

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 MARCH 2020

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

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Barbara Holyome, William Meyer, Vanessa Rowlands and Diana van der Klugt,

Ex Officio Members for Planning Policy items only (may participate on Policy Items but not vote, no participation on Development Management Items): Margaret Paren and Ian Phillips.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), David Easton (Development Management Lead), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Rafa Grosso-Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Hannah Collier (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Becky Moutrey (Solicitor), Robin Parr (Head of Governance), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer) and Sara Osman (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer), Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Specialist Lead) and Michael Scammell (Conservation Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

357. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that:

1. 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 delegates representing the interests of their appointing authority or any other interest groups.
2. 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

358. Apologies were received from Pat Beresford, Thérèse Evans, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

359. The Chair disclosed a non-prejudicial interest on item 7, as he had previously acted on behalf of Comer homes in a professional capacity.

360. Heather Baker disclosed a non-prejudicial interest on item 7 as she was acquainted with one of the speakers from a previous role as a District Councillor for Fernhurst.

361. William Meyer disclosed a non-prejudicial interest on item 8 as a Member of the Lewes Liberal Democrats. Whilst Party members had raised an objection to this application, William Meyer had not taken part in any discussions with them on this application.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 FEBRUARY 2020

362. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 February 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

363. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

364. There were none.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

365. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/19/00913/FUL - FORMER SYNGENTA SITE, HENLEY OLD ROAD, FERNHURST, WEST SUSSEX. GU27 3JE.

366. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave two further verbal updates, as follows:

- There was an amendment to the comments from the Local Highways Authority on item 4.5. The 6th bullet point should read: “It is agreed that the overall vehicular trip rate of 214 daily movements at peak times would be expected”.
- A further letter of objection had been received from a local resident. The main points included that they believed the scheme directly conflicted with the aims and principles of the National Park, and that there would be a disruptive impact on all areas of local life.

367. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- John Buchanan spoke against the application representing Fernhurst Parish Council.
- Neil Rowley spoke in support of the application representing Comer Homes.
- Alan Beaumont spoke in support of the application representing Comer Homes.
- Gavin Wheatley spoke in support of the application representing Comer Homes.

368. Jamie Brown from the West Sussex Highway Authority joined the meeting.

369. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-46), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- What methods were used to obtain the overall vehicular trip rate, and were vehicular movements outside peak times measured?
- Why could only 20% affordable housing be achieved on this site?
- Would the affordable units being offered as ‘social rented’ tenure be retained in perpetuity?
- Clarification on the housing mix, and confirmation that the 2 and 3 bedroom houses with a study did not equate to a further bedroom, increasing the actual number of 4 bedroom houses.
- Clarity on the carbon emission reductions to be achieved from the scheme.
- Why gas was chosen as the main source of heating for the dwellings, and what alternative sources of heating had been explored? Additionally, what form of future-proofing had been put in place to enable alternative heat sources to be used in the future?
- What enhancements would this scheme bring to the Cooksbridge Meadow Nature Reserve?
- Had the enhancements to compensate for loss of bat habitat been included in the details of the scheme?
- Would the footpath connecting to the village be wide enough for wheelchair users?

370. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Jamie Brown from the Local Highways Authority responded that it was expected that there would be 100 vehicle movements between 8-9am and 114 between 5-6pm. It was considered standard practice for traffic studies to focus on peak times when you would expect the highest volume of traffic.
- Whilst both the South Downs Local Plan and the Fernhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan set out a requirement for 50% affordable housing, this site was subject to a viability assessment and other national planning policy requirements. As it was a brown field site, ‘Vacant Building Credit’ could be applied. This would reduce the requirement for affordable housing where a development was proposed on previously developed land that included vacant buildings. The Highfield building on this site can be used to offset against affordable housing, leading to 20% being offered rather than 50%. Officers confirmed that the offer of 20% is policy compliant.
- Officers agreed to explore whether the ‘social rented’ tenure could be retained in perpetuity.
- The floor plans clearly showed that the 2 and 3 bedroom houses had a separate study space which was not an extra bedroom.

