

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 10 MAY 2018

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

Present: Heather Baker, David Coldwell, Neville Harrison (Chair), Barbara Holyome, Doug Jones (Deputy Chair), 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

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

Also attended by: Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Emily Anderson (Development Management Officer), Stella New (Development Management Officer), Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer), Dave Boyson (Conservation Officer), Alma Howell (Neighbourhood and Policy Planning Officer), Katharine Stuart (Senior Planning Policy Officer)

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

1092. Apologies for absence were received from Alun Alesbury, Roger Huxstep, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta and Margaret Paren.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

1093. David Coldwell declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as this application was within his ward.

1094. Tom Jones declared a public services interest in Agenda Item 14 as he was a member of Lewes District Council.

1095. Barbara Holyome declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 10 as she was a member of Bramdean and Hinton Ampner Parish Council. She confirmed that she had not had any discussion or influence on their decision.

1096. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 8 as a member of South Downs Society who had commented on the item.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 APRIL 2018

1097. The minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

1098. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

1099. The Director of Planning updated the Committee on the progress of the Local Plan which had been submitted at the end of April. All information was available on the SDNPA website. There had already been a lot of publicity and media interest in the Plan which is the first to have a proper landscape led focus. The assigned inspector had been named as Brian Sims, who had wide experience in rural areas on local plans and on minerals and waste plans.

There was no confirmed examination date at this stage. Appropriate legal representation would be in place for the examination.

- I100. The Director of Planning advised the Committee with regard to the weight that the emerging policies within the Local Plan were given by Officers in considering their recommendations. Development Management Officers in both the National Park and Host Authorities would be supplied with documentation advising weighting that should be given to policies during the examination period and up to full adoption of the Local Plan.
- I101. The submission date for representations to the revision of the NPPF was Thursday 10 May 2018. The South Downs National Park Authority had made representations through the National Parks England family. Representations for other consultations had also been submitted by the National Park in relation to CIL and viability assessments, which were core elements of the Local Plan.

ITEM 6: URGENT MATTERS

- I102. There were none.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

ITEM 7: SDNP/18/00749/FUL LAND TO SOUTH OF YOUTH HOSTEL, TRULEIGH HILL, SHOREHAM

- I103. The Case Officer presented the application.
- I104. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Nat Belderson spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
- I105. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC25/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:
- Whether the surfacing of path shown in the Officer presentation was the same as proposed for this application.
 - If alternative surfacing materials, which would have less visual impact, had been investigated.
- I106. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The image showed the same path surfacing as was proposed for the application.
 - Other surfacing had been investigated by Officers, the proposed surface was the most appropriate given the gradient of the site and accessibility for wheelchair users.
- I107. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- This was a good opportunity to improve access to all users and an exemplar application for other communities in the National Park.
 - The use of an all-weather surface would make this site accessible to all, especially wheelchair users.
- I108. It was proposed to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
- I109. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted for application reference SDNP/18/00749/FUL subject to the condition set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report.

ITEM 8: SDNP/17/03717/FUL BLAKEHURST FARM AND MAGGOT FARM, BLAKEHURST LANE, WARNINGCAMP

- I110. The Case Officer presented the application, referred the Committee to the changes to the reasons for refusal detailed in the 10 May 2018 Update Sheet. A verbal update was given with regard to the page references in the Update Sheet.
- I111. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Lee Scott spoke in support of the application as the agent for the application.
 - Nigel Draffan spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
 - Alex Lock spoke in support of the application as the tenant farmer of Blakehurst Farm.
- I112. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC26/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:

- The impact of the windows and roof lights in the Threshing Barn on Dark Night Skies.
- The number of dwellings required to make the application viable.
- If the viability assessment had considered the ability for the scheme to contribute to affordable housing or solely for the provision of the agricultural barns.
- The reasons for refusal regarding landscape and historic buildings.
- Whether the current route of the footpath could remain should the application be approved.
- If deferral was an option for this application, to allow further negotiation with the applicant to achieve an acceptable scheme.

