer presented an overview to the Committee.
862. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC80/17) and:
- Commended the community of East Meon for their hard work and in overcoming the challenges faced.
863. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
864. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
- 1) Noted the outcome of the East Meon Neighbourhood Plan Referendum;
  - 2) Agreed to make the East Meon Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan for the parish of East Meon.

**ITEM 12: THE MAKING OF LISS NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

865. The Communities Lead Officer presented an overview to the Committee.
866. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC81/17) and:
- Commended the community of Liss and the Communities Team for their hard work on the plan.
  - Highlighted that Liss had allocated a good number of houses whilst being able to retain the nature of a 'hidden' village within the National Park.
867. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation.

868. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1) Noted the outcome of the Liss Neighbourhood Plan Referendum;
- 2) Agreed to make the Liss Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan for the parish of Liss.

**ITEM 13: APPROVAL OF PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE WEST SUSSEX JOINT MINERALS LOCAL PLAN**

869. The Planning Policy Lead Officer presented an overview to the Committee.

870. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC82/17) and:

- Requested clarification on the soft sand joint review.
- Queried whether policy MM5 had procedures in place to ensure restoration delivered net gains to natural capital.
- Clarification requested regarding hydraulic fracturing not being permitted over 1200m in Groundwater Protection Zone 1 and whether this was a new standard being set by the National Park.
- Request for confirmation that hydraulic fracturing was not permitted within the National Park, therefore it was to be assumed that the policy referred to drilling under the National Park.
- Noted that the Steyning soft sand allocation had been removed from the plan and the site in Coldwaltham not included. Confirmation was required as to whether these sites could be added to the plan after adoption.
- Should an application be proposed before the plan was adopted, what weight would be given to this plan.

871. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- There had been debate with West Sussex County Council regarding restoration. It was not possible to extract minerals without localised damage. Amended wording referred to 'net gains' for biodiversity post extraction.
- Reference to hydraulic fracturing followed statutory guidance and was not setting a new standard for the National Park.
- Vertical drilling was not permitted within the National Park, but drilling could take place under the Park.
- Sites that had been left out of the plan could be added, along with other sites, when the plan was reviewed in future.
- Primary weight would be given to this plan in consideration with other existing minerals plans, West Sussex County Council would be applying the same weight.

872. The Director of Planning advised the Committee that commendable policies had been included in the plan, with the exception of the soft sand policy which would be reviewed further. Work would continue with West Sussex County Council in order to adopt the plan as soon as possible.

873. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation.

874. **RESOLVED:** The Committee recommended the National Park Authority to:

- 1) Agree the proposed Modifications to the draft West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (Appendix 1) for publication and public consultation on their soundness followed by submission to the Inspector;
- 2) Agree primary weight should be placed on the draft West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan, in conjunction with other material considerations, when determining minerals development proposals in the interim period until the date of adoption.
- 3) Agree to undertake a single issue (soft sand) joint review of the Plan after adoption.

**ITEM 14: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED FROM 30 AUGUST 2017 TO 27 NOVEMBER 2017**

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

876. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC83/17) and:
- Asked what the national picture was with regard to appeals when compared with the statistics of the National Park.
  - Requests confirmation of how much weight was being given to Partnership Management Plans (PMP) in regard to appeals.
  - Suggested that the appeals results were shared with Parish Councils and other Authorities as they would benefit from the information, especially where the National Park had been successful in upholding policies.
877. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The appeal statistics were broadly consistent with the national picture. Around 65-70% of appeals are dismissed nationally.
  - PMP policies were not always referred to in appeal decisions, weight afforded was lower than a development plan but broadly comparable to a supplementary planning document.
  - Moving forward this appeals information would be made available to all host authorities via a shared website. The Authority would look at adding appeals information into the planning e-newsletter which was sent to all Parish Councils.
878. The Director of Planning highlighted that 70-90% success was positive. It demonstrated that the Authority were pushing boundaries when making decisions.
879. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
880. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions between 30 August 2017 and 27 November 2017.

