

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 9 AUGUST 2018

Held at: The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:01am.

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker, David Coldwell, Neville Harrison, 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: Katie Kam (Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee Officer), Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Gill Welsman (Committee Officer)

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Victoria Corrigan (Senior Planner), Mark Gutierrez Waller (Design Officer), David Boyson (Conservation Officer), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead)

OPENING REMARKS

44. The Chair informed those present that:

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

45. Apologies were received from Robert Mocatta and Anthony Watts Williams.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

46. David Coldwell declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 8 as the site was in his ward.

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

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

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING

48. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

49. There were none.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

50. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/18/01777/FUL LAND SOUTH OF THE SEVEN STARS, RAMSDEAN ROAD, STROUD, PETERSFIELD, HAMPSHIRE

51. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the August 2018 Update Sheet.

52. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- David McKinney spoke in support of the application on behalf of Stroud Parish Council.
- Craige Burden spoke in support of the application on behalf of Cala Homes.

53. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC51/18), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- On the ownership of the stream on the northern boundary of the site.

- Whether the treatment of the water course was covered within the management proposals.
- That the revised NPPF was the document referred to in the Officers report.
- Whether the affordable houses were to be rendered and have a mix of roof tiles and whether the concrete roof tiles would be mixed across the site.
- Whether any further representations from Highways were expected in relation to the accommodation of further parking spaces for the Village Hall.
- If it would be possible to relocate the Village Hall, by a few metres to accommodate further parking if desired, after the Committee had made a decision.
- Whether there was ecological value in the land owned by the pub and what the likelihood was of connections being made with that land.
- Confirmation of the road that would be managed by Highways.
- How control of charges would be managed for the affordable houses and whether this could be included as an informative.
- What the local need was for the development and whether a viability test had been undertaken.

54. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- All reports and decisions made both under delegated and via Committee were compliant with the revised NPPF.
- The sections of the water course which were within the applicant's ownership would be maintained under Condition 6. It had been difficult to confirm ownership for those areas not under the applicant's ownership.
- The pub had been approached in relation to the area to the north of the site currently managed for ecology marked on the submitted crossing point drawing but they were not able to confirm whether it was of ecological value. The area had been flagged by the applicants given the highlighted ecological importance.
- The affordable housing would have a mixture of materials.
- Highways had not objected to the scheme and there was sufficient parking for both the dwellings and Village Hall. Based on the size of the hall, only 13.5 spaces would be required in accordance with the East Hampshire adopted parking standards, not 20. 13 spaces have been proposed for the village hall.
- A balance had been achieved within the application between landscaping and parking. Highways safety issues had been covered.
- Management of the access roads would be the responsibility of the management company, the first section of road would be under highways control.
- Management charges for the affordable housing would be under the control of the Housing Authority. It would be possible to add an informative relating to management costs.
- A viability test had been undertaken, which would be supported by the new NPPF especially in relation to allocated sites.
- The local needs survey demonstrated a need for seven affordable dwellings within the Parish of Stroud, the cascade mechanism would ensure that it would then benefit those in adjoining parishes. It was likely that all affordable housing would be taken up by those within a 5-10 mile radius.

55. The Director of Planning advised the committee of some reviews within the new NPPF specifically areas relating to; designated landscapes having the highest level of protection, revised definitions for major developments and the support for both conserving and enhancing environments.

56. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The proposal had been significantly improved since last considered.
 - It was pleasing to see that the design was landscape led and met the high standards of development within the National Park.
 - The management plan was key in terms of how landscaping and car parking were managed.
 - Suggestion to amend the wording of condition 6 in reference to commencement of development above slab level.
 - The management of SuDS and hard landscaping could be further tightened.
 - Concern regarding the proposed link to the pub garden and the area of ecological value and the suggestion that an informative be added to protect the ecological area.
 - The design was not over intensive, given the usual density of traditional villages.
 - That whilst the proposal was acceptable without relocating the Village Hall to accommodate further parking, relocating the Hall by a few metres would have a beneficial impact to residents and those attending events at the hall in the future.
 - There were considerable concerns regarding parking in the future, a lack of parking would encourage use of open spaces and grass verges. Management arrangements for future parking issues should be addressed by the developer in liaison with the community at this stage in the process.
 - It was good to see the positive co-operation between the developers and local residents.
 - That a mixture of materials should be used for dwellings across the site.
 - An informative was required to flag the concern of management charges for the affordable housing.
57. The Director of Planning suggested the inclusion of an extra condition relating to the management of parking, and amendment to remove reference to 'slab level' in Condition 6 and two informatives on the management of affordable housing and that best endeavours be used to complete the footpath to the pub. The final wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in conjunction with the Chair of the Planning Committee. He further advised the Committee that any discussions relating to extra parking for the village hall could take place between the developer and the Director of Planning in conjunction with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
58. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
59. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be approved subject to:
- 1) The completion of a legal agreement to secure:
 - 12no. affordable dwellings on site (40%);
 - A contribution of £4,000 towards provision of a footbridge and pathway on land to the north of the application site delivering a link between the residential development and the public house
 - Completion and transfer of village hall and curtilage (including land up to northern boundary of the site) to the Parish Council
 - 2) The conditions as set out in Paragraph 10.1 of this report, the amendment of Condition 6 to remove reference to 'slab level' and rather it be 'prior to commencement of development', an extra condition for management of parking, the addition of two informatives; i) management for affordable housing and ii) best endeavours for completion of the link to the pub and the August 2018 Update Sheet. The final form of wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in conjunction with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
 - 3) And that authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 3 months of the 9 August 2018 Planning Committee meeting.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/17/02771/FUL FORMER ANNINGTON MERE COTTAGES,
ANNINGTON ROAD, BRAMBER, WEST SUSSEX**

60. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet, highlighting the changes to conditions and recommendation.
61. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Michael Trentham spoke in support of the application as the agent.
 - George Macari spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
62. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC52/18), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Whether the possibility of use of the stabling by horse riders completing the South Downs Way had been explored.
 - Whether there was a management plan in place for the bunkhouse.
 - The number of bedrooms the previously approved application would have provided.
 - Whether tying the stable block to the five bedroom house was a viable business proposition.
 - Whether there was already an intended owner/occupier for the tied dwelling.
 - If the development was subject to CIL and how it compared to the contribution to affordable housing being proposed.
 - Who would have responsibility for the management of the area along the road.
 - The location of the waste from the stables.
 - Whether there were adequate storage facilities for refuse bins given the number of dwellings.
 - The location of parking for those using the accommodation that were not walking/riding the South Downs Way.
63. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- There had been no specific exploration with regard to offering stabling for users of the South Downs Way. Condition 8 restricted the use of the stables to the residents of House A and not for commercial purposes. Should the condition be breached it would be enforceable.
 - The extant application was for a 6 bedroom dwelling, the new application would offer a total of 12 bedrooms.
 - The development would be liable for CIL given the floor space, calculation for the levy would take place if permission was granted, but would be more than the contribution to affordable housing.
 - The red line of the development abutted the road and would be in control of the owner.
 - The equestrian waste area was to the west of the tables.
 - The design for refuse storage was based on the standard refuse requirement for the local area, this could be addressed through the landscaping condition.
 - Parking was adjacent to the accommodation.
64. Their concerns regarding:
- That given the location of the development careful consideration should be given to external finishes and windows.
 - This was a much improved proposal.
 - There were concerns with the viability and marketing for the business being tied to the dwelling.
 - Unease about permitting a permanent commercial building without a business plan being submitted before footings were in place.
 - This was increasing the size of what was a small settlement.