1113. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- All roof lights and windows in the threshing barn were new elements and the rooflights would be covered with mesh to comply with Dark Night Skies.
- The viability assessment suggested that the optimum number of dwellings was 7, which could provide an affordable housing contribution
- The conversion element of the application had been proposed in order to enable the agricultural barns at Maggot Farm. The reason for refusal on the grounds of affordable housing had been removed based on the limited weight that could be given to emerging Local Plan policy. The viability assessment had considered matters such as the existing tenancy as a working farm and the substantial payment that would need to be made to terminate this.
- The route of the footpath needed to be changed to accommodate the proposed extension and amenity areas provided on the southernmost barn.
- The Conservation Officer advised that whilst the current farmstead buildings were not fit for purpose retention and sympathetic conversion was desirable. The current proposal did not preserve the character of the building. There was scope to further improve the design in order to preserve the buildings and retain their character.
- The Landscape Officer clarified that the assessment should focus on the farmstead as a whole, rather than as individual buildings. The primary objection was around the loss of agricultural character along with design concerns and the impact of residential buildings on the historic narrative of the farmstead. The current nature of the farmstead was typical of the local landscape which would be lost with the proposed redevelopment.
- A decision was required as significant and exhaustive discussions had taken place at all stages of the application. Discussions had now reached an impasse with regard to the issues and aspirations of viability.

1114. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:

- If the 1960's barns were demolished this would open up the farmstead and return it to a pre-1960's condition.
- Changes were needed to the site to prevent it falling into disuse.
- Investment such as this was needed to accommodate modern arable farming.
- There was further opportunity to discuss the viability issues.
- The input of the Landscape and Heritage officers was critical to this application.
- This application had a lack of sensitivity with the design, character and history of the farmstead and did not reflect the design potential and opportunity the site presented.
- The design of the proposed agricultural building cluster was commended
- There was a commitment by the applicant to retain the historic buildings.
- Concern was expressed over refusing the application and the further degeneration of this site over an extended period of time.
- The footpath was currently impassable so any change would be beneficial as would secure the footpath for future use.
- There was still scope for further discussions to take place.

- A viable scheme was required in order to ensure the continuation of farming on the area.
 - The addition of domestic gardens could give the area an urban feel.
- I 115. The Director of Planning advised the Committee that the removal of the second reason for viability relating to affordable housing potentially altered the viability equation. Regardless of the viability there was still concern over the sub-division of the Threshing Barn into 4 units. It would be possible to still have positive discussions should the Committee be minded to refuse the application.
- I 116. There was a motion to defer the application which was proposed and seconded for the following reasons; that there was an element of change of circumstance on viability and the potential further exploration of landscape and design impacts.
- I 117. The Director of Planning suggested that if deferred a three month time limit would be imposed. This was incorporated into the motion under debate.
- I 118. The Committee voted on the motion for deferral and came to a split decision. In line with internal guidance the Chair requested that the Committee discuss the proposal further. The following points were made:-
- I 119. It was commented that whilst there was desire for the project to succeed there was a need for the applicant to recognise that this was a development in the countryside and in the setting of a listed building which needed to be of a high standard and respect the landscape and historical background. This was currently lacking.
- I 120. The Director of Planning advised the committee that there was a need to sub-divide the elements of viability; whether it was viable to carry out works and get a return and whether there was enough return to support the farm buildings being proposed as part of the application.
- I 121. The Committee voted again on the motion for deferral and came to a split decision. The Chair of the Committee exercised his casting vote and the motion to defer was lost.
- I 122. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation. The Committee came to a split decision and the Chair of the Committee exercised his casting vote. The Officer's recommendation was carried.
- I 123. **RESOLVED:** That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the 10 May 2018 Update Sheet.

