

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 11 JUNE 2020

Held: online via Zoom videoconferencing, at 10am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Thérèse Evans, Barbara Holyome, Diana van der Klugt, Gary Marsh, William Meyer, Robert Mocatta and Vanessa Rowlands.

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

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Rafa Grosso-Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Heather Lealan (Development Management Lead (Minerals and Waste)).

OPENING REMARKS

411. The Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.
412. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that:
- Due to the current Coronavirus pandemic the South Downs Centre and Memorial Hall remained closed until further notice, hence the meeting of the South Downs National Park Authority was held using the Zoom Cloud Meetings software.
 - 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 purpose
 - 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 would act in the best interests of the National Park as a whole, rather than as representatives of their appointing body or any interest groups.
413. The Senior Governance Officer reminded Members of the protocol that would be followed during the meeting.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

414. Apologies were received from Pat Beresford, and Gary Marsh sent apologies that he would be late.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

415. Robert Mocatta disclosed a public service interest on items 7 and 10 as an East Hampshire District Councillor. Item 7 was in his ward and he was acquainted with many of the public speakers for both items.
416. Barbara Holyome disclosed a non-prejudicial interest on items 9 and 10 as two of the public speakers were known to her.
417. William Meyer disclosed a non-prejudicial interest on item 9 as three of the public speakers speaking against the application were known to him. He had met the applicants once at an SDNPA meeting, but had not taken part in any discussions with them on this application. His decision would be based on Member discussions at this meeting, which he would consider with an open mind.
418. Vanessa Rowlands disclosed a non-prejudicial interest on item 9 as one of the public speakers was known to her.
419. Alun Alesbury disclosed a non-prejudicial interest on item 9 as one of the public speakers was known to him.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 MARCH 2020

420. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 March 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendments:
- The third bullet point of minutes 379 should read ‘there were design concerns’ (amended from ‘there was’).
 - Minute 397 should read ‘Bob Fewings spoke against the application representing Newton Valence Parish Council’ (not ‘himself’ as stated).
 - The third bullet of Minute 400 should include ‘Estate’ after Newton Valence, to read ‘It was further recognised that Newton Valence Estate had a WEP’ to ensure clarity that it was the Estate, and not the village as a whole, that had a WEP.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

421. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

422. The decision had been issued for SDNP/18/05206/FUL - Aldi House.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

423. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/19/04720/FUL - WORKSHOP AND LAND REAR OF 34 LAVANT STREET, PETERSFIELD, HAMPSHIRE.

424. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet which included an amendment to the recommendation and an amendment to condition 3. The Officer also gave the following verbal update:
- Further comments had been received from Petersfield Town Council. Whilst their latest formal response stated that they have no objection to the scheme, they commented on the design and expressed concerns about whether the scheme addressed policy SD35 (loss of an employment site).
425. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Ben Smith spoke against the application representing himself.
 - Matthew Warner spoke against the application representing himself.
 - Alistair Harris spoke in support of the application representing Metis Homes.
426. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-57), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Would a precedent be set if this employment site, which was designated in the SDNPA Local Plan and the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan, was approved for housing?
 - What was the current space allocated to business use premises on the site.
 - Did the conclusions of the viability study concur that this site could only provide 3 affordable houses? Was there any clawback mechanism which could allow for more than 3 affordable dwellings to be provided for when development commenced?
 - Had East Hampshire District Council’s shown any current interest in purchasing the site?
 - Why did the architectural design change from the previous application when the Historic Buildings Officer comments advised that the more traditional design of the previous application would produce a better result for this important site?
 - Could there be an opportunity for residents of Charles Street to have vehicular access to the back of their properties via the site?
 - Was there provision for cycle storage on site?
 - What percentage of electric charging vehicle points would be provided on this site?

- Had the Design Officer comments on landscaping been taken into consideration, including the use of green roofs and more meaningful infrastructure?

427. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Whilst this site is identified as an important local employment site, each site is considered on its own merit. Local Plan policy SD35 seeks to safeguard employment sites, however all policies contain matters for exceptions which should be taken into consideration, allowing for judgement to be used on each site. Applications that would result in a loss of employment land on principal employment sites would only be permitted provided that evidence of a robust marketing campaign of at least 18 months clearly demonstrated that there was no market demand for the business premises. That had been demonstrated in this case and therefore other options could be considered.
- The current site provided just under 2000m² of business premises, and the proposals provided for 241m².
- This application was an improvement on the previous application which did not provide for any affordable housing. Policy SD28 on provision of affordable housing did not need to be met if an application was robustly shown to be unviable. Whilst there had been different opinions on the value of land, the viability studies we had assessed showed that the scheme could not be policy compliant for affordable housing due to high costs. Officers had asked for detailed costs for the scheme, which were shown to be high. The S106 agreement would contain provision for clawback should provision for more affordable housing be possible.
- East Hampshire District Council made an offer on the site in June 2017, which was rejected, and no further approach to the landowner had been made. Policy D35 required a minimum of 18 months marketing to show that there was no interest in a site, and this had now passed.
- The design had changed after pre-application discussions between the applicants, the Design Officer and Case Officer. The Design Officer was happy with the application, which incorporated a modern design with some traditional architectural features of the conservation area.
- An access road to the rear gardens of Charles Street properties would limit the layout and scale of what could be achieved on the site. This would lead to loss of courtyard spaces, and possible loss of trees along the boundary. The increased vehicle dominance in the plans could result in a negative visual impact from the Charles Street properties.
- A communal cycle store would be provided within the flats and cycle hoops would be situated in the central courtyard for the office site.
- A high percentage of charging points would be included in the schemes, to meet policy SD22.
- The Landscape Officers comments had led to new and improved planting, including a rainwater garden. There had also been improvements to enhance biodiversity and improve quality of the bank of the stream at the rear of the site. The conditions would ensure opportunities for Green Infrastructure to be maximised, despite limitations of the site.

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

- It was accepted that this was a more complex site than other employment sites in Petersfield. It was a key location in a conservation area, and provided a first impression for visitors arriving in the Park by public transport.
- Members concurred with the concerns expressed by the Historic Building Officer that the proposed building on the Lavant Street frontage, a prominent site within the Conservation Area, would be more appropriate if it had a more traditional form..
- Members also accepted that inclusion of a small access road to the rear of properties on Charles St would negatively impact the design of site.

- The location of this site, next to the train station and in walking distance to the town centre, was deemed a prime location to meet affordable housing provision.
 - Members recognised that Metis homes were trying to build to a high quality design, and that the associated costs may reduce the ability to meet affordable housing policies. However Members agreed that policy SD28 was a landmark policy, had been through rigorous debate and was recently approved by an Examiner. To provide only 10% affordable housing was not sufficient to warrant approval.
 - It was agreed that the design on Lavant Street, along with a lack of affordable housing provision, were key causes for concern.
429. It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused for the following reasons:
- The lack of affordable housing given its proximity to local amenities;
 - The design of the particular frontage on Lavant street was not deemed appropriate.
430. **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 Planning Committee:
- The lack of affordable housing given its proximity to local amenities;
 - The design of the particular frontage on Lavant street was not deemed appropriate
431. Gary Marsh joined the meeting at 12:15.
432. The meeting adjourned for a 5 minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 8: SDNP/19/02919/FUL - SOLDIERS FIELD STABLES SOLDIERS FIELD LANE FINDON.

433. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
434. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Michael Drakeford spoke against the application representing himself
 - Kris Mitra spoke against the application representing Mr & Mrs Fagan – Downsedge House, Stable Lane.
 - Cathrine Gear spoke against the application representing Findon Village Parish Council.
 - Dawn Appleton spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
 - Tina Cook spoke in support of the application representing herself.
435. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-58), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- As this was a hybrid application, Members sought clarification on whether they would be voting parts 1 and 2 of the application separately, or both together.
 - Confirmation that the site was outside the settlement boundary, and whether it was acceptable to build 2 new residences outside a settlement boundary?
 - In providing 4 bedroom dwellings, did the application conflict with the housing mix outlined in policy SD27?
 - What ecosystem services were provided in the application?
 - Had there been any discussions on the use of carports instead of garages?
 - Were there any policies that referred to supporting a business?
 - What lighting would be permitted on the site, to ensure the Dark Night Skies were protected?
436. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The officer clarified that the Committee should decide on the application as a whole.

- The site was outside the settlement boundary. Ordinarily 2 new dwellings was not acceptable outside the settlement boundary, however the site lies within previously developed land and the extant permission allowed a similar amount of development.
- This application would remove any permitted development rights ensuring no further development could take place without applying for planning permission.
- The housing mix for this application was in conflict with SD27. However the Officers recommendation for approval was based on an on-balance view, taking into consideration the scheme as a whole and the progress made from previous applications.
- The use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) was outlined in detail in the Officer's report. There had been a lot of local concern about water run off onto Soldiers Field lane, and it was considered that the current proposals addressed this issue.
- The Landscape Officer comments on garages had led to amendments to the plans. There were no garages at the stables or equestrian area; undercover parking spaces were provided for the holiday cottages; and plot no 2 had an open sided garage, similar to a carport. This would be approved at the discharge of conditions stage.
- The Findon Neighbourhood Plan supported equestrian businesses within the village.
- The only lighting controlled by conditions referred to external lighting to dwellings. No other lighting would be permitted on site.

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

- Members were pleased that there would be no lighting around the arena area, which would be a concern for light pollution.
- It was recognised that this application proposed a reduction in dwellings when compared to the extant planning permission and the Officer was commended in getting this proposal to Committee.
- The application was considered an improvement on the previous extant application and Members were of the opinion that the existing landscape would be improved by this application.

438. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations.

439. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the Officer report.

440. Gary Marsh left the meeting.

441. The meeting adjourned for a 5 minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 9: SDNP/19/03768/FUL - IFORD FARM, THE STREET, IFORD.

442. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet, which included a revision to the recommendation, an additional condition, an amendment to condition 6 and details of additional representations made against the application.

443. The Chair indicated that, due to the exceptional public interest in this application, and the background to this matter being brought before the Committee, he had used his discretion, as set out in the Authority's Standing Orders, to allow an increase in the numbers allowed to speak, and had permitted a fourth speaker against the scheme. It was made clear that this was an exceptional circumstance, and this decision would not be taken as a precedent for future applications. The applicant had been informed and, in the interests of fairness, given the opportunity to register a fourth speaker, but had elected not to do so.

444. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Fiona Harrison spoke against the application representing Kingston Parish Council, part of the Parishes of the Lower Ouse (POLO).

- Sue Carroll spoke against the application representing Rodmell Parish Council and POLO (The Parishes of the Lower Ouse Valley group)
 - Peter Earl spoke against the application representing Cycle Lewes.
 - Vic lent spoke against the application representing the South Downs Society.
 - John Robinson spoke in support of the application representing the Iford Estate.
 - Ben Taylor spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
 - Lee Scott spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
445. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-59), the update sheet and the public speaker's comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Would this application be considered if the Estate did not have a Whole Estate Plan (WEP)?
 - Should this application be considered along with other sites listed in the WEP?
 - Were other sites considered for this proposal, specifically sites nearer a main road or sites which had less impact on the landscape?
 - How many farms within this Estate will be affected by, or benefit from, this consolidation, and how many buildings on those farms will be rendered redundant as a result of this application?
 - Was this application an expansion of the farm, and would that lead to an increase in farm traffic on the C7 road?
 - What impact would there be from the significant raise in levels needed for this site?
 - How would this application deliver the proposed new wetland/meadows?
 - Was the proposed route of the Egrets Way the link that would join both ends of the route from Lewes to Newhaven? What was the risk to the long term future of the Egrets Way after the 25 year lease period expired?
446. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- An application for agricultural buildings, such as in this application, would be considered on its planning merits regardless of whether the site had a WEP. The existence of a WEP is a material consideration and allows all to see the wider picture, aspirations and opportunities arising from the Estate as a whole, (in this case such as the Egrets Way Link), in order to outweigh any harm which may be perceived from the development.
 - A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was submitted with the application, which considered various locations and provided details explaining why this site was considered the most appropriate. The LVIA had been accepted by the Case Officer and the Landscape Officer.
 - There were a further 3 planning consents, which were addressed in the highway report. However, the committee were advised that this current application did not proposed to increase the trips on the highway network
 - The agricultural statement provided an inventory of buildings on the connected 3 sites but it was difficult to say how many buildings would be rendered redundant. It could be in the regions of 15-20 buildings.
 - This application was not an expansion of Iford farm but was a consolidation. As there was no expansion to the farm operations, it was not considered that there would be an increase in traffic.
 - Advice was sought from the Landscape Officer on the raised levels and the potential visual impact. It was agreed that in this case the raised levels proposed would not result in an unacceptable impact to visual appearance. Natural England did not comment on the land being raised and the Environment Agency was satisfied with a flood risk assessment which

was undertaken and found no greater risk of flooding. Water movement through the site was to be improved with the inclusion of ponds and reed beds.

- The proposed new wetland/meadows would be on land to the west of the raised cattle yard, and would require an ecological management plan to be put in place. This was covered in the conditions.
- The proposed route of the Egrets Way would link both ends of the route, however there was still a lot of work to be done and funds to be raised to finalise this. The proposed 25 year lease was a commitment agreed through discussions between the Egrets Way project and the Applicants. Agreement of the proposed lease would be secured through a S106 agreement.

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

- The Committee recognised the need for farms to consolidate and diversify and that larger buildings were needed to accommodate larger, modern farm vehicles.
- The Officers were commended on the extensive conversations that had taken place to get to this point. However there were concerns about making a decision on one part of a site included in a WEP which also contained other sites. There was a view that a decision for this site needed to be taken with regard to the wider picture of what plans existed for the other sites within the WEP.
- Concerns were raised that buildings on the other farm sites, not considered as part of this application, could be repurposed and lead to an increase of traffic on the C7.
- This application was considered to be a large development in a prominent location in the National Park, and it was agreed that the visual impact on the landscape was unacceptable.
- Members were not convinced that this was the only location this development could take place.
- There was strong agreement that this application did not support the first of the two statutory purposes for National Parks in England, which was to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park.
- Members acknowledged the large amount of public interest in this application and suggested that wider consultation with local communities might have led to a scheme that was more acceptable to the community.

