

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

ADDITIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE 23 JANUARY 2014

Held at Cowdray Hall, Easebourne, Midhurst at 10:30.

Present:

Andrew Shaxson (Chair)	Barbara Holyome	David Jenkins	Doug Jones
Neville Harrison (Deputy Chair)	Diana Kershaw	Ian Phillips	Margaret Paren (ex officio)

SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Keith Reed (Deputy Director of Planning), Tim Richings (Planning Policy Manager), Lara Southam (Local Plan Lead), Gareth Giles (CIL Project Manager), Anna Ludford (Planning Policy Officer), Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor) and Kate Lanham (Interim Member Services Support Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

382. The Committee Chair informed Committee members and members of the public that this was an additional Planning Committee to cover policy agenda items and that the minutes of the previous meeting and this meeting would be approved at the next Planning Committee on 13 February.

APOLOGIES

383. Apologies were received from Alun Alesbury, Jennifer Grey, Tom Jones, Charles Peck and Norman Dingemans (ex officio).

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

384. Margaret Paren declared a public service interest in item 7 as a member of the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) Hampshire.
385. Doug Jones declared a public service interest in item 7 as a Parish Councillor in East Hampshire District.

URGENT ITEMS

386. There were none.

STRATEGY & POLICY

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK LOCAL PLAN OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

387. The Committee Chair informed the Committee that the Draft Options Consultations Document (Report PC9/14 Appendix 1) had been through internal scrutiny and would be considered at the next National Park Authority Meeting on 4 February 2014.
388. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC9/14).
389. The case officer referenced items on the update sheet including:
- In consultation with the Head of Communications concerning the linkages between chapters and other reference material the proposed side bars referred to in the last sentence would not be used due to the impact they would have on the length of the document.
 - Paragraph 2.5 - The references to 53 issues in both the first and second sentences should read 52 issues.
390. The Chair led the Committee Members through the Draft Options Consultation Document (Report PC9/14 Appendix 1) Chapter by Chapter.
391. In response to questions officers clarified that:
- This document would not be fully comprehensive; it would cover the main strategic issues.

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee
Agenda Item 3b**

- The draft would be proof read by the Communications Team.
- Traffic noise/tranquillity had been moved into the Design Chapter.
- There would be a separate consultation later this year on the Settlement Hierarchy, which would be mentioned in the next Local Plan Newsletter.
- Policy boundaries would be considered as part of a review of settlement policy boundaries across the National Park for those settlements in Tiers 1-4 where allocations are proposed.
- The exact definition of 'local people' currently varies across the National Park and is being discussed with the Housing Authorities.
- The site threshold for rural exception sites referred to in note 35; page 94 would have an upper ceiling of 1ha.
- Public rights of way are protected through legislation. County Councils are legally required to maintain an up to date Definitive Map with a register of all public rights of way.
- There was no longer a chapter on climate change; it had been incorporated into other chapters of the document.
- A report would be brought to the June Planning Committee on the responses to this consultation.

392. In discussion, the following minor amendments were proposed:

- Other topics not addressed in the Draft Options Consultation Document, but proposed for inclusion in the Local Plan, could be listed at the end of the relevant chapter.
- The two section headings on page 19 would be reviewed to provide further clarification for the reader regarding green infrastructure and ecosystem services.
- Page 20, paragraph 1.42 would be amended to make it clear that climate change is cross-cutting issue running throughout the Local Plan.
- The figure for the number of listed buildings on page 23, Figure 5, would be amended from 5,000 to the correct figure of 5,860.
- Aquifers would be referred to in the Introduction for Chapter 3; page 29.
- Local Landscape would be referred to in paragraph 3.15; page 32.
- The Green Infrastructure Study referred to on page 35; paragraph 3.16 should be called by its original title 'Access Network and Accessible Natural Greenspace Study'.
- Issue 3; page 39 the distinction between designated and undesignated would be made clear by amending the title.
- Page 46; Option 6a the text 'with appropriate local native species' would be removed and the word 'appropriate' inserted in front of 'new trees and other vegetation'.
- Option 9b; page 52 the text would be reviewed.
- Reference would be made in Chapter 5 to the National Park Design Review Panel.
- The words 'within new development' would be removed from the title of Issue 18 in the main text and in the box on page 65.
- A note on consultation would be added to the text in paragraph 6.9; page 71 on Settlement Hierarchy Study.
- The first bullet point in the box for Issue 21; page 73 would be changed to include reference to the quiet enjoyment of the National Park.
- The wording would be reviewed in paragraph 6.16 and for Issue 22 in the box on page 74.
- Tier 1 and Tier 2 of Issue 25; page 78 would be separated into different boxes and reference made to the major development test in NPPF paragraph 116, as it applies in Tier 1 differently to elsewhere.