ITEM 9: SDNP/17/05259/FTP - DIVERSION OF FOOTPATH - BLAKEHURST FARM AND MAGGOT FARM, BLAKEHURST LANE, WARNINGCAMP

- I 124. The Case Officer presented the application and referred the Committee to the 10 May 2018 Update Sheet.
- I 125. The public speakers declined the invitation to address the Committee further.
- I 126. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC27/18). Given the close link to the previous item there were no further clarifications or discussions required.
- I 127. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
- I 128. **RESOLVED:** That an order under Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the diversion of Public Footpath number 2218, as shown on the plan appended to report PC27/18 be not made for the following reasons:
1. Absence of a recommendation for approval for application SDNP/17/03171/FUL.
 2. Concerns in regard to the landscape impact of the diversion.
- I 129. David Ingram, the Head of Environmental Health at Winchester City Council joined the meeting for Agenda Item 10.
- I 130.

ITEM 10: SDNP/18/00939/CND - THE MATTERLEY ESTATE, ALRESFORD ROAD, OVINGTON, HAMPSHIRE

- I 131. The Case Officer presented the application, referred the Committee to the 10 May 2018 Update Sheet and verbally updated the Committee with regard to Condition 2. In 2017 the

number of ticket holders was 48,400, not the stated 48,000. If the Committee were minded to approve the application the officer recommendation is that a change to this condition to 48,400 ticket holders should be made.

I 132. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Martin Hendry spoke against the application representing Cheriton Parish Council.
- Simon Scott spoke against the application on behalf of David Pain.
- Peveril Bruce spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
- Chris Rutherford spoke in support of the application representing Boomtown Fair.
- Anna Wade spoke in support of the application representing Boomtown Fair.

I 133. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC28/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:

- The siting of the noise monitoring locations and the implications of the increase for bass level sound.
- Whether the areas that had not been resolved by Southern Water were relevant to this application.
- If the issue of major development and the consideration of alternative locations were relevant to the discussion.
- Whether there had been effective participation regarding the EIA and whether it was 'hidden' from the public view.
- Whether Section 73 was still relevant as the proposal was asking for various increases in operation.
- Clarification as to the application process when the current temporary application expires.
- Whether there would be a condition covering access to the ticketing system for auditing purposes.

I 134. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The Head of Environmental Health for Winchester City Council informed the Committee that the new licence had been approved earlier this year. The adjustment of noise levels through this application brought the planning regime in line with the licencing. Average noise levels were monitored over a period of time for 15 minutes at any time during the event. Bass noise levels would increase between 9pm-11pm on the Friday and Saturday evening. The current permission was for 65dbs, with a proposed increase of 3dbs, the noise increase would be marginal. The monitoring locations were located around the site and had been determined by Environmental Health and experience of previous events.
- There had been no further changes to previous report regarding Southern Water.
- The matter of the application being a major development has been dealt with in the report.
- The Authority had participated effectively in the screening and there had been no collusion in terms of hiding it from public view. The information was publically available on 3 May 2018. Interested parties had not been prejudiced, there had still been time for them to respond to the Authority.
- There were no fundamental changes to the original applications, only amendments to certain conditions, therefore Section 73 was still relevant.
- Access to the ticketing scheme for audit purposes had been requested. Ticket bands would be scanned on entry and on departing the site throughout the event. A twice daily reporting structure was in place, numbers would be made available both during and after the event.
- It was up to the applicant to decide whether to submit a new application in 2019.
- There would be sufficient data available from two Boomtown events in relation to the revised conditions should permission be granted in order to make a judgement on any

future application.

1135. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:

- The soft entry system for staggered entry to the site was positive. However people would still need to leave the site which could still cause an impact on the locality.
- Concern that the data to be used for any future applications would be affected by the increase in numbers and that there would not be a long enough period of time to test the revised conditions before a permanent permission was sought.
- The event was effective for engaging younger people with the purposes of the National Park.
- A Whole Estate Plan would provide the National Park with a clear overview of planned activities and support the estate's diversification from agricultural use.
- Enforcement and monitoring would provide vital information for future applications.
- There should be a report submitted following the Boomtown Festival in 2018 in relation to how well controlled the noise and attendance levels were managed.