448. Members debated whether deferment of the application would be useful, but decided that there would be no benefit in doing so.

449. It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused for the reasons of its impact on the landscape and that it did not meet policy SD39 of the South Downs Local Plan on Agriculture and Forestry.

450. **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 Planning Committee:

- its impact on the landscape;
- it did not meet policy SD39 of the South Downs Local Plan on Agriculture and Forestry.

451. The meeting adjourned for a 5 minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 10: SDNP/19/03160/OUT - LOWER YARD, SELBORNE ROAD, NEWTON VALENCE, ALTON.

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

453. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Philip Lucas spoke against the application representing himself.

- Bob Fewings spoke against the application representing Newton Valence Parish Council.
 - Charles Louisson spoke against the application representing East Hampshire District Council.
 - Jon Fountain spoke in support of the application representing Newton Valence Farm.
 - Lionel Fanshawe spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
 - Ian Ellis spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
454. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC19/20-60) and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was it possible for Parish Council to be a signatory to the S106 legal agreement?
 - Should the amount of CIL payable be more?
 - Was the payment to the Parish Council for repairs to the village hall sufficient?
 - Were the two key worker houses for Estate staff and were they considered affordable housing?
 - What was the benefit of reopening the disused Meon Valley railway line along the western edge of application site? Could the Officer explain why the northern route is proposed to be a 'path dedicated for public use' but southern part of the route proposed to be a 'permissive path'?
455. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Normal parties to a S106 legal agreement would be the Planning Authority and all landowners involved. All necessary landowners would need to sign up to the agreement, and if it was not delivered, planning permission could not be granted. In this instance the Parish Council is not understood to be a landowner and would not need to be a party to the S106. It would, however, be the beneficial recipients of funds.
 - The amount of CIL payable was subject to various conditions set by Government, and the amount of CIL payable could be reduced if exemptions applied. As this was an outline application, the final amount of CIL liable would be decided at the reserved matters stage.
 - The applicant proposed to provide costs of up to £35k for repairs to the village hall, which was considered a significant amount, but not the whole amount required.
 - The proposal recommend that the key worker dwellings would remain under the tenancy of farm, however a S106 legal agreement would include the allocation criteria for key workers to be specified.
 - The Officer would prefer to see a 'path dedicated for public use' along the full length of the trail but was satisfied that the proposal put forward would enable the public access which the SDNPA aspired to achieve. Any new public Rights of Way would be secured through a legal agreement and the land dedicated as public highway.
456. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Members commended work done on the WEP and could see improvements to the application.
 - It was accepted that if the 2 farm workers dwellings allocation criteria was controlled in the S106, it would be a good outcome in terms of affordable housing provision.
 - This was not considered a sustainable location the application did not contribute to sustainable development. Newton Valence was a rural location with no opportunities for work, so any new housing would rely on individual car use.
 - Concerns were raised that the Landscape Officer had raised an on balance objection. However it was recognised that the principle of development had been accepted on landscape and visual impact terms, and that all other concerns raised by the Landscape Officer could be controlled by conditions or thorough benefits secured through S106 agreement.

457. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations, with assurance that the concerns raised by the Landscape Officer would be addressed in the S106 legal agreement or in the conditions.

458. **RESOLVED:**

1) That outline planning permission be granted subject to:

- The completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the delivery of the following:
 - a. Two affordable dwellings and two key estate workers' dwellings;
 - b. A public bridleway and permissive path on the former Meon Valley Railway and appropriate connection to the right of way network;
 - c. A scheme of new permissive footpaths and signage across the estate;
 - d. Repair and maintenance of public bridleway no. 12;
 - e. A scheme of Green Infrastructure Initiatives;
 - f. A financial contribution towards repairs of Newton Valence Village Hall (up to £35,000);
 - g. An energy audit of the estate and a strategy for energy reduction and use of renewable energy;
- The completion of bat and reptile surveys and provision of a suitable policy compliant mitigation and enhancement strategy, the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning; and
- The conditions, substantially in the form set out in paragraph 11.2 of this report along with any additional conditions, the form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning' to address those mitigation matters that arise from the completion of bat and reptile surveys and strategy.

2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if:

- a) The S106 agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not be made within 6 months of the 11 June 2020 Planning Committee meeting.
- b) The bat and reptile survey and provision of a suitable policy compliant mitigation and enhancement strategy is not completed or sufficiently progressed within 6 months of the 11 June 2020 Planning Committee meeting.

459. It was agreed that, due to the length of this first online Committee meeting, that the Strategy and Policy items 11, 12 and 13 should be deferred.

460. The Chair closed the meeting at 5.45pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 09 JULY 2020

Held: online via Zoom videoconferencing, at 10am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Thérèse Evans, Barbara Holyome, Diana van der Klugt, Gary Marsh, William Meyer, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands and Andrew Shaxson

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Becky Moutrey (Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer) and Sara Osman (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Stella New (Senior Development Management Officer), Amy Tyler-Jones (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Jack Trevelyan (Enforcement Officer), Jeremy Burgess (Landscape and Biodiversity Lead (Water)) and Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

1. The Director of Planning welcomed new Members to the meeting and informed those present that:
 - Due to the current Coronavirus pandemic full meetings were not able to be held at the Memorial Hall until further notice, hence the meeting of the South Downs National Park Authority was held using the Zoom Cloud Meetings software.
 - 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 purpose
2. The Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present, that the meeting was quorate and reminded Members of the protocol that would be followed during the online meeting.

ITEM 1: ELECTION OF CHAIR

3. The election process was presided over by the Director of Planning and Senior Governance Officer. Members were invited to nominate themselves for Chair of Planning Committee until the first meeting following the Authority AGM in 2021. One nomination was received from Alun Alesbury.
4. As Alun Alesbury was the only nomination Alun Alesbury was duly elected as Chair of the Planning Committee until the first Planning Committee meeting after the Authority AGM in 2021.
5. Alun Alesbury took the Chair and presided over the rest of the meeting.
6. The Chair welcomed Andrew Shaxson and Janet Duncton to the Committee, and thanked departing Committee Member Pat Beresford for his service to the Committee.

ITEM 2: ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIR

7. The election process was presided over by the Chair, and Members were invited to nominate themselves for Deputy Chair of Planning Committee until the first meeting following the Authority AGM in 2021. One nomination was received from Heather Baker.
8. As Heather Baker was the only nomination, Heather Baker was duly elected as Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee until the first Planning Committee meeting after the Authority AGM in 2021.

9. The Chair reminded 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 would act in the best interests of the National Park as a whole, rather than as representatives of their appointing body or any interest groups.