- The overall scheme would reduce regulated CO₂ emissions to net zero relative to Building Regulations, 19% of which would be reductions via the built fabric of the dwellings and further 81% through the use of PV panels and the proposed wood burning stoves.
- The residential dwellings would be heated using both natural gas and 'Ecodesign Ready' wood stoves which were approved by Defra as low-emission wood burning stoves and which would meet proposed new EU standards. The applicants had explored alternative forms of heating to gas. They had agreed to explore air source heat pumps for the commercial units, however they proved to be undeliverable for the residential dwellings. The proposed infrastructure had been future-proofed to enable alternative sources of fuel, such as hydrogen fuels, which may replace natural gas in the future. The scheme was deemed policy compliant by Officers.
- The applicant was in discussions with the local Wildlife Trust to secure benefits to the Cooksbridge Meadow Nature Reserve through the S106 legal agreement. This would include enhanced planting on the boundary and improvements to the Right of Way, alongside information on the reserve for new residents.
- The enhancements to compensate for loss of bat habitat had been included in the details of the scheme and no further comments had been received from the Sussex Wildlife Trust.
- The footpath connecting the site to the village would be 1.5m wide.

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

- The scheme was commended on its environmental considerations specifically on the following points: that the development would achieve BREEAM New Construction Design 'Excellent'; that there would be a 32% net gain for biodiversity; that there would be a reduction of regulated CO₂ emissions to net zero relative to Building Regulations; that the scheme included passive house (Passivhaus) standards; and the promotion of sustainable travel initiatives such as car sharing club and on-site minibus service to local amenities.
- There were some concerns that the courtesy bus may need to run earlier in the day and later in the evening to capture commuter hours and school drop off, if it was to be a viable alternative to individual car use.
- Despite reservations that the number of affordable housing units was only 20%, Members were pleased that 74% (32) of the affordable units were being offered as 'social rented' tenure.
- The design was felt to be slightly overbearing and urban for a rural setting. However Members understood that the starting point for design was in context to the landscape woodland setting and pagoda building, and that modern design can work successfully provided care is taken to detail and end results related to character of the area.
- The inclusion of accessible and adaptable dwellings was commended.

372. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.

373. **RESOLVED:**

- I. That planning permission be approved subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of the Officers report and subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning with obligations relating to:
 - The provision of 32 social rented affordable units and 11 shared ownership affordable units;
 - The provision of a footway from the site to Fernhurst Village and other highway improvement works immediately outside of the site;
 - The provision of a Travel Plan and sustainable transport measures (including on-site minibus service, car parking management scheme and a car sharing club);
 - The provision of a Community Liaison Group and Estate Management Company;
 - The provision of Estate Management Plans (to include the maintenance and management of the landscaped areas, ecological measures, drainage, and SuDs, open spaces, lighting, estate roads and footways);

- The provision of off-site ecological and other mitigation works to Cooksbridge Meadow Nature Reserve, and
 - The provision of employment and skills training.
2. That the Committee confirm in their decision they have taken into account:
 - the environmental information as required by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;
 - all matters referred to in the Director of Planning's report including comments received from statutory consultees and other interested parties, and
 - all other material considerations, and
 3. 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 has not been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 12 March 2020

374. Jamie Brown left the meeting.

ITEM 8: SDNP/18/05444/FUL - GARDEN STREET AUCTION ROOMS, GARDEN STREET, LEWES. BN7 1TJ.

375. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave the following two verbal updates:

- The proposal description incorporated a housing mix which was out of date. The table on page 74 of the committee papers detailed the correct housing mix, which was: ten residential units comprising four no. two-bed split-level apartments, two no. three-bedroom houses and four no. four-bedroom houses.
- Two further letters of representation had been received, both raising objections relating to the conservation area and the absence of affordable housing provision.

376. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Elizabeth Thomas spoke against the application representing Friends of South Downs Society.
- Jennifer Chibnall spoke against the application representing herself.
- David Stechler spoke against the application representing himself.
- Liam Russell spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.

377. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-47), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Clarification on the changes to the housing mix and which of the dwellings on the floorplans were 3 bed and which were 4 bed properties, as it was not clear on the plans whether they included an extra bedroom or a study.
- Why there was no provision of affordable housing, which was in conflict with both the South Downs Local Plan and the Lewes Neighbourhood Development Plan (LNDP). The LNDP has specifically identified affordable housing for young people as a need for Lewes. Had an analysis of a different, more conservative design been undertaken to ensure that affordable housing could be viable with a different application?
- Did the site include a strip of land which was not owned by the developer?
- Would this development affect the views across to the downs from the junction of Garden Street with Southover Road in the northwest corner of the site?
- Further clarification from the SDNPA Conservation Officer on their reasons for submitting no objection to this proposal that is within the conservation area of Lewes.
- Did the application sufficiently preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lewes Conservation area, as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, or the adopted 2013 Lewes Area Conservation Management Plan?
- As a corner site, adjacent to 2 roads, clarification that the developers had taken the advice of the Design Review Panel in conducting a study of other corner developments in Lewes, as there were many good examples of buildings on steep-sided, corner sites.

378. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The officer clarified the housing mix on the floorplans. There were fewer 3 bed properties than originally proposed as two of the dwellings included a bedroom which failed to meet the minimum size standards for bedrooms. They were reclassified as 2 bed properties with a study included.
- This application had been in progress before the adoption of the SDNPA Local Plan and therefore at the time the weight to be attributed to disputed policies was far less. Despite this, and given that the application now fell to be determined against current adopted Plans, an independently assessed viability appraisal had demonstrated that the proposed development with the provision of affordable housing would not be viable. The developer had undertaken analysis of various options and was of the view that, due to the constraints of the site, affordable housing would still not be viable with a more conservative design.
- It was the Officers understanding that any land inside the red line shown on the Site Location Plan (see appendix I of the Officer's report) was owned by the applicant. They had not been made aware that there was any land not in the developer's ownership but would consider any evidence that came forward.
- The views from the junction of Garden Street with Southover Road may be impacted but the Downs would still be visible through gaps across the site. Due to the nature of the site, which drops steeply at the North West corner, it was considered difficult to develop the site without impacting the views.
- The Conservation Officer explained that, whilst the site is within the Saxon core of the conservation area, it is constrained as a housing site due to its levels and surroundings. On the North West side it had a steep bank up to Garden Street and Southover Road, and the North East side was bordered by the railway line. It was felt that the proposed design, whilst modern, put forward an ingenious and coherent response to a difficult site. It was also in line with other recent, more modern architectural developments in the area.
- Officers felt that the policy issues for building in a conservation area were correctly laid out. Members were reminded that the law required that special attention be paid to the desirability to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a Conservation area. It was a matter of judgement for the Committee to decide, having regard to the wording of the legislation.
- The developers had followed advice following the 2018 meeting with the Design Review Panel, as detailed on item 2.5 of the Officers report, and conducted an analysis which had been incorporated into the application before the Committee.

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

- Members were not against the principle of development on this site and acknowledged the constraints of the site. It was recognised that this was an interesting development and that a lot of work had gone into the application. They also praised the use of renewable energy in the application.
- However it was agreed that, while the Committee was not against the principle of contemporary design in appropriate circumstances within Conservation Areas, the application here was not suited to this site, and did not take sufficient note of the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Lewes Conservation Area, as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, or the Lewes Conservation Area Management Plan. Any application for this site should reflect and respect the design characteristics and local materials of the Lewes Conservation Area.
- There was specific design concerns over the dominance and incongruity of the buildings and amount of glazing used for residential dwellings.
- Concerns were raised about the restriction of views to the Downs which was contrary to policy SD6 of the South Downs Local Plan on safeguarding views.
- The design for this application could not be supported because it precluded the provision of affordable housing which went against the South Downs Local Plan policies. The Lewes NDP specifically identifies affordable housing for young people as a need for Lewes and this site was considered a suitable site for affordable housing being located near the station and walking distance to the town centre.