1136. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation.

1137. **RESOLVED:**

1. That temporary planning approval be granted subject to a deed of variation to the Section 106 Agreement being completed to incorporate the application details and subject to the conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the report, the May 2018 Update Sheet and the number of ticket holders in condition 2 to increase to 48,400.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the Section 106 Agreement was not completed within 2 months of the 10 May 2018 Planning Committee meeting.

ITEM 11: SDNP/18/00994/FUL - THE MATTERLEY ESTATE, ALRESFORD ROAD, OVINGTON, HAMPSHIRE

1138. The Case Officer presented the application and referred the Committee to the May 2018 Update Sheet. There was also a verbal update on additional conditions in relation to highways and amended wording for Condition 2.

1139. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC29/18). With there being no requests for clarification the Committee moved into the debate and commented:

- General concern for the works that had already been carried out on this access without permission.
- There was a need for a Whole Estate Plan which would prevent the further erosion of the character of the estate and urbanisation of the landscape.
- The pragmatic approach to the widening of the access at this location was compounded by the road system which had evolved across the estate.
- The land owner needed to address the issue of pressures and further understand the context of the National Park in order to secure a permanent solution in the future.

1140. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation to include two further conditions and the removal of the wording 'shall not' in Condition 2.

1141. Condition 2 to be amended to:

2. Within one month of the decision notice, details of the temporary lighting at this access shall be submitted to the Authority for approval. The use of the access for the festival shall not take place unless the details of the lighting have been approved.
Reason: To prevent an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties by way of light pollution during the event.

1142. Additional Condition 3 to read:

3. The proposed hard surface/s shall either be made of porous materials or provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface/s to a permeable or porous surface within the site, details of which shall be submitted to the Local Planning

Authority for approval within one month of the decision notice. Development shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details within 2 months of the decision notice.

Reason: To ensure adequate provision for surface water drainage and avoid discharge of water onto the public highway.

1143. Additional Condition 4 to read:

4. The proposed surface/s shall not be made of migratory materials or provision shall be made to stop any migratory materials overflowing onto the local road network.

Reason: To avoid discharge of material on to the highway.

1144. **RESOLVED:** That Planning permission be granted for a temporary period expiring on 31 December 2019 subject to the conditions in section 10.1 of the officer report, the May 2018 Update Sheet, the amended wording of Condition 2 and the addition of two further conditions as follows as set out in minute numbers 1140, 1141 and 1142.

1145. The Head of Environmental Health for Winchester City Council left the meeting at 13:10.

1146. The Committee broke for lunch at 13:10 and reconvened at 14:00.

1147. Norman Dingemans joined the meeting at 14:00.

1148. There being no further declarations of interest the Committee moved to Agenda Item 12.

ITEM 12: SOLENT RECREATION MITIGATION STRATEGY

1149. Barbara Holyome declared a personal interest in the agenda item being a member of the RSPB for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

1150. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report.

1151. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC30/18) and requested clarification as follows:

- Whether the mitigation was in addition to CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy).
- If the funds would be allocated across the whole area of interest or in the vicinity of the development.
- Whether funding was coming from other bodies and parties.
- Who was funding the current Ranger team.

1152. In response, Officers clarified:

- The mitigation was in addition to CIL.
- Funds could be distributed in a number of ways across the scheme.
- The primary source of funding would be from developer contributions outside the National Park.
- There was an interim policy in place which had funded the current Rangers.

1153. The Committee further commented that the content of the strategy was to be commended, especially with regard to the attention given to the projects currently being carried out by the National Park.

1154. It was proposed to vote on the Officer recommendation.

1155. **RESOLVED:** The Committee endorsed the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership's 'Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy' (December 2017) for implementation with immediate effect.

