

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE 13 SEPTEMBER 2018**

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

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker, David Coldwell, Neville Harrison, Barbara Holyome, Doug Jones, Tom Jones, Robert Mocatta and 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 and Margaret Paren.

Officers: Katie Kam (Solicitor), Robin Parr (Head of Governance), Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee Officer) and Tim Slaney (Director of Planning).

Also attended by: Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Stella New (Senior Planner), Mark Waller Gutierrez (Design Officer), David Boyson (Conservation Officer), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), Sarah Nelson (Strategic Planning Lead) and Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager).

**OPENING REMARKS**

82. 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**

83. Apologies were received from Roger Huxstep.

**ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

84. There were none.

**ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9 AUGUST 2018**

85. The minutes of the meeting held on 9 August 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING**

86. There were none.

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

87. There were none.

**ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS**

88. There were none.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/18/01289/FUL SOLDIERS FIELD STABLES, SOLDIERS FIELD LANE, FINDON, BN14 0SH**

89. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.

90. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Dominic Fagan spoke against the application as a resident of Findon.
- Peter Cleveland from Henry Adams Planning spoke in support of the application as the agent.
- Dawn Appleton spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

91. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC55/18), the update sheet, the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- How many known noise complaints had there been in the past?
- Did the southern area of the site adjoin or sit outside the settlement boundary?

- Should details of lighting on the site have been expected as part of the application?
  - Why was this site discounted during the Local Plan housing allocation process?
  - Confirmation of the area of this application covered by the extant planning permission.
  - Did the replacement house size conform to the maximum size for a rural workers dwelling?
  - Was an agricultural tie considered to be on one of the dwellings?
92. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- No details were available regarding previous noise complaints, however, Environmental Health had been consulted and raised no objection.
  - The whole of this application site was outside of the settlement boundary in both the submitted version of the SDNP Local Plan and the Arun Local Plan.
  - Details of lighting were not included, however, if the application was approved appropriate lighting could be secured through condition.
  - The site was considered to have potential, however the housing need was met through other sites. The cumulative impact of this site and the Soldiers Field House site was considered unacceptable.
  - The extant approval covered the southern area of the current application south of the holiday cottage and replacement dwelling.
  - The size of the proposed replacement agricultural workers dwelling was not considered to be an issue as it was comparable to the current extant approval.
  - An agricultural tie was on one of the dwellings.
93. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- There was a high class business on site currently whose future should be viewed favourably. Although a scheme with some housing could be acceptable the structures as presented in this application were unsatisfactory. Pushing the built form into the northern area of the site, into open fields, was unacceptable.
  - There were many unknowns with this application such as parking, lighting and the scale of engineering work required. The extant consent should not be given undue weight as the current application had additional impacts on the landscape.
  - It should not be ignored that this site did not pass the neighbourhood development plan assessment.
  - As the application was in a sensitive location information on lighting should have been provided. It was not acceptable to simply state that lighting would be kept to a minimum.
  - The site did need improvement in order to maintain its high standards.
  - Housing was important but it had to be constrained by the landscape impact. The purposes of the National Park were paramount.
  - The additional dwellings outside the settlement boundary were of concern and against policy guidelines.
  - It was good to see holiday accommodation included as part of the development, but the lack of affordable housing less so.
94. The Director of Planning commented that in this instance enabling development for heritage assets carried limited weight. Concerns around lighting were usually controlled by conditions. Although some modest weight could be given to emerging neighbourhood plans, made plans carried full weight.
95. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
96. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/18/03921/FUL and SDNP/18/03922/LIS BLAKEHURST FARM AND MAGGOTS FARM, BLAKEHURST LANE, WARNINGCAMP, ARUNDEL, WEST SUSSEX, BN18 9QG.**

97. The Case Officer presented the application.
98. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Lee Scott spoke in support of the application as the agent.
  - Alex Lock spoke in support of the application as the tenant farmer.
99. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC56/18), the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Where was the condition that secured the upgrading of the entire route of the footpath?
100. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Condition 13 covered the footpath works.
101. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Mr Lock's statement about the future of farming was very much appreciated.
  - This was an excellent demonstration of cooperation between officers and applicant to improve a scheme following feedback at committee.
  - The buildings on this site were worthy of being saved.
  - Given the mixing of farming and residential a management condition on the external areas should be considered clearly setting out ownership curtilages and residential, communal and farming areas. A management plan could aid clarity.
  - The committee should not be micromanaging matters which were the responsibility of the developer.
102. The Director of Planning suggested condition 9 would cover the landscaping and external areas.
103. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation for SDNP/18/03921/FUL.
104. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report.
105. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation for SDNP/18/03922/LIS.
106. **RESOLVED:** That listed building consent be granted subject to conditions as set out in paragraph 10.2 of the report.