ITEM 3: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

10. Apologies were received from Janet Duncton.

ITEM 4: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

11. Vanessa Rowlands declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 9, SDNP/20/01693/FUL Cowdray Park, as both the applicant and the speaker for this item, Adam Coxen, were known to her.
12. Heather Baker declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 11, Affordable Housing SPD, as she had been the Chair of the SDNPA Affordable Housing Task and Finish Group but had not been involved since that work was completed.
13. Thérèse Evans declared a public service interest in agenda item 10, SDNP/20/01263/FUL Whitewool Farm, which was in the Winchester City Council (WCC) area where she was a Councillor. She had not had any involvement in that application.
14. Thérèse Evans declared a public service interest in agenda item 11, Affordable Housing SPD, as comments had been received by Winchester City Council (WCC) where she is a Member.
15. Thérèse Evans also declared a public service interest in agenda item 13, Appeals Update, as she had been the Chair of Planning Committee at Winchester City Council when the decision was made for SDNP/18/00679/FUL Land at Abbots Worth House. She also noted that the appeal for SDNP/19/02763/CND Joinery & Boxwood, Owslebury, was also in the WCC area but she had not had any involvement in that application as it was a delegated decision.
16. Robert Mocatta declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 10, SDNP/20/01263/FUL Whitewool Farm, as the speaker for this item, Jamie Butler was known to him. He was also an East Hampshire District Councillor and his ward included East Meon.

ITEM 5: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2020

17. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 June 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendment:
- Due to technical issues, Gary Marsh left the meeting after the debate for item 8 and was unable to re-join. Therefore, minute 440 should be moved to follow minute 448, and should read: 'Due to technical difficulties Gary Marsh was no longer present in the meeting at 15:30'.

ITEM 6: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

18. There were none.

ITEM 7: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

19. The decision has been issued for SDNP/18/05385/FUL - The Henry Warren Club and Land North East of Prestwood, Nyewood (Nyewood Village Hall).
20. The decision has been issued for SDNP/19/04275/CND - Broad View Farm, Binsted.

ITEM 8: URGENT ITEMS

21. There were none.

ITEM 9: SDNP/20/01693/FUL – Cowdray Park Treehouses.

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

- One further point of clarification had been received from a Member asking whether any units could be sold leasehold or for time share. The Officer responded that the applicant's company is a holiday let business and selling their units to third parties as leaseholds or time shares does not form part of their business model.
23. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Adam Coxen spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
24. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-01), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Would interpretation signage be used to inform visitors about the landscape-led design and sustainable construction of the treehouses, and of the cultural heritage of the site?
 - Condition 5 stipulated that a Site Management Plan should be submitted prior to first use of the development, and should include details of fire and BBQ rules. Would fires be permitted on this wooded site?
 - What was in place to prevent the proposed footpaths, going through site from parking areas to treehouses, creating a semi-urbanised feel once established, and visitors wandering off the formal paths?
 - Were there cycle storage facilities to encourage sustainable travel to the site?
 - What processes were in place for monitoring the state of the units over time, to ensure that they continued to preserve and enhance the landscape? Had consideration been taken regarding what happened to the units and the site once the units came to their end of life?
25. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The applicant intended to continue working closely with the Cowdray Estate and SDNPA access teams to provide a heritage trail on the wider estate. They planned to provide their own interpretation to tell the story of the site and also promote Dark Night Skies to visitors.
 - Condition 5 ensured that rules should be in place stating that no fires or BBQs would be allowed on the site, including disposable BBQs.
 - Footpaths would only be provided solely to the units themselves and visitors would not be encouraged to wander through woodland. This could be strengthened through the Site Management Plan required in Condition 5, and maintenance of the understorey could be secured by extending the landscape management scheme required by Condition 10.
 - Lockable storage for cycles would be provided elsewhere on the site, but not by the units themselves.
 - The units were designed to last at least as long as the 30-year lease for the site. A detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan had been submitted with the proposal, and whilst development of this nature in woodland would not ordinarily constitute enhancement, this development would bring the woodlands back into formal management which would achieve the National Park's first Purpose. A number of cultural heritage enhancements would also be delivered to the Historic Parkland on the Estate, including the restoration of historic rides and a Haha.
26. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Members acknowledged the extensive collaborative working which had taken place between the Applicants and Officers, in order to develop and amend the previous plans, and that they had addressed comments previously raised by Committee.

- Members noted that all concerns raised from the previous application had been answered satisfactorily. The proposed units were sustainable, the finishes fitted in with the surroundings, and the designs had been adapted to fit each site individually.
 - Concern was raised that this may set a precedent for applications for treehouses elsewhere in the Park, and Members emphasised that each application should be considered on its own merits, taking into account the landscape in which they were sited.
 - Further concerns were raised that monitoring the state of the site was not covered over a sufficiently long time period, and related more to the landscape than the units themselves. It was proposed that there should be an additional condition to require monitoring of the state of the units over their lifespan and to cover what should occur when the buildings came to end of life.
 - Conditions 20 and 21 stated that details should 'be provided', and it was proposed that these should be amended to read that details should 'be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority'.
27. It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved subject to the following amendments:
- An additional Condition to be added relating to monitoring the physical structures of the treehouses, and measures to address the end of life of the treehouses.
 - Conditions 5 & 10 to be strengthened in relation to keeping to the formal footpaths and preventing any urbanisation of the woodland sites;
 - Conditions 20 and 21 be amended to read that details should 'be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority'.
28. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the officer's report, and subject to the following, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee:
- An additional Condition to be added relating to monitoring the physical structures of the treehouses, and measures to address the end of life of the treehouses.
 - Conditions 5 & 10 to be strengthened in relation to keeping to the formal footpaths and preventing any urbanisation of the woodland sites;
 - Conditions 20 and 21 be amended to read that details should 'be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority'.
29. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.
30. Jeremy Burgess (Landscape and Biodiversity Lead (Water)) and Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) joined the meeting.

ITEM 10: SDNP/20/01263/FUL – Whitewool Farm.

31. The Case Officer presented the application. referred to the update sheet and gave the following verbal update:
- The Landscape Officer had withdrawn their objection following information provided by Natural England. Their response was now a neutral response, however their concerns regarding the wetland habitat in the wider area still stood.
32. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Jamie Butler spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

33. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-02), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Members sought further information on the benefits of this scheme to the wider catchment area and downstream of the site, and confirmation that the land would not become saturated with nitrates.
- How would developers further downstream purchase 'credits' to offset nitrates produced as a result of their development, and was there a national standard for nitrate offsetting credits? How was this monitored?
- How were nitrate levels measured and how often would this need to be done?
- Could the Landscape Officer explain what led to a change of view from objecting to the proposal to a neutral position?
- Where would the extracted soil go and what impact would it have on the landscape?
- Were there any other schemes like this in the National Park that had set a precedent?

34. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The Biodiversity Lead clarified that nitrates from the surrounding farmland would be absorbed by the plants specifically selected for the proposed wider river catchment area, and that this would reduce levels of nitrates flowing downstream. A key point for consideration in the management of the site was that it needed to stay a wetland to ensure plant take-up of nitrates.
- Natural England had created a national standard for nitrate offsetting credits. Developers would approach the farm and submit details to Natural England, who would decide whether the site would be able to offset the nitrates produced as a result of the Development scheme. There was a legal obligation on the landowner to notify the SDNPA of any schemes which came forward to use nitrate offsetting credits. This would be regulated through the S106 legal agreement.
- The Biodiversity Lead explained that to monitor nitrate levels, water samples would be taken above and below the site to compare how much nitrate entered and left. From these figures the amount of nitrate absorbed on the site could be calculated. The frequency of sampling was dictated by Natural England's processes. The case officer added that the SDNPA would monitor the capacity of site through the S106 legal agreement, which would oblige the applicant to provide this information alongside any developments that propose to use the site to offset nitrates of a scheme.
- The Landscape Officer responded that, whilst they could see the ecological benefits of the proposed wetland, they had not been convinced there was sufficient evidence the land would stay wet in the long term. The application did not provide details covering a full year cycle, and figures supplied were taken during winter months only. However, following discussions with Natural England, they were reassured that there had been sufficient improvements in the design to improve water flow rates, and on this basis had changed their view to a neutral position.
- The majority of soil from the site would be used in regrading and re-profiling the landscape on the site. Condition 6 set out details on the disposal of any waste from the site and this would be covered by the discharge of conditions.
- There were similar, smaller schemes taking place in the National Park which did not require planning permission, however these have set a good precedent for processes and monitoring of such sites.