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee
Agenda Item 3b**

- Page 78; Issue 25, second bullet point, the word ‘determined’ would be changed to ‘informed’.
 - The word ‘How’ would be replaced with ‘What’ in the title of Issue 27; page 81 and the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 6.30 would be reviewed.
 - The words ‘very visible’ would be reviewed in paragraph 6.30; page 81.
 - Joint Core Strategies would be added to the text in paragraph 7.30; page 92.
 - Issue 31, page 92 – remove ‘local’ in last sentence, rewrite as ‘...affordable housing for people with a local connection in perpetuity’.
 - Page 99; Introduction - an emphasis would be placed on the value of National Park status to economy and tourism.
 - Amendments would be made to paragraph 8.28; page 110 to include the concept of keeping day visitors inside the National Park, instead of them driving straight through to the coast.
 - A reference to green infrastructure would be added to paragraph 9.9 on page 116.
 - A sentence could be added to 9.15 / 9.16; page 118 regarding parish plans.
 - Option 48c; page 122 would be reworded to ‘The Local Plan could include the development of a sensitivity analysis of the National Park’s landscape to identify areas that that are more sensitive and where development may therefore need to be restricted.’
 - Additional text would be added to Chapter 10 to refer to the need for the Authority to be mindful of Local Transport Plans and other proposals from the local highway authority.
 - Page 127; paragraph 10.9 the words ‘and healthy’ would be added after eco-friendly.
 - Any minor typos picked up could be emailed to officers.
393. These, and other minor amendments to the draft Options Consultation Document, are to be included in an update sheet for the NPA meeting on 4 February.
394. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendations with an additional delegation to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Authority Chair to formulate a list of minor changes to be reported to the National Park Authority. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
395. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- 1) Approved the Options Consultations Document at Appendix I of report PC9/14 with minor amendments to be made by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Authority Chair, including those to reflect the comments of the Committee; and
 - 2) Recommended to the National Park Authority that the Options Consultation Document, taking into account the proposed minor amendments, be published for the purposes of consultation.
396. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a comfort break at 12:15.
397. The Chair reconvened the meeting at 12:25. Agenda Item 7 was heard before Items 5 and 6 due to the public speaker for item 7.

MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO THE EAST HAMPSHIRE JOINT CORE STRATEGY

398. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC12/14).
399. The case officer referenced items on the update sheet and orally updated the Committee:
- Paragraph 1.2; page 36 – Change the date from ‘December 2012’ to December 2011’.
 - Paragraph 1.3; page 37; second sentence – Change the date from ‘20 December’ to ‘17 December’.