380. It was proposed and agreed 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:
- The proposal, in this location, by virtue of its design, materials, mass and bulk, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Lewes Conservation Area;
 - There was extensive use of glazing and inappropriate fenestration in comparison to dwellings typical to Lewes;
 - That the inappropriate design and costs associated led to an inability for the site to produce any affordable housing.
381. **RESOLVED:** That the application be refused for the following reasons, with the final form of words delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee: The proposed development by virtue of its mass, scale, bulk, design, materials and extensive glazing would appear incongruous and overly dominant within the street scene, and in other important views, and as such would harm rather than preserving or enhancing the special architectural or historic interest, character and appearance of the Lewes Conservation Area, and would be in conflict with policies SD5 and SD15 of the South Downs Local Plan. The incongruous and unacceptable design has significant construction costs associated with it which have eroded the viability of the development to provide policy compliant affordable homes. Given that the development will result in unacceptable harm, in conflict with policies SD5 and SD15, then the absence of any affordable housing provision from residential development on this site is considered to be in conflict with policy SD28 of the South Downs Local Plan.

ITEM 9: SDNP/18/05206/FUL - ALDI HOUSE, 1 BROOKS ROAD, LEWES, EAST SUSSEX BN7 2BY.

382. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet which listed two further conditions, and gave the following verbal update:
- A further note had been sent by Aldi to Members outlining the benefits of the scheme.
 - There was a minor amendment to two disabled parking spaces following advice from the Highways team of East Sussex County Council.
383. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Alastair Close of Planning Potential spoke in support of the application representing Aldi.
384. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-48), the update sheet and the public speaker's comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- There were some concerns that the landscape officer had objections to the scheme and that they did not believe the scheme followed a landscape-led approach.
385. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The Officers had to balance many different views and weigh them up against policies. It was felt that this scheme was a great improvement from the first scheme, and that it delivered many benefits by achieving Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) Excellent.
386. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The Committee congratulated Aldi on their community engagement which had led to an acceptable scheme being presented.
 - It was noted that Aldi had worked hard to change original design and make it more landscape led.
 - The scheme was applauded for meeting BREEAM Excellent requirements.
387. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations, subject to the minor corrections to the Recommendation, and subject to the two additional conditions as set out in the update sheet, and also subject to an amendment to condition 16 to include submission of further car parking information.
388. **RESOLVED:**
- 1) That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the Update Sheet, and subject to the submission of further car parking

information the consideration of which is to be delegated to the director of planning, and subject to a legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the following:

- The relocation strategy, the lease extension of a year to the occupants of the industrial units and a developer contribution of £25,000 to town centre enhancements and employment initiatives.
- 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 has not been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 12 March 2020

ITEM 10: SDNP/19/04275/CND - BROAD VIEW FARM BLACKNEST ROAD BINSTED ALTON GU34 4PX.

389. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet, which included an update to condition 7 and two corrections to the recommendation, and gave the following verbal update:

- The applicant had submitted further landscaping details not detailed on the Update Sheet, which sought to address comments made by the Hampshire County Council Rights of Way (RoW) team regarding fencing and hedging along to western edge of the proposed car parking space. This would require an amendment to condition 4 to require this condition to be discharged.

390. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Claire Fargeot spoke against the application representing herself.
- Claire Fargeot spoke against the application representing County Councillor Mark Kemp-Gee
- Ian Salisbury spoke against the application representing himself.
- Stephen Andrews spoke in support of the application representing the applicants.

391. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-49) and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Could the application previously approved be built out if this application was not approved?
- Clarification that the expiration date detailed on condition one was correct, and was three years from the 31st March 2017.
- Was it an offence to drive or cycle over a RoW without authority and whose authority was required?

392. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Permission was granted in 2017 for a number of buildings, including lodges which had now been built. The 2017 permission approved the construction of a building across a footpath. At that time approval was also given to a diversion order to divert the footpath. Objections to the diversion order meant that an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State held a public inquiry. The Inspector did not permit the diversion of the footpath, therefore that building could not be built.
- The date detailed in condition 1 was correct and the previous permission had been partially implemented by virtue that the lodges had already been built.
- It was an offence to drive or cycle over a RoW without authority, however the owner of the land was entitled to permit him/herself or their guests to drive across a footpath as long as it did not obstruct the footpath. Parking on a footpath was not permitted as this would cause an obstruction.

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

- The Committee commended Officers and the applicant for seeking to address the issues that had arisen and that they had been sensibly addressed.

394. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations as set out in the Update Sheet, subject to the amendment to condition 7 as set out in the update sheet, and an amendment to condition 4 as detailed above.

395. **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That planning permission be granted subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the previous S106 requirements in relation to the original planning permission SDNP/16/03835/FUL, which are:
 - Not to sever the legal ownership of the barn and tourist accommodation or any parts thereof from the remainder of the land (Broadview Farm).
 - Not to create any legal interest in the barn and tourist accommodation or any parts thereof separate from the remainder of the land (Broadview Farm).
- 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 has not been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 12 March 2020.
- 3) The conditions as set out in paragraph 11.1 of the Officer's report, subject to the amendment to condition 7 as detailed on the Update Sheet and subject to an amendment to condition 4, the final form of words delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee.

ITEM 11: SDNP/19/03160/OUT - LOWER YARD, SELBORNE ROAD, NEWTON VALENCE, ALTON, HAMPSHIRE.

396. The case officer presented the report, referred to the update sheet and gave the following verbal update:
- An email had been received by Officer and Members from a District Councillor for the area raising matters relating to the principle of development for the site, landscape matters and the ability to deliver the Whole Estate Plan.
397. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Bob Fewings spoke against the application representing himself.
 - Pip Lucas spoke against the application representing himself.
 - Charles Louisson spoke against the application representing the Ropley, Hawkley & Hangers Ward of East Hampshire District.
 - Ian Ellis in support of the application representing the Applicant.
398. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-50), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- What was the basis of the tenancy of the farm workers cottages and two affordable houses, and would either be kept in perpetuity?
 - Would the houses be supplied by mains water or a private water supply, and was it sufficient for 10 dwellings?
 - What consideration was given to the Newton Valence Village Plan, which did not appear to support this application?
 - What impact would this proposed development have on traffic using narrow rural roads?
 - Had the Landscape Officers comments been taken on board, considering this was an outline application, or would they be considered at the reserved matters stage?
 - What was the policy position under the newly adopted South Downs Local Plan were it not for the site being included in a Whole Estate Plan (WEP)?
 - How could the advantages of the WEP be secured and be enforceable?
 - Had a valid costing been received detailing why there was a need for six market properties in order to provide two affordable and two rural estate workers dwellings?
399. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- This was an outline planning permission and not a full application, but many reserved matters were for determination. The tenure of the two farm worker cottages and affordable housing units would need to be rented tenure to be compliant with the affordable housing policy. This was still to be agreed and Officers would seek to secure this in the S106 agreement.