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

- Members supported the ‘stage zero’ approach as an important way forward in conserving and enhancing the landscape, and an improvement to the habitat of this site would be of benefit to the Park.
- The benefits of the proposal were recognised, including: more water would be kept upstream, reducing the risk of flooding downstream; water quality would be improved and the river would be encouraged to follow its natural path to counteract man-made canalisation of the rivers course in the past.
- Members considered that wet woodland and water meadows were rare landscapes which had been lost in this area, and that restoring them would be beneficial and increase biodiversity that would otherwise no longer exist on this site.
- Some concerns were raised about the process of offsetting, and that whilst it was good that nitrates be absorbed from the local farmland, it would not prevent nitrates from developments affecting waterways further downstream.
- There was some concern amongst some Members that this application had been brought before Committee prematurely, and as ‘stage zero’ was a very new approach, the application should be deferred in order that Members could be thoroughly briefed on the process. However other Members were satisfied with the Officer presentation and answers to points of clarification.
- It was agreed that the ecological survey was not done at the best time of year, or for a long enough period, and Members asked that a stipulation be required in the S106 legal agreement for several surveys to be done over the whole year.
- On-balance, Members agreed that there were many positive benefits to this scheme and they noted that no objections were raised by the experts that had been consulted.

36. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendations.

37. **RESOLVED:**

1) That planning permission be granted subject to:

- The completion of a S106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the following:
 - a) The scheme is secured and managed for the lifetime of the development which relies on it as mitigation.
 - b) Appropriate arrangements for the management and monitoring of the wetland and its performance of capturing nitrates; an agreed nitrogen saving budget for offsetting development; provision of remedial measures as necessary; appropriate funding, responsibilities and mechanisms to ensure compliance of the above by appropriate organisations.
- The completion of further ecological surveys regarding protected species on site, principally within the stream corridor, and provision of a suitable policy compliant mitigation and enhancement ecological strategy to the satisfaction of the SDNPA, the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning; and
- The conditions as set out in paragraph 10.1 of this report and any additional conditions, the form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to address any mitigation and strategy matters that arise from the completion of further ecological surveys.

2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if:

- a) The S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 9 July 2020 Planning Committee meeting.
 - b) The additional ecological surveys and provision of a suitable policy compliant mitigation and enhancement strategy is not completed or sufficiently progressed within 6 months of the 9 July 2020 Planning Committee meeting.
38. Jeremy Burgess (Landscape and Biodiversity Lead (Water)) and Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer) left the meeting.
39. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.
40. Ian Phillips joined the meeting.

ITEM 11: Adoption of Affordable Housing SPD

41. The Senior Planning Policy Officer reminded Members of the report content, referred to the update sheet and gave the following verbal update:
- The new paragraph outlined in the update sheet should be amended so that the second to last line should read: ‘Policy SD29 requires all affordable housing on rural exception sites to be affordable and provided so in perpetuity’.
42. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-03), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- How would the affordable housing mix be worked out for rural exception sites, considering that Parish Councils have differing requirements for housing needs in their area?
 - Confirmation that all affordable provided through Whole Estate Plans should be provided in perpetuity.
43. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- All policies should be read together. If a good reason was given why the policy for smaller units should be diverted from, it would be considered.
 - The SDP clarified that affordable housing provided through Whole Estate Plans would be expected to be in perpetuity.
44. The Committee discussed and debated the SPD, making the following comments:
- Members welcomed this document as it would help deliver more affordable housing for young people and families on low income. It would also provide more clarity for developers regarding financial contributions.
45. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
- 1) Noted the content of the Consultation Statement (Appendix 1 of the Officer’s report); and
 - 2) Adopted the revised Affordable Housing SPD (Appendix 2 of the Officer’s report).

ITEM 12: Enforcement Update

46. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-04) and requested clarification as follows:
- Could the report contain more detail on enforcement issues, to provide evidence of outcomes of enforcement actions or outstanding cases? Members comments that there was a high number of cases closed due to ‘no breach’, and more detail on this would be welcomed.

47. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- It was agreed that more detailed information should be supplied in the enforcement report to enable Members to better understand enforcement issues and resolutions.

48. **RESOLVED:** Members noted the update on enforcement action.

ITEM 13: Summary of Appeal Decisions Update

49. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-05) and requested clarification as follows:

- Were parish councils informed of information in this report?

50. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The officer clarified that the report was publicly available on the SDNPA website as part of the papers for this meeting, and all Parish Councils were informed when the meeting agenda was available. Parish Councils who had submitted comments to an appeal would have been sent a copy of the inspector's report on that appeal.

51. **RESOLVED:** Members noted the outcome of appeal decisions.

52. The Chair closed the meeting at 1.45pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 13 August 2020

Held: online via Zoom videoconferencing, at 10am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Janet Duncton, Thérèse Evans, Barbara Holyome, Diana van der Klugt, Gary Marsh, William Meyer, Vanessa Rowlands and Andrew Shaxson

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Becky Moutrey (Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer) and Sara Osman (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Jane Rarok (Development Management Officer), Stella New (Senior Development Management Officer), Kevin Wright (Planning Policy Officer), Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Specialist Lead).

OPENING REMARKS

53. The Chair welcomed new Members to the meeting and informed those present that:
 - Due to the current Coronavirus pandemic full meetings were not able to be held at the Memorial Hall until further notice, hence the meeting of the South Downs National Park Authority was held using the Zoom Cloud Meetings software.
 - 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 purpose
54. The Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present, that the meeting was quorate and reminded Members of the protocol that would be followed during the online meeting.
55. The Chair reminded 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 would act in the best interests of the National Park as a whole, rather than as representatives of their appointing body or any interest groups.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

56. Apologies were received from Robert Mocatta.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

57. Diana van der Klugt raised a non-prejudicial, public service interest in item 8 as she was the Councillor for the Pulborough, Coldwaltham and Amberley ward where the site was situated. She had attended meetings of the Amberley Parish Council but had not been to any planning meetings or been privy to discussions on planning items. One of the speakers was a Councillor for Amberley Parish Council and was known to her.
58. Alun Alesbury, Barbara Holyome and Andrew Shaxson declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 10 as one of the speakers, Jane Cecil, was known to them.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9 JULY 2020

59. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 July 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

60. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

61. Appeals for the following items had been submitted to Planning Inspectorate:
- SDNP/19/04720/FUL - Land rear 34 Lavant Street, Petersfield
 - SDNP/19/01876/FUL - Soldiers Field House, Findon
 - SDNP/18/05444/FUL - Garden Street Auction Rooms, Lewes
 - SDNP/18/03162/FUL - Eastmead Industrial Estate, Lavant

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

62. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/19/03366/OUT - Plumpton College.