ITEM 13: SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY (SDNPA) RESPONSE TO THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION ON THE STEDHAM WITH IPING NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1156. The Neighbourhood and Planning Policy Officer presented the report.
1157. Lucy Petrie, the Chair of Stedham Parish Council, was invited to address the Committee as a public speaker.
1158. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC31/18) and requested clarification as follows:
- Whether locally designated heritage assets were outlined in the Local Plan.
 - Clarification as to how heritage assets were locally designated.
 - Whether self-build could be encouraged for the Sawmills Site.
 - Whether allocating the West Lodge site was the appropriate way forward when a planning application could be submitted and considered under the Rural Exception Site policy.
 - Consistency with regard to wording relating to number of houses in the Local Plan Site Allocation policy.
 - Whether the reference to 60% evergreen planting could be amended as this would not reflect local character.
1159. In response, Officers clarified:
- Local planning authorities could prepare Local Lists for undesignated heritage assets using a range of different criteria detailing why they are special for that particular area. Parish Councils, through their Neighbourhood Plans, could designate Parish Heritage Assets.
 - The National Park held a self-build register which made clear where self-build was appropriate and was dependent on demand. The submitted Local Plan did not propose the Sawmill site for self-build.
 - Officers would check the consistency of wording regarding references to housing numbers across policies.
1160. The Committee commended the Stedham and Iping neighbourhood team on their swift compilation of the plan and encouraged them to consider the comments of the Officers and Committee when amending the plan.
1161. Members further commented as follows:
- That reference to CIL, as commented by the Officers, should be included in the plan; greater explanation of CIL and how communities could prioritise projects for funding would be useful.
 - Encouraged further discussion with the Parish Council, exploration of how the aspiration to improve the health and wellbeing of the community could be met in the plan as well as addressing some of the concerns of the National Park Authority.
 - That the inadvertent effect of the local gap detailed in SINDP2 could put pressure on the hamlet of Iping.
 - Reference to affordable housing in policy SINDP8 needed further clarification.
 - The group should consider whether it was appropriate to allocate the West Lodge site in the plan or whether it would be more appropriate to submit a planning application in relation to the Rural Exceptions Site policy.
 - That there were strong reasons not to allocate the West Lodge site given the suitability of the brown field Sawmill site, the effect on the historic character and parkland setting of the house, grounds and lodge houses.
 - It would be a positive step to see the status of the house and grounds of West Lodge recognised at a local level either within the NDP or on the Local List of Heritage Assets.
 - That action should be taken to address the earth bund that had been constructed on the West Lodge site.
1162. The Director of Planning confirmed that there would be more certainty of delivery of

affordable housing if the Exception Site approach was used. There was scope for further work with the group to look at the historical landscape and heritage of the house through the Local Plan process which would have greater weight than a Local Listing. He summarised the Committee's comments to be included in the SDNPA Pre-submission Response:

1. To address the concerns regarding the issue of evergreens species around policy SINDP2.
2. Review the consistency of reference to housing numbers.
3. Consider a local assessment on the character and historical parkland, specifically its conservation and enhancement.
4. To consider whether the West Lodge Site should be allocated.

1163. It was proposed to vote on the Officer recommendation.

1164. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the Table of Comments, subject to those issues referenced by Committee being addressed, as set out in the Appendix 2 of the report which formed the SDNPA representation to the Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-submission consultation.

ITEM 13: MAKING OF DITCHLING, STREAT AND WESTMESTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1165. The Planning Policy Manager presented the report and referred to the May 2018 Update Sheet.

1166. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC32/18) and commended the group on the plan. It was noted that the inspector had commended the group on the plan.

1167. It was proposed to vote on the Officer recommendation.

1168. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

1. Noted the outcome of the Ditchling, Streat and Westmeston referendum;
2. Agreed to make the Ditchling, Streat and Westmeston Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan for the parishes of Ditchling, Streat and Westmeston.

ITEM 14: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

1169. Thursday 14 June 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 14:45