- The site was currently supplied by private bore hole but this application would ensure that mains supply from SE water would be connected if this application went ahead.
- The Village Plan had been given consideration in the assessment of the application and many of its objectives were embedded in the report's assessment, including retention of hedgerows, retention of road verges and concerns about light pollution. The Village Plan indicated that the local community were generally against new development throughout the village, however there were mixed views about how to redevelop and use agricultural sites. The preference for redevelopment of such sites was towards housing rather than business, and Officers had taken this into account. The site had a long history of pre-application enquiries which ranged from proposals for between 5 and 12 dwellings.
- Policy SD21, which addresses the impacts of development on historic rural roads and verges, had been taken into consideration. The existing site was not working at its full capacity as a farm, and it was felt that smaller vehicles from this development would have less of an impact than larger farm vehicles, which could have a significantly higher impact on the road verges and sunken lanes. The application sought to maintain the existing access, rather than propose a new access to the site, in order to further reduce impacts to the surrounding rural roads. The Highways Authority had not raised any objection to this outline permission.
- Some of the Landscape Officers comments had been taken into account in the Officers report, however many of the comments relating to design would need to be addressed at the reserved matters stage.
- There were policies in the Local Plan which related to either conversion of buildings, or new buildings on farmsteads. However, if there were not a WEP for this site, this outline application would be considered in a different light as it would be contrary to South Downs Local Plan policy as it was outside of the settlement boundary. However, it was right to consider this application as part of a WEP under Policy 25 in the South Downs Local Plan, provided it would deliver multiple benefits in line with the purposes and the special qualities of the National Park and in regard to ecosystem services.
- The WEP identified the need for affordable housing and rural worker dwellings. A S106 legal agreement would need to be entered into as part of the planning process in order to mitigate any harm caused by the development. In 2015 the Government restricted what could be included in S106 agreement and the key requirements was that mitigation was necessary to make a development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
- Approximate figures, but not full financial figures, had been provided to indicate the number of open market properties needed for this site in order to provide for the two affordable dwellings, two rural workers dwellings and other benefits of the WEP that fall outside of the application site.

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

- Members would have preferred to have considered a full application and not an outline application. They expressed concern that the application was lacking sufficient information to enable them to make a decision to approve or refuse this outline application.
- If this site did not have a WEP the policies relating to WEPS would not be applicable, but the site is part of a WEP and therefore the policies are relevant, as well as others in the Local Plan.
- It was acknowledged that the principles of WEPs had been endorsed by the SDNPA and that they can deliver good outcomes. It was further recognised that Newton Valence had a WEP which had been endorsed by the SDNPA. However Members were concerned that, whilst the endorsed WEP is a material consideration, there would need to be clear justification, and significant benefits shown, to accept a development as part of a WEP which was outside any settlement boundary. In this case the multiple benefits of the WEP had not been made clear or secured.
- There were concerns that six open market properties, and 10 dwellings overall, on a rural site was excessive.

- There was concern at the amount of weight that had been given to the Newton Valence Village Plan, which the local community had worked hard on.
401. It was proposed to defer the application so that further consideration could be given as to the multiple benefits as identified in the WEP that could be achieved and how these balanced against the settlement boundary issue and other identified concerns over the scheme.
402. **RESOLVED:** That determination of the application be deferred in order for the multiple benefits demanded by policy could be secured sufficient to demonstrate the full advantages of the scheme, in the context of the endorsed Whole Estate Plan (WEP) and the wider landscape.
403. Margaret Paren and Ian Phillips joined the meeting at 3.20pm

ITEM 12: MAKING OF THE SEAFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

404. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report.
405. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-51), and made the following comments:
- Would any of the 10 sites be affected by, or affect, views to the National Park?
406. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- One site had had concerns raised about the effect on views at submission stage, however this had been taken into account. There was also a Scheduled Ancient monument on this site.
407. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The Committee praised the work of all involved in the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan, and thanked the people of Seaford who had engaged well with the process. The fact that the Plan was unanimously endorsed was seen as a testament to the hard work of local people and Officers at Lewes and the SDNPA.
408. It was proposed to vote on the Officer recommendation.
409. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
- Noted the outcome of the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan Referendum;
 - Agreed to make the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for that part of Seaford Parish within the South Downs National Park.
410. The Chair closed the meeting at 3.25pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____