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

- One further letter had been received from a neighbour after the update sheet had been published, raising concerns about ecology and the impact on listed buildings. These concerns had been addressed in the Officer's report.

64. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Mike Barber spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.

65. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-06), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- What would be the colour scheme and nature of the roofs of the pig units? Would they be visible in the landscape and would there be any screening on the northern boundary?
- How prominent would the building on site 10 be in the landscape on the northern boundary?
- Where there were plans for extensions to buildings, could they be considered on their own merit in terms of achieving BREEAM Excellent, or would they have to be considered in the context of the whole building and therefore only achieve BREEAM Very Good, as stated in the report?
- Would the provision of staff accommodation be retained in perpetuity?
- The provision for student accommodation was considered small in relation to number of students at the college. Would more provision of accommodation be needed at a later stage?
- Clarification that the 'precedent' images in the Officer's presentation for later phases of the development were purely illustrative, and not definitive versions of what was proposed for these parts of the site?

66. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The pig units would be an extension of existing buildings and would square off the current site. They would be smaller than, and reflect the materials of, the current buildings on site, and conditions were in place to cover materials that could be used. They would be visible in the landscape but no more than the existing buildings currently were. Native hedges and tree planting were proposed to enclose the buildings of the pig unit.
- The buildings on site 10 would cover the same area as the existing footprint and be contained well within the northern perimeter road. Whilst it would be visible, it would not appear incongruous in its location and would be read as part of the campus development. Tree planting would be conditioned.

- In order for the extensions to the main building to respect the character of the building, and be of like material, it meant that they would not meet BREEAM Excellent rating but would achieve BREEAM Very Good status.
- The staff accommodation would be retained in perpetuity and this would be secured by the S106 legal agreement.
- There was a waiting list for student accommodation and 91 beds had been proposed based on the college's calculation of need over the 7 years of this proposal. Whilst it was not possible to say whether there would be future additional demand for accommodation, any future application would need to be judged on its merits.
- The images provided for Phases 2, 3 and 4 were illustrative only. Details would come forward at the reserved matters stage.

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

- Members welcomed that all new build would attain the BREEAM excellent standard; that there would be a 66% biodiversity net gain; that thought had been put into lighting provision on the site; and that ducting would be put in place to future-proof for electric vehicle charging provision.
- The scheme was considered to be a significant improvement on the site in general, and specifically an improvement to the existing car parking layout.
- Securing the cycle path along the east of the site was welcomed but it was noted that much work would have to be done outside of this application for this to link right through to Plumpton Railway Station.
- Members emphasised the need to ensure screening of the pig units and the use of appropriate colour schemes (with a dark coloured roof being preferred), which would be managed through the details of the conditions.
- It was noted that, as the building on site 10 would be prominent in the landscape, its design should reflect the nature and traditions of buildings in the Sussex landscape.

68. It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved.

69. **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That planning permission be granted subject to:
 - The completion of a S106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the following:
 - a) Staff accommodation occupation restrictions limiting the occupation of the dwellings to persons solely or mainly employed at the College
 - b) Provision of a Landscape & Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)
 - c) Secure the use of the existing cycle path along the eastern boundary for the future use of cyclists and equestrians
 - d) Travel plan & Travel Plan Audit Fee, and bus control measures for the Estate Road
 - e) Highways works in accordance with a Section 278 agreement (including bus stop and junction improvements)
 - f) The phasing of the development and associated studies
 - The completion of further ecological surveys regarding bats on site and provision of a suitable, policy compliant, mitigation and enhancement ecological strategy to the satisfaction of the SDNPA, the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning; and

- The conditions as set out in paragraph 10.2 of the Officer's report and any additional conditions, the form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to address any mitigation matters that arise from the completion of the further ecological surveys.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if:
- a) The S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 13 August 2020 Planning Committee meeting.
 - b) The additional ecological surveys and provision of a suitable policy compliant mitigation and enhancement strategy is not completed or sufficiently progressed within 6 months of the 13 August 2020 Planning Committee meeting.
70. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 8: SDNP/19/05270/OUT Pickwick, Amberley.

71. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave the following verbal update:
- One further request for clarification had been received from a Member asking whether the applicants were the same applicants for the approved application adjoining the site (SDNP/19/04886/FUL - Land adjacent to Strawberry Villas). The Officer confirmed that they were not the same applicant.
72. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Peter Cozens spoke against the application representing Amberley Parish Council.
 - James Thorns spoke in support of the application as the applicant
 - Robert Gifford von Schiller spoke in support of the application as the agent.
73. Members were reminded that as this was an outline application, they were not considering design or layout at this stage, but were considering the principle of 7 dwellings on this site. The design and layout of the housing would come before the Committee at the reserved matters stage.
74. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-07), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- What options were available for pedestrian connection from the site to the Millennium Fields and the rest of the village? Could access be provided via the as yet unbuilt Strawberry Villas development site, via the playing fields to the east of the site or to the west along the frontage onto the Turnpike Road?
 - What was the position in regard to settlement housing numbers required by the Local Plan, where these have already been met?
75. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The site did not have a pedestrian link to the rest of the settlement, other than via the highway verge, however access would be determined at the reserved matters stage and the applicant would need to demonstrate that they could provide access to main village, millennium green and playing grounds. Condition 29 stipulated that no works could commence until a scheme of pedestrian access had been submitted and agreed.
 - The site was within the settlement boundary. Applications should still be considered whether or not a housing target had been reached, and this was not a reason to refuse dwellings coming forward.

76. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Members recognised that whilst Amberley had met its allocations for housing in the South Downs Local Plan, this did not prevent further development proposals coming forward.
 - They further recognised that, as this was an outline application, they must be satisfied as to the in-principle acceptability of the amount and type of development proposed, the ability to mitigate any ecological impacts and whether safe access was achievable in principle.
 - The site was considered a key gateway site at the entrance to Amberley approaching from the East, and that it was visible from the South Downs Way, which ran along the Downs to the south of the site.
 - Concern was raised about safe vehicular access with a higher volume of traffic turning into and out of the site from the Turnpike Road. Traffic speed was a concern and Members questioned whether the speed limit could be moved further east along Turnpike Road to ensure a lower speed at the junction to the site. However, it was recognised that this was the domain of the Highways Authority, who had not objected to the proposal, subject to conditions.
 - Whilst Members raised concerns that the Landscape Officer had objected to the application, it was generally considered that up to 7 dwellings could be accommodated. An appropriate landscape led scheme at the reserved matters stage could be an improvement and enhancement of the current site.
 - However, it was considered that with a significant number of dwellings on the site, a scheme for pedestrian access to the village, and for safe vehicular access, would be important at the reserved matters stage.
 - Members were pleased that the outline planning permission included a legal agreement to ensure compliance with policy SD28 on affordable housing provision.
 - It was proposed to amend the wording of the second recommendation to clarify that the legal agreement relating to provision of affordable housing should not make sufficient progress within 6 months.
77. Gary Marsh left meeting due to technical issues and although he re-joined 5 minutes later, was unable to vote on this application.
78. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations, subject to the amendment to condition 11 as set out in the Update Sheet, and subject to the following amendment to the second recommendation:
- That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the legal agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing is not completed or sufficient progress made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 13 August 2020.
79. **RESOLVED:**
- 1) That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the Officer's report and the Update Sheet, and a legal agreement to secure two affordable dwellings;
 - 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the legal agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing is not completed or sufficient progress not made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 13 August 2020.
80. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 9: SDNP/20/01676/FUL - Ditchling Rugby Club.

81. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave the following verbal update:
- One further point of clarification had been received regarding access via the Drove. The Officer responded that access via the Drove had been addressed in the previous application and no further objections had been received.
82. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Donald McBeth spoke against the application representing Ditchling Parish Council.
83. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-08), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- That the Member debate should focus on the reason for temporary permission and whether it could be made permanent and not on any conditions that may have led to permission being sought previously.
 - As there was a known archaeological monument on the site was the sustainable drainage solutions listed in condition 9iii sufficient or was there a need for an archaeological condition should more engineered draining works be required?
84. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Temporary permission had been granted, and the Application before Members was to discuss whether the temporary permission could be made permanent. If there were substantial issues of concern regarding the temporary permission, or any new issues that need to be addressed, Members could overturn a temporary permission but should have good reasons to do so.
 - Condition 9iii was considered appropriate in this case. Any sustainable drainage scheme that came forward should not require substantial excavation works and therefore an archaeological condition was not needed. However, archaeology could be addressed by an informative stating that, should physical works be required, a) it would need planning permission and b) given the archaeology on the site, archaeological mitigation measures would be required.
85. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Members discussed the suggestion from the Parish Council that the previous decision had been reached improperly. They concluded that the decision to grant temporary permission had been fairly reached and based on sound advice. It had not been taken to a Judicial Review and there had not been any contraventions of the conditions which could prevent the temporary condition being continued.
 - Members noted the concerns from the local Parish Council and Landscape Officer regarding the impact on the landscape and preserving the strategic gap between Ditchling and Keymer villages. However, whilst the Members had a duty to preserve and enhance the landscape, they also had a duty to promote understanding and enjoyment of the Park. It was agreed that, on-balance, there would not be significant harm to the area and there would be many benefits to the community.
 - It was commented that improvements could be made to the visual impact of the entrance and signage to car park from the main road.
86. It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved.
87. **RESOLVED:** That permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 10.1 of the Officer's report.

88. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 10: SDNP/19/06071/FUL - The Old Pub Car Park, Slindon.

89. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
90. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Jane Cecil spoke against the application representing The National Trust.
 - Mr Charles Fuente spoke in support of the application as the applicant.
91. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-09), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Should this application be considered alongside the approved and built out scheme for Leigh Cottage and the Old Stables? The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) stated that should two or more separate planning applications come forward within 5 years for adjacent sites within the same ownership and/or which have a clear functional link, the SDNPA may conclude that the developments should be considered as a single scheme.
 - Were any of the properties in the vicinity of this scheme owned by the National Trust?
 - Were the objections from the Historic Buildings and Landscape Officer as a result of the scheme not being demonstratively informed by a landscape led approach?
92. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The application for Leigh Cottage and the Old Stables was approved over 5 years previously and so did not need to be considered as a single scheme.
 - The National Trust owned Vine Cottage and 32 & 33 Lodge Road.
 - Insufficient landscape evidence and analysis had led to the concerns raised by the Historic Buildings and Landscape Officers. However, whilst the scheme did not demonstrate a landscape-led approach, the scheme had been assessed by the Case Officer on its own merits, and the proposal was considered, on balance, to be acceptable from design, landscape and heritage perspectives.
93. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Members acknowledged that there was a need for 2-bedroom houses across the country, and that 2-bedroom cottages would be an asset to the village.
 - There was concern that both the Historic Buildings and Landscape Officers had objected to the application, and specifically the Landscape Officer's comments that the building bore no relationship to the access route. Some Members felt that the scheme could be improved with a different layout.
 - However, it was noted that, on balance, officers had discussed the layout and orientation with developers, and were satisfied that this scheme put forward the best placement for the dwellings in facing them out onto the Recreation Ground and was in accordance with the development plan.
 - The proposal was considered an improvement to the carpark that currently existed.
94. It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved.
95. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the officer's report.

96. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

97. Ian Phillips joined the meeting and William Meyer left the meeting.

ITEM 11: Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) consultation

98. The Planning Policy Officer reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.

99. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-10) and requested clarification as follows:

- Would a 12-week consultation be more acceptable, in light of covid-19 emergency?
- Could a garage in a proposed dwelling be considered a habitable room and be counted in the parking calculator?
- Using the parking calculator, would a development in a town not be allowed as many parking spaces as a similar, rural development?
- Could the Parking SPD be considered in conflict with Policy SD22 in the South Downs Local Plan, which covered Parking Provision?
- Whilst the Parking SPD made it clear that all parking must be landscape led, could wording to be added to ensure that parking should also enhance and make a positive contribution to the wider landscape?

100. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Officers had considered extending the length of the consultation but had not been convinced that any benefit would be gained by extending it to 12 weeks.
- A garage would be counted as a habitable area as it could be converted to a room without further planning permission. A small garage was not included as an allocated parking space. Parking provision should always be considered in the context of the wider landscape.
- The parking calculator made an allowance for the type of area the development was situated because research showed that parking need was different depending on where people lived. Therefore, it was possible that a development in a town did not need as many parking spaces as a similar, rural development.
- The South Downs Local Plan provided a policy hook for the SPD by referring to parking standards for the locality. The number of spaces required for a development was calculated when an application was being decided. The Parking SPD would make it easier to work out how many spaces were needed.
- The design of parking provision, and whether it would make a positive contribution to the wider landscape, was to be covered in a 'Design SPD' which would come before the Committee at a later date.

101. The Committee discussed and debated the SPD, making the following comments:

- Members welcomed this document and noted that the Parking Calculator would be a useful tool.

102. It was proposed to extend the consultation from 8 to 12 weeks, but Members agreed it should remain an 8-week consultation.

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

104. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1) Approved the draft Guidance on Parking for Residential and Non-Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document for public consultation
- 2) Delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair, authority to make further minor changes to the SPD prior to public consultation.

105. Gary Marsh left the meeting.

ITEM 12: Adoption of the Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

106. The Specialist Lead reminded Members of the report content.

107. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-11) and requested clarification as follows:

- That Members were voting to adopt the Sustainable Construction SPD as it was without proposing further amendments?
- Did the SPD set the highest standards, as far as it was able to within constraints set by the Government?
- Would this document be reviewed and updated at regular intervals?
- How many Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points were required per dwelling?

108. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Members could either adopt or reject the SDP before them, or suggest amendments. Any consequential amendments to the SPD would mean that it would need to go out for further consultation.
- Whilst certain targets were constricted by Government Guidance, where there was flexibility the highest possible, evidence-based standards had been set.
- The SPD could be reviewed at any point to enable it to reflect any subsequent Government changes. Additionally, the South Downs Local Plan and its policies would be reviewed within 5 years from adoption
- All new residential dwellings, where feasible, should have 1 electric vehicle charging point.