**ITEM 9: SDNP/18/03954/FTP FOOTPATH 2218, BLAKEHURST FARM, BLAKEHURST LANE, WARNINGCAMP, ARUNDEL, WEST SUSSEX, BN18 9QG.**

107. The Case Officer presented the application.
108. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC57/18), and requested clarification as follows:
- Should the Authority be encouraging landowners to upgrade footpaths to bridleways?
109. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Upgrade of footpaths could have additional consequences and this would need to be part of a wider debate on the Authority's stance on this.
110. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
111. **RESOLVED:** That an order under Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the diversion of the Public Footpath number 2218, as shown on the plan appended to the report, be made.
112. Margaret Paren and Norman Dingemans joined the meeting at 11:20.

**ITEM 10: DEVELOPMENT BRIEF – LAND AT PULENS LANE, SHEET**

113. The Design Officer presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet.
114. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC58/18) and requested clarification as follows:
- Regarding movement and connectivity, were developers expected to connect one end of the development with a bridge? Should there be comments about connectivity to the road network and the A272. It would also be helpful to show how development sites connected to local facilities such as schools, health centres and leisure centres with the aim of encouraging non-motorised travel.
  - On page 16, section 6d had duplicated information regarding trees, was that deliberate? Suggest the wording that referred to scale rather than size would be preferable.
  - Were there any comments on affordable housing in the development brief? If not, should there be?
  - Page 18, figure 12 showed an assumption that affordable housing would be flats, was that correct?
115. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- An applicant would be expected to review the opportunities, practical issues and to work with other organisations such as the highways authority. Page 31 discussed the opportunities available.
  - Including the statement on significantly sized trees was to ensure layouts showed trees to a scale of what would ideally be seen on a street.
  - Page 44 explained that a mix of market and affordable dwellings would be expected and this would need to accord with Local Plan. Following approval of the Local Plan the general guidance would set out that any development needed to meet all affordable housing policies.
  - Figure 12 was for illustrative purposes, it was indicative and not site specific, however, the illustration would be revised to not show affordable housing as flats only.
116. The Committee discussed the design brief, making the following comments:
- A design brief would be the ideal place to express the Authority's aspiration for connectivity on a particular site.
  - Unsatisfactory wording related to design in previous versions had largely been addressed, however, the wording on page 19 should be more subtle when mentioning traditional or contemporary approaches as this language was open to interpretation. Wording to the effect of "a style based on vernacular tradition or a contemporary approach" would be more appropriate wording for a National Park. Also, the photo on page 39, lower left, was not appropriate.
  - The reduction in the number of units to protect biodiversity was excellent. It would be useful to have a map on page 43 showing where the SINC and further opportunities for conservation were.
117. The Director of Planning summarised the changes to be made to the document as follows:
- Page 16, duplication of language relating to size and scale of trees.
  - Page 18, the illustration would be amended.
  - Page 19, section 7b, the wording would be amended.
  - Page 39, the image in the lower left would be changed.
  - Page 43, a map showing designations would be included.
118. **RESOLVED:** To approve the use of the Development Brief for land at Pulens Lane, Sheet, for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications subject to the amendments agreed by committee, the final form of wording which will be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee.

**ITEM 11: DEVELOPMENT BRIEF – HOLMBUSH CARAVAN PARK, MIDHURST**

119. The Design Officer presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet.
120. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC59/18) and requested clarification as follows:
- Had the lake been considered for leisure or other uses?
  - As landscape management was of significant importance on sites such as this could design briefs flag up the need for a management plan?
121. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Potential use of the lake for recreation had not been explored. Its value in relation to biodiversity, landscape and passive recreation was clear. Other uses including use of the water could be explored as part of any planning application.
  - Management plans were covered on page 22.
122. The Committee discussed the design brief, making the following comments:
- The same matters related to language and wording on pages 16 and 19 needed to be addressed. The photo on page 41, middle top, needed to be changed. Also on page 41 the approach should not specify an innovative contemporary approach, but rather should talk about high quality homes that respond to the landscape. On page 46, paragraph 42, reference to contemporary design should be removed, the focus should be on high quality design. Wording that included innovation may be acceptable, but a specific style should not be prescribed.
  - Reference to affordable housing should be included as with the previous design brief. A comment that affordable housing would be expected should also be included.
123. The Director of Planning summarised the changes to be made to the document as follows:
- A statement on the expectation of affordable housing would be included in the general comments.
  - Reference to the potential for access to and use of the water to be explored.
  - Page 16, duplication of language relating to size and scale of trees.
  - Page 18, the illustration would be amended.
  - Page 19, section 7b, the wording would be amended.
  - Page 41, the image in the middle top would be changed and the wording amended.
  - Page 46, wording referring to a contemporary approach would be amended.
124. **RESOLVED:** To approve the use of the Development Brief for Holmbush Caravan Site, Midhurst, for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of the planning applications subject to the amendments agreed by committee, the final form of wording which will be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee.