- Concern that Condition 8 ruled out the option for equestrian accommodation. The condition should be reworded to ensure horses could be accommodated.
 - There was concern that the accommodation would not be viable in perpetuity.
 - This felt like over development given the increase in footprint of the development when taking into account the need for ancillary hardstanding, the further sub division of the site and increase in number of bedrooms being proposed in multiple dwellings.
 - This was an opportunity to provide bunk house accommodation for those using the South Downs Way, could be a unique offer for equestrian users.
 - The previous application had proved unviable, this proposal could also prove unviable due to tying the house to the accommodation.
 - There was a risk that the bunkhouse accommodation could be converted to housing or use for other purposes should it prove unviable.
 - This was a balanced decision, accommodation and provision of affordable housing were they key factors.
65. It was proposed to refuse the application on the grounds of overdevelopment, due to the number of bedrooms being provided and the size of the footprint of the development when considering both the dwellings and ancillary hardstanding.
66. The motion to refuse was not carried.
67. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation with the following amendments.
1. The amendment of condition 8, to ensure that the use for overnight stabling of horses was for tourists using the bunk house accommodation.
 2. The strengthening of the S106 agreement to secure the tourist accommodation, with reference to a contract being in place to build out the tourist accommodation and the inclusion of the bunk house being included in the Management Scheme for the tied dwelling.
68. **RESOLVED:**
- 1) That planning permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in Section 10 of this report, the August 2018 Update Sheet and subject to the completion of a S106 agreement with obligations relating to:
 - A contribution of £9,920 towards off site affordable housing.
 - Submission of a management scheme for the tourism accommodation.
 - Restriction of tourism accommodation to ensure not to be used for general C3 residential dwelling house.
 - Tie the tourist accommodation with the dwelling known as House A on the submitted application plans.
 - Reference to a contract being in place to build out the tourist accommodation, further supported by the Management Plan for the dwelling tied to the bunk house.
 - Securing of translocation receptor area as part of reptile mitigation strategy.
 - 2) That Condition 8, be amended to enable overnight stabling of horses for riders staying in the bunkhouse accommodation.
 - 3) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application, with appropriate reasons if the S106 agreement is not completed or sufficient progress had not been made within 3 months of the 9 August 2018 Planning Committee meeting.
69. Margaret Paren and Norman Dingemans joined the meeting at 12:20.
70. Norman Dingemans declared a public service interest in agenda item 9 as Slindon was in his ward.

ITEM 9: SLINDON CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN (CAAMP)

71. The Conservation Officer presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet.
72. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Barbara Brimblecome spoke on behalf of Slindon Parish Council.
73. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC53/18), comments from the public speakers and:
- Congratulated all those involved in the plan, it was a good, encouraging document.
 - Welcomed the role played by the Parish Council in the development of the plan, this was a good model that should be considered by other parishes in the future.
 - That there would be merit in combining CAAMP's and NDP's in the progressing Local List.
 - Whether the archaeological advice had been delegated to Hampshire County Council as referenced on page 144.
 - The photographic example of the diversity of flint work in West Sussex was a welcome addition to the report.
74. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- The archaeological advice had been delegated to Hampshire County Council.
75. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
- 1) Approved the proposed extensions to the boundary of Slindon Conservation Area, as shown in pink on Figure 32 (pages 70 – 71 of the CAAMP) and set out in paragraph 1.4 of this report.
 - 2) Adopted the Slindon Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan for the purposes of Development Management and to inform the other activities of the South Downs National Park Authority and its partners.

ITEM 10: SDNPA RESPONSE TO THE PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) CONSULTATION ON THE UPDATED FINDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

76. The Communities Lead Officer presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet.
77. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- David Hutchison spoke against the report and its recommendations on behalf of Findon Parish Council.
 - Robin Reay spoke in support of the plan on behalf of Seward Properties.
78. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC54/18), the comments of the public speakers and:
- Requested confirmation that Officers were not recommending that the Updated Findon Neighbourhood Development does not proceed to the next stage.
 - Confirmation that the sites being proposed were still likely to be available, specifically SD72 and HD13.
 - Commented that the risks had been indicated and were being passed to the NDP Group.
 - Whether there had been any similar situations with regard to allocation of sites in a Local Plan and Neighbourhood Development Plan.
79. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Site SD72 was still available and deliverable.
 - That the SDNP response did not recommend that the FNDP did not progress.

- There had been a case where a site allocation which was being considered in a Local Plan had been rejected by the NDP. In this case the inspector allocated the Local Plan site as well as the other sites within the NDP.

80. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the Table of Comments as set out in Appendix 3 of the report which formed the SDNPA representation to the updated Findon Neighbourhood Development (FNDP) Plan pre-submission consultation.

ITEM 11: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

81. Thursday 13 September 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

CHAIR

The meeting closed at 13:00.