**ITEM 15: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

881. Thursday 18 January 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

**CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 14:50.



## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE 18 JANUARY 2018**

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 Guttierrez (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 2017**

888. The minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING**

889. There were none.

### **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/17/03850/CND & SDNP/17/03856/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.
  - 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.
- 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 here 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.

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.
  - 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 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 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 commenced in January 2017 and been more rigorous since September 2017.
- Environmental Health and HCC Monitoring Officers had monitored the screener on site 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.
- 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.

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.
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 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 LAND, 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.
- 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 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.

## **Agenda Item 19**

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.





**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY  
PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 FEBRUARY 2018**

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, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta  
Ex Officio Members for Planning Policy items only (may participate on Policy Items but not vote, no participation on Development Management Items):  
Norman Dingemans

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Gill Welsman (Committee Officer)

Also attended by: Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Luke Smith (Senior Development Management Officer), Sarah Nelson (Strategic Planning Lead)

**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**

979. Apologies for absence were received from David Coldwell, Margaret Paren and Ian Phillips.

**ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

980. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as a member of the South Downs Society.

981. Gill Welsman declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 8 as she was acquainted with the owner of site H8.

**ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18 JANUARY 2018**

982. The minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING**

983. There were none.

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

984. There were none.

**ITEM 6: URGENT MATTERS**

985. There were none.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

**ITEM 7: SDNP/16/06023/FUL & SDNP/16/06024/LIS - GREAT BARN, WISTON**

986. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the February 2018 update sheet.

987. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:

- Simon Thomas spoke in support of the application representing the Society of Saint Columba as the Chair of the Columba Barns Society.

988. The Committee requested clarification on the following:

- Further explanation of the materials being used for buildings B11 and B13-15.
- Whether there was any intention to reuse grey water.
- Whether the wording of condition 17, relating to the occupation of groups, should be reworded as it could be misinterpreted.
- Whether less prominent sites for locating the new agricultural buildings had been investigated.
- As this was a sensitive location within the National Park if consideration had been given to improving the visual impact of the current farm buildings and whether screening was proposed in order to reduce the impact of the new barns.
- If the plans to expand the car park included the retention of the picnic area.

989. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Building B11 was a mix of timber and brick. Building B13-15 was timber framed with glass panels and render.
- Water recycling was referred to in the drainage strategy and would be covered by condition for further details to be provided.
- Agreed that the reference to group use of the visitor accommodation could be misinterpreted and would be removed from Condition 17.
- Other sites had been considered with regard to the siting of the new agricultural buildings. The siting of the new buildings was deemed appropriate given their proximity to existing farm buildings, which would continue to be used, the physical constraints of the site and adverse landscape impacts associated with other available sites
- The existing farm buildings, not the listed buildings, were not part of the current application and their roof material was not proposed to change. An informative relating to future management of these buildings could be included in the recommendation.
- Screening had been explored, the advice from the Landscape Officer was that any screening would need to be in keeping with the landscape pattern and that it was normal to see farm buildings within the landscape. Soft planting had been advised to minimise the visual impact of the buildings.
- There would be an informative put in place with regard to retaining a suitable picnic space within the car park.

990. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC11/18), the February 2018 update sheet, the public speaker comments and commented:

- Concern over the reference to management of the land within the report and whether an informative relating to ongoing management could be included.
- This was a well-considered application, especially with regard to the use of listed agricultural buildings.
- Highlighted the importance of colour and finish for the new agricultural buildings in order to reduce the visual impact in this area of the South Downs.
- Concern relating to the impact on Dark Night Skies and the suggestion that low light transmittance glass be used.
- That the proposal would have a positive impact on the quality and revenue of farming, which was to be encouraged within the National Park.

991. The Director of Planning informed the Committee that an informative with regard to future management and improvement of the existing farm buildings would be advised. The concerns over landscaping were covered within the conditions. This was a positive progression of a Whole Estate Plan which had been endorsed by the National Park.

992. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised recommendation for both applications that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Sections 10.1/10.2 of report PC11/18, the February 2018 update sheet, inclusion of informatives relating to the future management of the existing farm buildings, the picnic area and glazing and the removal of the words "or group" from Condition 17 of section 10.1.

993. **RESOLVED:**

**Recommendation for SDNP/16/06023/FUL:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Section 10.1 of report reference PC11/18, the February 2018 update sheet, inclusion of informatives relating to the future management of the existing farm buildings, the picnic area and glazing and the removal of the words “or group” from Condition 17.

**Recommendation for SDNP/16/06024/LIS:** That listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in Section 10.2 of report reference PC11/18, the February 2018 update sheet, inclusion of informatives relating to the future management of the existing farm buildings, the picnic area and glazing.

994. Norman Dingemans joined the meeting at 10:58.

**ITEM 8: PETWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN DECISION STATEMENT**

995. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the February 2018 update sheet.

996. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:

- Colin Nutt spoke against the application representing himself as a local resident.

997. The Committee requested clarification on the following:

- Explanation of the regulations relating to undertaking a public consultation.
- The access arrangements to site H8.
- Whether there were any existing policies that would limit the number of dwellings on a particular site.
- Further explanation as to why this site was being allocated at this late stage of the plan, given that it had been excluded at the Regulation 14 stage.
- Confirmation that the plan would be brought back to the Committee should the decision to include site H8 differ from the Examiners recommendation following the public consultation.

998. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Regulations enable the National Park to consult on a decision statement should Officers wish to oppose the examiners recommendation. Officers support the examiner’s findings, however felt it appropriate to give the public the opportunity to consult on the new proposed allocation of site H8 as it had not been part of the Regulation 14 or 16 consultation.
- Site H8 had two potential access points, one off Rothermead, the other from the grain storage site.
- Policy ASD2 regarding housing density within the neighbourhood plan stated that density of residential developments should be 30-35 dwellings per hectare.
- The site had been brought in at both Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages of the process by the land-owner, initially the site had been grouped with other sites that were under consideration, and not as a site in its own right. The examiner felt that it was appropriate to include the land as a designated site.
- The Plan would be brought back to committee should the public consultation indicate that a different decision to the examiners recommendation be recommended.

999. It was proposed to vote on the Officer’s recommendation as worded in the February 2018 update sheet.

1000. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1) Noted the comments of the Examiner.
- 2) Invited representations on proposed policy H8 for a period of 6 weeks from the 9 February to the 23 March 2018.

- 3) Delegated authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to review the representations on policy H8, amend the policy if necessary, agree and publish the Final Decision Statement.

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

1001. Thursday 8 March 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

**CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 11:32.

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

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY  
PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 MARCH 2018**

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

Present: Alun Alesbury (Deputy Chair), Heather Baker, David Coldwell, Neville Harrison (Chair), Barbara Holyome, Roger Huxstep, 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: Katie Kam (Solicitor), Gill Welsman (Committee Officer), Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee Officer)

Also attended by: Rob Ainslie (Development Management Manager), Vicki Colwell (Senior Planner Development Management), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Alister Linton-Crook (Cycling Project Officer), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead)

**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**

I001. Apologies for absence were received from Gary Marsh.

**ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

I002. Doug Jones declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 10 as he was Chair of the Sustainable Communities Fund which had awarded a grant to the proposed community shop in Fittleworth.

**ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 8 FEBRUARY 2018**

I003. The minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING**

I004. There were none.

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

I005. Robert Ainslie updated the Committee on the proposal at Swanborough Lakes south of Lewes. The Committee had previously resolved to approve the application subject to a S106 Agreement which had now been secured and the decision made.

**ITEM 6: URGENT MATTERS**

I006. Robert Ainslie updated the Committee on a recent Article 4 direction which had been issued earlier this week in relation to the sub-division of land west of Mill Lane, Steep. Officers had worked closely with enforcement colleagues at East Hampshire District Council and acted quickly under delegated powers to impose the direction.