**ITEM 12: CLAYTON CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN (CAAMP)**

125. The Conservation Officer presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet.
126. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC60/18) and discussed the design brief, making the following comments:
- The wall paintings were excellent examples.
  - In reference to action 6, the road was naturally traffic calmed and engineering work should not be done to it.
  - Action 6 should be amended with the aim of ensuring that any works done to the road accord the SDNPA documents “Roads in the South Downs: Enhancing the safety and quality of roads and places in the National Park”.

- Ditchling Parish Council were in the process of undertaking a traffic survey as Underhill Lane was known to be misused by traffic. Quiet Lane Status was being pursued.
- The CAAMP should be realistic in its expectations and the actions were appropriate.
- It was unfortunate the railway tunnel was separated from the village by the road, it would have been good to include in the CAAMP.

127. **RESOLVED:** To adopt the Clayton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, attached as appendix I to the report, for the purposes of development management and to inform the activities of the National Park Authority and its partners subject to amendments to Action 6 as agreed by committee.

### **ITEM 13: INFRASTRUCTURE BUSINESS PLAN – PROCESS FOR ALLOCATING THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

128. The Major Projects Lead presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet.

129. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC61/18) and requested clarification as follows:

- How was the committee to agree whether to allocate to large or small projects and who would take the final decision?
- Should the Partnership Management Plan be included under the basic eligibility tests in paragraph 4.2?
- Should projects that were not deliverable be discounted at the outset? Should deliverability be a first test outside of the matrix?
- Was there any consideration of the geographic distribution of monies and whether there would be a limit on how much an area or county could receive?
- Areas that were taking development and hence providing a large CIL contribution may be concerned that the relationship wasn't stronger and wonder why money was being directed elsewhere.

130. In response to questions, officers clarified:

- The focus for selection should be on the categorisation regardless of the projects being large or small. Planning Committee would make the decision on officer's recommendation. Officers would put forward a report including a recommended sum which did not have to be the full amount applied for, any difference would fall back on the requesting body to meet.
- PMP was included in the prioritisation matrix but could not be included under the basic eligibility tests due to the CIL Regulations.
- Deliverability was part of the scoring matrix, however, consideration could be given to how ready to go projects were as there was a degree of judgement in the process.
- If an area had not taken any growth then it would be difficult to allocate CIL, there would always be a degree of geographic bias as CIL is to be used to support growth. County Councils would be allocated the 60% to spend on their projects which were deemed to be critical / essential. The remaining 40% would be distributed by the Authority.

131. The Director of Planning suggested that while the CIL charging schedule was approved by an inspector, the structure and scoring wasn't necessarily approved but it was considered prudent not to alter it as it formed the foundation of a solid CIL schedule. However, if deliverability was considered of particular importance then weightings could be altered to a certain degree.

132. **RESOLVED:** To approve the process for the creation of the Infrastructure Business Plan (the process for allocation the Community Infrastructure Levy) subject to comments by committee.

**ITEM 14: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED FROM 31 MAY TO 28 AUGUST 2018**

133. The Strategic Planning Lead presented an overview to the Committee and referred to the update sheet.
134. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC62/18) and requested clarification as follows:
- Was it thought that the Authority and inspectors were enforcing higher standards of design in the National Park as opposed to elsewhere?
  - If a partner organisation left the Authority liable for costs was that covered in the SLA and was there any mechanism for recovering that money? What was happening to improve the performance of partner organisations?
135. In response to questions, officers clarified:
- Decisions outside the park were not monitored so a comparison of design standards as not possible. However, it was encouraging that a significant amount of decisions included character and design comments.
  - There was a mechanism whereby if a pattern of cost liabilities emerged then finances could be discussed. Quarterly meetings with host authorities with the aim of improving performance were held and any unacceptable practices were raised at these meetings. Tighter controls on delegation were also being considered in one Authority
136. **RESOLVED:** To note the outcome of appeal decisions.

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

137. Thursday 11 October 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

**CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 13:25.

