

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 FEBRUARY 2019**

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

Present: Neville Harrison (Chair), Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker, David Coldwell, Barbara Holyome, Doug Jones 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, Margaret Paren

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Katie Kam (Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee Officer), Sara Osman (Governance Officer) and Rob Ainslie (Development Manager).

Also attended by: Vicki Colwell (Major Planning Projects Officer), David Cranmer (Development Management Lead), Stella New (Senior Planner Development Management), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), Kevin Wright (Planning Policy Officer).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

331. The Chair informed those present that:

- South Downs National Park Authority (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.
- The Chair welcomed Sara Osman as the new Governance Officer for the SDNPA.

### **ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

332. Apologies were received from Roger Huxstep, Tom Jones, Robert Mocatta, and Anthony Watts Williams.

### **ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

333. The Chair declared a general non-prejudicial interest on behalf of all Committee Members in relation to agenda item 8, as Andrew Shaxson, who was speaking on this item, was a former SDNPA Member and Chair of Planning Committee, and was therefore known to all Members present.

334. Doug Jones declared a public service interest on agenda item 7 as a member of the Sustainable Communities Fund (SCF) and as he was acquainted with one of the speakers; and on agenda item 8 as he was acquainted with one of the speakers.

335. David Coldwell declared a public service interest on agenda items 9, 10 & 11 as he was a Member of Horsham District Council.

336. Alun Alesbury declared a public service interest in agenda item 7 as he was acquainted with a resident of the Leydene Park Estate.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17 JANUARY 2019**

337. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 January 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

338. There were none.

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

339. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS**

340. There were none.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/18/05145/FUL - THE SUSTAINABILITY CENTRE, MERCURY PARK, DROXFORD ROAD, EAST MEON. PETERSFIELD. HAMPSHIRE**

341. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
342. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Clive Elvin spoke against the application representing residents of Leydene Park Estate.
  - Clive Elvin spoke against the application on behalf of Grahame Purvis who was a resident of Leydene Park Estate.
  - Michael Knappett spoke against the application representing Mr Colin Hush.
  - Christine Seaward spoke in support of the application representing The Sustainability Centre.
  - Louise Arthur spoke in support of the application representing The Sustainability Centre.
  - Barry Lamacraft spoke in support of the application as the Chair of Trustees of the Sustainability Centre.
343. Following public representation Members were advised that the matters raised regarding a Section 106 agreement, which covered the Sustainability Centre site and the Leydene Park Estate, had been considered and that the planning obligations under this agreement had been discharged. The issues raised relate to land transfer agreement and therefore were a separate private legal matter and not material to the consideration of this application
344. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC05/19), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Confirm the location and size of the proposed balcony in relation to adjacent properties in Leydene Park Estate.
  - Whether it was anticipated that there would be an increase in visitors above the current level.
345. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The size of the proposed balcony and confirmed that the balcony was proposed to be on the side of the building farthest from the residential housing.
  - Although there would be some increase in overall floor space, it was not anticipated that this application would generate a significant increase in visitor numbers.
346. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- This application improved the existing building and contributed to the purposes and duty of the SDNPA
  - Although it was not felt that noise levels would significantly increase over current levels, as noise was one of the main concerns of local residents there may be design solutions to help reduce noise. It was possible the design and reconfiguration of the building already accomplished this, however, there was no evidence to confirm this.
  - Conditions 25 and 26 would be effective, however, there was concern these conditions could be overly restrictive and whether a design based solution would allow less restrictive hours of use.
  - As there was an increase and reconfiguration of the internal space this should allow a greater proportion of events to take place indoors, thereby reducing noise to neighbouring properties from those events.
  - Improvements could be made to the external landscaping including additional trees in the car parking area and ensuring that outdoor spaces related to the use of the building.
347. Members were advised that as this application was continuing the existing use of an existing premises, conditions 25 and 26 were considered appropriate in mitigating any potential impacts.
348. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
349. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in Section 10 of the officer's report.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/18/03926/FUL - SKY PARK FARM, DURFORD LANE, WEST HARTING, WEST SUSSEX**

350. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
351. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Andrew Shaxson spoke against the application as Chichester District Councillor for Harting ward and chairman of Harting Parish Council.
  - Mr Jan Henslow spoke against the application as a resident of Durleighmarsh Farm
  - Jamie Matthews spoke in support of the application as himself.
  - Neil March spoke in support of the application representing the Applicants.
  - Pierce Noonan spoke in support of the application as the Applicant.
352. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC06/19), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- It was noted that there was a typographical error regarding the Application number in the Officers recommendation.
  - Whether the route of the Non-Motorised User (NMU) path along the disused railway at the eastern end could be re-instated in the future. If not, where could existing Rights of Way (RoW) re-join the route?
  - Was the education room was for the general public to learn about deer and deer farming or for use by schools and other groups.
  - Further clarification on local traffic issues.
353. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The correct application number was SDNP/18/03926/FUL.
  - The SDNPA's aim was to reinstate as much of the disused railway route as possible, however, the route may need to move onto other RoWs where appropriate. Current RoWs on this site could reconnect with the disused railway route a short distance away at the western end of the site, linking it to Petersfield.
  - The education room would be multi-use for both educational visits and for visitors to the farm or as a meeting room. Condition 4 restricted its use to being ancillary to the operation of the site as an agricultural enterprise.
  - West Sussex Highways had no objection to the proposal, stating that they did not consider it would have a severe impact on the local highway network.
  - Policy SD21 of the Local Plan, which protected the biodiversity and amenity value of rural roads, recommended that an impact assessment was carried out if traffic was predicted to increase by more than 10%. Traffic predictions showed this threshold would be exceeded, hence an analysis was undertaken which concluded that in this case the increase would not have a detrimental effect on Durford Lane.
354. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- This proposal did not undermine policies SD20 and SD21 of the South Downs Local Plan, as it mitigated non-use of the disused railway line through the use of other existing routes which both linked to the wider RoW network and could re-join the route of the disused railway line in the future at an appropriate point.
  - The application was welcomed as a good example of well-designed farm diversification which would bring an increase to the economic development of the area.
355. The high fencing needed for deer farming was not unduly intrusive. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations.
356. **RESOLVED:**
- I. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at section 10.1 of this report and a legal agreement to secure £25,000 towards improvements to public right of way adjacent to the site and/or the upgrading of the disused Petersfield to Pulborough (via Midhurst) railway line for non-motorised users.

2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the legal agreement is not completed or sufficient progress made within 3 months of the Planning Committee meeting.

**ITEM 9: SDNP/18/04995/FUL - NORTH FARM LONDON ROAD (A24), WASHINGTON. WEST SUSSEX**

357. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
358. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Richard Goring spoke in support of the application as the Applicant.
  - Dale Mayhew spoke in support of the application representing the Applicant.
  - Gary Kelly spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
359. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC07/19), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was the approved Design Code mentioned in the conditions submitted for approval as part of this application or had it been approved through a separate process?
  - What approval was being sought for the holiday lets as part of this application?
360. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The Design Code was for approval as part of this application.
  - Outline permission for the holiday lets along with the main access to them was for approval as part of this application. The design, layout and access to individual units would form part of a future application.
361. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- This was considered to be a good example of a Whole Estate Plan (WEP) being adopted and followed up by a masterplan and design code which followed advice from the Design Review Panel.
  - It was an excellent example of a landscape led plan which was a big improvement on the present site, however, there may be opportunity for additional tree planting where appropriate given the large overall area of hard standing
  - Improvements to access from the A24 were welcomed.
  - The permissive path, which would be for Non-Motorised Users (NMU) including horse riders, was welcomed.
362. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations.
363. **RESOLVED:**
1. That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in Section 10 of this report and the update sheet, and subject to the completion of a S106 agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, with obligations relating to:
    - Delivery of the permissive path
    - Landscape Management Plan (including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)), and,
    - Phasing of the development and associated studies (including Travel Plan).
  2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse application SDNP/18/04995/FUL with appropriate reasons if the S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 3 months of the 14 February 2019 Planning Committee meeting.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/18/05278/FTP - BRIDLEWAY 2086 NORTH FARM LONDON ROAD (A24) WASHINGTON WEST SUSSEX**

364. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
365. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Richard Goring spoke in support of the application as the Applicant.
  - Dale Mayhew spoke in support of the application representing the Applicant.
366. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC08/19).
367. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations.

368. **RESOLVED:**

1. That an order under Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the diversion of Public Bridleway number 2086, as shown on the plan appended to this report, be made and the statutory 28-day consultation be undertaken;
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to confirm an unopposed order or to submit an opposed order to the Secretary of State for decision.