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

**ITEM 7: SDNP/17/03985/ADJUT – LAND WEST OF NEW MONKS FARM, MARSH BARN LANE, LANCING**

**ITEM 8: SDNP/17/04761/ADJUT – SHOREHAM AIRPORT, CECIL PASHLEY WAY, SHOREHAM (BRIGHTON CITY AIRPORT) LANCING**

1007. The Chair advised the Committee that as Agenda Items 7 and 8 were closely linked the Case Officer would give one presentation for the two proposals.
1008. Case Officer presented the application.
1009. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Mark Milling spoke against the application as the Bursar of Lancing College.
  - Peter Rainier spoke in support of the application as the agent.
1010. The Committee considered the reports by the Director of Planning (Reports PC13/18 and PC14/18), the public speakers comments and requested clarification on the following:
- Whether the access concerns voiced by Lancing College were surmountable.
  - That the 30% affordable housing allocation was in line with the Adur Local Plan.
  - Request for further information regarding the area in which the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was deficient.
  - Whether the proposed roundabout met with the Highways England proposal to improve the A27 at this location.
  - Whether the pedestrian access was at road level.
  - Whether there were any drawings available to further understand the impact of the development in relation to other buildings and the potential visual impact from Lancing College and the South Downs.
  - Whether the proposed Non-Motorised User (NMU) route, which was outside the red development line, formed part of this proposal.
  - Further information requested as to how the proposed NMU and improvement of the path along the River Adur were tied into the application.
1011. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Further explanation was given on the location of the proposed roundabout in relation to the access to Lancing College.
  - Negotiations regarding access to Lancing College were ongoing. The suggested proposal for the fourth arm on the roundabout was not part of the current New Monks Farm application. Any new proposal, should it include land within the National Park, would require a separate application.
  - The current Highways England consultation for the A27 did not include a roundabout at this location.
  - Access across the A27 would be at road level, using traffic light controlled pedestrian crossings at the roundabout and connecting users via the path to Coombes Road and Hoe Court Lane.
  - The proposal to upgrade the existing footpath along the River Adur was part of the New Monks Farm proposal. It would be upgraded to a bridleway and would go under the A27 using the current underpass. Future management of footpaths and bridleways would be covered by Rampion conditions and a S106 Agreement to ensure continued management.
  - There would be a separate application made to the Authority for any development proposals which were inside the National Park boundary.
  - The 30% affordable housing was in line with Adur policy requirements.
  - Detailing on the LVIA were still ongoing. Officers had been working closely with the applicant to highlight the importance of the impact of views from the South Downs,

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

Lancing College and from the railway embankment back to the South Downs. There was insufficient evidence to demonstrate an understanding of the importance of the site in the context of the National Park. Specific concerns had been raised in relation to protecting Dark Night Skies, and there was a further requirement for a cumulative impact assessment to be carried out given the number of planning applications within the geographical area.

- Reliance on tree planting and screening along the northern edge as mitigation for the retail development was inadequate and was unlikely to be successful. Further consideration to improve the current LVIA proposals for the retail development and the surrounding area was required.
  - The colour of the retail development was a concern and no changes had been proposed by the applicant.
1012. The Chair reminded the Committee that this was a response to consultation, they were not making a planning decision. Impact of the development on the National Park was the main consideration.
1013. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- There was a lack of engagement with the importance of the site in relation to the National Park.
  - Proposed tree planting was insufficient to mitigate the proposed retail development.
  - The colour and impact of the proposed developments was a concern and needed to be made more robust in the response to consultation.
  - Concern relating to the pedestrian access across the roundabout and the impact of introducing new junctions along the A27.
  - There was no clear view offered by the applicants to demonstrate the impact of the developments on the current views.
  - The colour, scale and mass of the outline application was a concern.
  - The need to protect the current views both from and to the South Downs.
  - Access and egress issues in relation to Lancing College could be explored further.
  - Concern about the increase in traffic on an already busy section of the A27 and the impact on the College. Wording of the transport section of the response could be strengthened.
  - This was a major development on the edge of the National Park.
  - There was potential to challenge the design of the buildings given the scale and mass of the development in relation to the National Park.
  - Standards of design for the commercial developments could be improved especially with regard to the colour, roofscape, break-up of elevations with architectural application, cosmetic application and landscaping.
  - There was a lot of detailing that still needed to be addressed, specifically in relation to road junctions, the increase in traffic, lighting and layout of the buildings.
  - The development offered an opportunity to link two cycle ways to the north and south of the site and would improve access to a network of footpaths, bridleways and cycle ways in the National Park.
1014. Officers advised the Committee that they would strengthen the wording of the traffic impact section of the report. Objections had been made regarding the visual impact and design of the New Monks Farm development had not been responded to.
1015. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the recommendation for **SDNP/I7/03985/ADJAUT** objecting to the proposed development and subject to comments made by the Committee indicating a more robust response being made and that authority be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, to agree the final submission.
1016. **RESOLVED - SDNP/I7/03985/ADJAUT:** The Committee agreed:

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

1. That subject to the comments of the Planning Committee being addressed, agreed the SDNPA response to Adur and Worthing Councils, objecting to the proposed development.
  2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to agree the final submission to Adur and Worthing Councils.
- I017. The Chair asked the Committee for any comments in relation to Agenda Item 8 that had not already been covered. Having no further comments it was proposed and seconded to vote on the recommendation.
- I018. **RESOLVED - SDNP/17/04761/ADJAUT:** The Committee agreed:
1. The SDNPA response to Adur and Worthing Councils, providing a holding objection to the proposed development.
  2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to agree the final submission to Adur and Worthing Councils.

**ITEM 9: UPDATE ON SDNPA LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

- I019. The Planning Policy Manager presented the report.
- I020. The Committee requested clarification on the following:
- Whether reference to SPD's that have already been adopted needed to be referred to in the report.
  - Was there any content within the new NPPF that would effect the emerging Local Plan
  - Whether the Secretary of State's recent decision regarding housing would have a positive impact on the Ashdown Forest issue.
- I021. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Further work is currently being undertaken to ensure the SPD's can move forward once the Local Plan had been adopted, they do not need to be included in the LDS. Policy references will be changed it was envisaged that all SPD's would be able to be included.
  - The new NPPF included a lot of what was already in the emerging Local Plan, however the current submission would be under the old NPPF.
  - The Secretary of State's decision was positive for the National Park. Decisions have been made; there were no likely significant adverse effects to the Ashdown Forest and development could go ahead. The HRA policy in the Local Plan states that there were no were likely significant effects to the Ashdown Forest SAC.
- I022. It was proposed to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
- I023. **RESOLVED:** The Committee approved the Local Development Scheme (Fifth Revision).

**ITEM 10: RESPONSE TO THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION ON THE FITTLEWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

- I024. The Communities Lead presented the report.
- I025. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC16/18) and requested further clarification on the following:
- The number of dwellings outlined in the plan was higher than the number recommended in the emerging Local Plan, was the figure in the Local Plan determined to be a minimum allocation.
  - Whether the housing numbers outlined in the Local Plan were set figures.
- I026. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The reference to housing numbers within the Local Plan was an approximation. The number of dwellings allocated in a settlement could be higher than the recommendation within the Local Plan, as long as there it had public support and there was no adverse effects to landscape, bio-diversity and cultural heritage.
- I027. Members also commended the Fittleworth Neighbourhood Development team and the



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

South Downs Officers on their work on their plan.

1028. It was proposed to vote on the Officer's recommendation.

1029. **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 Fittleworth Neighbourhood Development Plan pre-submission consultation.

**ITEM 11: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED FROM 28 NOVEMBER 2017 TO 22 FEBRUARY 2018**

1030. The Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager presented the report.

1031. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC17/18) and made the following comments:

- That the Inspector was referencing the National Park in each report and that they were clearly considering the impact of the setting of the National Park when making decisions.

1032. It was proposed to vote on the Officer's recommendation.

1033. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions between 28 November 2017 and 22 February 2018.

**ITEM 12: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

1034. Thursday 8 March 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

**CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 11:43.