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee
Agenda Item 3b**

- Paragraph 2.2; page 37 – Change first sentence to ‘draft further Proposed Modifications...’
 - Paragraph 7.1; page 41 – Change first sentence to ‘This was not discussed at the 2013 Hearing, but was referred to at the original meeting in 2012’.
 - Paragraph 9.3; page 43 – Replace ‘an objection should be made to’ with ‘concern should be raised about’.
 - Paragraph 10.1; page 43; fifth sentence – change ‘Policy MM6’ to ‘Policy CP5’.
 - Paragraph 12.1 and 12.2; page 43 – Replace the word ‘objections’ with ‘concerns’.
400. Chris Napier spoke on the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy on behalf of CPRE Hampshire; he spoke about:
- His strong concerns regarding the three main modifications.
 - The proposal by the Inspector to change ‘about’ to ‘a minimum of’ was not discussed at the hearing.
 - Allowing ‘a minimum’ would give rise to inconsistency and a carte blanche for development in Petersfield; causing serious damage to the National Park and meaning that the Plan would be in conflict with the National Park purposes.
 - His opposition to delete the policy giving priority to the development of previously developed land.
401. In response to questions officers clarified that:
- The wording referred to in the update could be changed from ‘concerns’ to ‘strong reservations’ to reflect the Committee’s strength of feeling.
 - The East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy Final Main Modifications were currently out to consultation, as there would have been a significant delay before receiving the Inspector’s report if the modifications were to be considered by this Committee and then out to the public.
 - The words ‘a minimum of’ only apply to sites proposed to be allocated under parts 3 and 4 of Policy CP8; it could not be used to justify further sites coming forward through the development management process, which would be considered on their own merits, including their landscape impact in a National Park.
402. Members discussed:
- The word ‘minimum’ needed precision and did not appear to take account of the different terminology used in the neighbouring Winchester Joint Core Strategy.
 - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
403. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendations including minor amendments to be made to reflect the discussion of the Committee. Following a vote the proposal was carried.
404. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
- Agreed the comments on the Main Modifications to the East Hampshire Joint Core Strategy as set out in 5 to 9 of the report as summarised at (1) to (5) below and request the Inspector to take these into account in preparing his final report:
- 1) No objection to the 700 target for Petersfield (IMM13), subject to reiterate to the Inspector that it cannot be guaranteed that this level of housing will not have an adverse impact on the landscape of the National; Park and to clarification in the supporting text that identified large urban brownfield sites within settlement boundaries may form part of the allocations to be determined through the Petersfield Neighbourhood;
 - 2) The SDNPA’s strong reservations over the introduction of ‘a minimum of’ in place of ‘about’ in relation to settlements within the National Park (IMM13), since the policies of the NPPF place a restriction on meeting needs in nationally designated areas based on landscape and because the proposed wording would create inconsistency with the

adjoining Winchester Joint Core Strategy, making the standardisation of policies within the SDNP Local Plan more difficult;

- 3) No objection to the non-deletion of the Reserve Sites from the Local Plan Second Review saved policies (IMM38) subject to clarification in the supporting text that these are not allocations other than as reserve sites in the existing Local Plan, and that they will be re-assessed as part of the Neighbourhood Plan or South Downs Local Plan process on the same basis as other emerging sites;
- 4) No objection to the changes to the second part of Policy CP8;
- 5) Strong reservations over the deletion of the first part of the fifth paragraph of Policy CP 1 ('New development will make the best use of previously developed land and buildings within existing built-up areas.') (MM 3) and the deletion of paragraph 7 of FPM61(MM14) since this would be in accordance with the core planning principles in paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the deletion would create inconsistency with the adjoining Winchester Joint Core Strategy, making the standardisation of policies within the SDNP Local Plan more difficult.

405. The Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 13:18.

406. The Chair reconvened the meeting at 13:50.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE, APPROVAL TO CONSULT

407. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC10/14) and the update sheet.

408. In response to questions officers clarified that:

- CIL refers to the Gross Internal Area of buildings as defined by the Valuation Office Agency (everything within the outside walls of a building).
- Changes of use are exempt from CIL where they do not increase floor area; it only applies to new floor area.
- Charities are generally exempt from paying CIL, however there is an option in the consultation documents relating to whether charities should pay CIL when they develop buildings for profit.
- A link could be incorporated into the Local Plan Options Consultation on the internet to take people to the CIL consultation.

409. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

410. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

Considered and recommended to the National Park Authority that the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule be published for the purposes of consultation.

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK UPDATED STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

411. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC11/14) and the update sheet.

412. In discussion, the following minor amendments were agreed for Appendix 1 of Report 11/14):

- More detail would be included in Section 3 Approach to Consultation regarding how the Authority plans to engage with hard to reach groups.
- The departments listed in 3.2; page 13 would be removed.

413. In discussion, the following minor amendments were agreed for Appendix 2 of Report 11/14):

- A clearer explanation of the various elements of the development plan (i.e. Core Strategies, Saved Local Plan policies and Joint Plans) will be included in Section 2.

**Unconfirmed minutes –to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Planning Committee
Agenda Item 3b**

- The following text will be added to Paragraph 3.1; page 14: "...or those local authorities which were well-advanced in the preparation of a Core Strategy".
- Ensure Paragraph 5.1 is consistent with the information provided in the Statement of Community Involvement.
- The Integrated Landscape Character Assessment will be added to the list of Evidence in Paragraph 10.5 (vi); page 23.

414. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

415. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- 1) Approved the Statement of Community Involvement (First Revision);
- 2) Approved the Local Development Scheme (Second Revision); and
- 3) Agreed that any subsequent minor changes be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 14:30.