

**Excerpt from the October 2018 Planning Committee Meeting Minutes – Agenda Item 9**

**ITEM 9: SDNP/17/01744/FUL LAND SOUTH OF THE SEVEN STARS, RAMSDEAN ROAD, STROUD, PETERSFIELD, HAMPSHIRE**

711. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and informed the Committee of an additional update received on the morning of the Committee meeting, which negated the need for Condition 6 as this had now been addressed.
712. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Viv Hill spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
  - David McKinney spoke in support of the application as Chairman of Stroud Parish Council.
713. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC68/17), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and commented:
- The proposal lacked attention to detail with the design and context of the site.
  - There was opportunity for improvement of design.
  - There was scope for further discussion regarding the design and mix of housing.
  - The size of the development was appropriate for the site.
  - Recognition that the proposal would further support housing needs within the wider East Hampshire area, not just the community in Stroud.
  - The need to respect policy in respect of the current consultation on the Local Plan.
  - The potential community benefits of a village hall and some affordable housing.
  - Development on a green field site in the National Park should be of a very high design standard.
714. The Committee also raised concerns and requested clarification as follows:
- Clarity regarding the specific issues with the proposal and what needed to be improved.
  - Given that the proposal was on an allocated site in the emerging Local Plan, where did the concerns of the Officer lie with regard to the proposal?
  - Concern regarding the amount of affordable housing being proposed in the scheme.
  - Clarity relating to disconnect between the National Park and the developers on Affordable Housing and Economic Viability Assessment expectations.
  - The proposal demonstrated a lack of work and attention with regards to the needs of the National Park.
  - Concern that the affordable housing was not spread throughout the development.
  - Concern surrounding the water course and access to the Public House from the site.
715. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Officers had assessed this application and deemed it to be a major development, therefore paragraph 116 of NPPF applied.
  - The proposal did not meet the tests relating to affordable housing and the mix of housing.
  - Weight had been given to both current and emerging policies in considering the application but greater weight given to the Adopted Joint Core Strategy.
  - The Design Review Panel had input on the scheme at both pre-app and full-app stages. There had been insufficient research and interpretation of the scheme.
  - There was a lack of evidence regarding assessing and understanding the landscape, its value and how landscape character had been used to inform the scheme.
  - Lack of explanation relating to how design and access statement had been achieved.

- The applicant had not addressed issues and suggested amendments that had been raised at the different stages of this application. These included safe access routes to the Public House, the archaeological importance of the site, the ecological and landscape importance of the water course.
- The visual context of the development was not in keeping with the National Park and the locality.
- Viability assessment showed that 40% affordable housing could be provided.

716. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with the removal of reason for refusal number 6.

717. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the report and the October 2017 update sheet.