369. The Committee broke for lunch at 12.55pm.

370. The Committee reconvened at 1.30pm.

**ITEM 11: SDNP/18/05963/FUL - MARKET GARDENS CARAVAN SITE, CLAPPERS LANE, FULKING, HENFIELD. WEST SUSSEX**

371. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and provided a verbal update as follows:

- An email was received this morning from Horsham District Council in relation to the Small Dole Caravan site, which had been suggested as a suitable alternative site by objectors. This site was specifically developed to accommodate a displaced family group in 1980. At present the site was full and priority would be given to close family members in need of accommodation. There was an adjacent site occupied by another family however this was unauthorised.

372. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Miles Firth spoke against the application representing Fulking Parish Council
- Cllr John Wilkinson spoke against the application as a Mid-Sussex District Councillor
- Cllr Colin Trumble spoke against the application as a Mid-Sussex District Councillor.
- Georgina Hearne spoke in support of the application as the Applicant.

373. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC09/19), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Were the conditions restricted to the named persons and did the conditions cover what should happen should a named person no longer be an occupier on the site?

374. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Condition 5 could be amended to also state that the caravans should be removed should named parties leave the site.

375. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:

- Whilst there was minimal impact to the view from the South Downs Way on the top of the Downs, the proposed plans could negatively impact the view from the RoW approaching Fulking from the Downs.
- The importance of treating the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) and the settled community equally was acknowledged, as was the specific provisions in planning legislation for the GTTS communities.
- The proposed design was utilitarian and had not followed the SDNPA principles of a landscape led approach failing to take into account the local character of this area of the South Downs National Park (SDNP).
- Increasing the density of caravans on the existing site may be preferable to extending into the paddock.
- Concern was raised about the significant amount of hard standing proposed.
- In line with the view of the Planning Inspector on APP/Y9507/W/15/3005938 set out in paragraph 21 of appendix 2 to the officer's report, the cumulative effect of the increased number of GTTS plots would represent an overconcentration within the small village of Fulking.

376. It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application for the following reasons, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee:

1. Unacceptable impact on the open landscape of the SDNP and the nucleated settlement pattern of Fulking.
2. Poor landscape design.
3. The additional plots would represent an overconcentration of GTTS plots in the small village of Fulking.

377. The vote for refusal was carried.

378. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Committee:

1. Unacceptable impact on the open landscape of the SDNP and the nucleated settlement pattern of Fulking.
2. Poor landscape design.
3. The additional plots would represent an overconcentration of GTTS plots in the village of Fulking.

379. Norman Dingemans and Margaret Paren joined the meeting at 2:33pm

## **ITEM 12: QUARTERLY UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING**

380. The Planning Policy Officer presented the report.

381. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC10/19), and requested clarification as follows:

- Newhaven Neighbourhood Plan had been submitted recently but was not referred to in this update.
- It was noted that Arundel were revising their Neighbourhood Plan which was made in 2014. Was there a requirement for Neighbourhood plans to be reviewed after 5 years?
- Did the Government grant for Neighbourhood Plans cover all the costs of Neighbourhood Plans or were extra funds needed from the Authority?
- Following examination, had there been any modifications to the site allocations in the Local Plan for Findon and what was the current situation with their Neighbourhood Plan?
- Had there been any interest from Midhurst Town Council in making a Neighbourhood Plan?

382. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Newhaven submitted their Neighbourhood Plan after this report was written. It would be covered in the next report to committee.
- There was no specific requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to be reviewed. There was a requirement for the Local Plan for have a 5-year review and that could trigger a community to review their Neighbourhood Plan.
- The SDNPA received same amount of money for each Neighbourhood Plan it supported; some plans are concluded with a financial surplus from the grant and some with a deficit, depending on the size and complexity of the plan.
- The inspector did not make any main modifications to the sites for Findon in the Local Plan. The local Neighbourhood Planning group in Findon needed to decide how it wished to proceed with allocations in their Neighbourhood Plan.
- There had been no interest from Midhurst Town Council in making a Neighbourhood Plan and the allocations for Midhurst are now in the Local Plan.

383. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer recommendation.

384. **RESOLVED:** The Committee was recommended to note the progress to date on the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans across the National Park.

## **ITEM 13: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

385. Thursday 14 March 2019 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

## **CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 2:45pm

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_