109. Ian Phillips left the meeting due to technical difficulties and re-joined 5 minutes later.

110. The Committee discussed and debated the SPD, making the following comments:

- Members welcomed this document and congratulated the team on producing a well presented and accessible document.
- Members asked for more clarity and consistency on the number of Electric Vehicle charging points needed per development type listed on the Summary of Requirements table.
- The following typographical errors were noted:
 - Page 288-289 (Single Dwelling Sustainability Chart): Errors were noted in the numbering of the footnotes (1-4);
 - Page 306 (Glossary): in the listing for 'BRE' the word 'with' should state 'which' to read "The Building Research Establishment (BRE) is a multi-disciplinary, building science centre **which** is focussed on how to improve buildings and infrastructure..."

111. It was proposed and seconded to note the content of the Consultation Statement and adopt the Sustainable Construction SPD, subject to the typographical amendments noted above.

112. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1) Noted the content of the Consultation Statement (Appendix 1 of the Officer's report);
and
- 2) Adopted the revised Sustainable Construction SPD (Appendix 2 of the Officer's report).

113. The Chair closed the meeting at 4.30pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 10 September 2020

Held: online via Zoom videoconferencing, at 10am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Janet Duncton, Thérèse Evans, Barbara Holyome, Diana van der Klugt, William Meyer, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands and Andrew Shaxson

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

Also attended by: Heather Lealan (Development Management Lead (Minerals and Waste)) and Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead (West)).

OPENING REMARKS

I 14. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that:

- Due to the current Coronavirus pandemic full meetings were not able to be held at the Memorial Hall until further notice, hence the meeting of the South Downs National Park Authority was held using the Zoom Cloud Meetings software.
- 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 purpose

I 15. The Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present, that the meeting was quorate and reminded Members of the protocol that would be followed during the online meeting.

I 16. The Chair reminded 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 would act in the best interests of the National Park as a whole, rather than as representatives of their appointing body or any interest groups.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

I 17. Apologies were received from Gary Marsh.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

I 18. Vanessa Rowlands declared a non-prejudicial interest for item 7 as one of the speakers, Vic lent, was known to her.

I 19. William Meyer declared a non-prejudicial interest for item 7 as both public speakers were known to him. He had been contacted by the applicants offering a personal visit to the site which was turned down.

I 20. Robert Mocatta declared a non-prejudicial, public service interest for item 9 as he was both the District Councillor and the County Councillor for the area where the application was sited, and two of the speakers were known to him.

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

I 21. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 August 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendment:

- The wording of the last bullet point of item 76 should read: 'It was proposed to amend the wording of the second recommendation to clarify if the legal agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing should not make sufficient progress within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting, authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application'.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

122. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

123. There were none.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

124. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/20/01237/CND - Swanborough Lodges

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

- The applicant had emailed the Case Officer agreeing to install the green roofs by the end of October 2020 if the Members went with the Officer's recommendation and refused the application.

126. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- The Governance Officer read out the statement against the application on behalf of Vic lent, of the South Downs Society, who was unable to attend due to an urgent matter.
- Ben Taylor spoke in support of the application representing Iford Estate.

127. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-12), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Members noted that the mix of holiday accommodation had changed since the previous application was debated at the 2017 committee and approval issued in 2018, and asked whether the mix had been a deciding factor for granting permission?
- Was there any evidence to show a positive or negative impact to biodiversity as result of not having green roofs on the lodges?

128. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The mix had changed, and all 3 bed units had been replaced with 1 bed units. The mix had not been critical to the decision for the previous application.
- There was insufficient information to demonstrate whether there had been any impact to biodiversity on the site.

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

- Members agreed that there had been a breach of conditions and were disappointed that the applicants had not complied with the conditions of the planning permission.
- The responsibility of the Planning Committee was to ensure that planning permissions granted in a National Park offered the highest protection of the landscape and biodiversity. Inclusion of green roofs had been critical in approving the previous application, following a lengthy debate at the 2017 Committee meeting, and concern was raised that a precedent would be set if this permission was granted without the green roofs.
- Whilst it could be argued that the lodges had limited visual impact on the wider landscape, it was agreed that the green roofs would improve the visual impact on the site itself, and had potential to benefit biodiversity net gain as well as reduce water run-off from the lodges.
- Members commented that, whilst the lodges were well-constructed in their design, they were unattractive without the green roofs.

130. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation, as amended in the Update sheet.

131. **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That planning permission be refused for the reason outlined in Paragraph 10.1 of this report.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to serve a Breach of Condition notice with regard to the failure of the applicant to install the green roofs as required by condition 2 of SDNP/16/06072/FUL.

132. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 8: SDNP/20/02065/HOUS - The Gate House, Poynings

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

134. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Mark Tonkin spoke against the application representing himself
- Cllr Colin Trumble spoke against the application as Ward Councillor for Hurstpierpoint and Downs
- Nigel Evans spoke against the application representing Poynings Parish Council
- Simon Bareham spoke in support of the application as the Agent representing the applicant
- Fariba Taheri-Westwood spoke in support of the application as the applicant

135. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-13), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Could the outbuilding be used for overnight accommodation?
- Did the verge between the wall and public footpath belong to the applicants and could it be used for planting to screen the wall?
- Was the height of the south west boundary wall, which ran alongside the public footpath, acceptable and was it in keeping with the landscape character of the rest of the village?
- Did the front dwarf wall, to the north of the house, require planning permission or would this be allowed as permitted development, where a wall could be built up to 1m in height, if it faced a highway? Would the height of 1m create an obstruction to pedestrians crossing the road?

136. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Condition 6 specifically required that the use of the outbuilding be incidental to the occupation and enjoyment of the Gate House. Therefore, it could be used for hobbies but could not be rented out.
- The land between the south west boundary wall and the public footpath was not within the applicant's ownership and conditions could not require planting on that land in order to screen the wall.
- A fence of around 2m height previously ran alongside the public footpath where the south west boundary wall was now situated. The new structural wall was higher due to a difference in levels created by structural terracing in the garden of the property, but this was not considered excessive by Officers. They also did not believe the wall, when finished, would be out of keeping with what you would expect to see along a boundary of a footpath. The property was set at the edge of the main village, and was mostly surrounded by countryside with buildings being sparser than in the main part of the village. The finish of the wall had not yet been agreed but the conditions would ensure that the Conservation Officer would be consulted to define the finish to this wall, ensuring suitable materials would be used, and the applicant had not raised any objection to this.

- Regarding the front dwarf wall, to the north of the house, permitted development allowed for a wall up to 1m to be built where it faced a road, however the previously approved application had envisioned a height of 0.75m . The Officer had since considered the increase of height acceptable in design terms and did not consider it to be overbearing. The Highways Authority had not raised any concerns regarding the wall.
137. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Whilst Members acknowledged the frustration of local Parish Councillors that this application sought part retrospective permission, it was agreed that Members must take an application on its planning merits, and that there were no material planning considerations on which to refuse this application.
 - Members recognised that the increased height of the walls might have some minor visual impact, however, the development as now proposed was likely to be a visual improvement in the long term.
138. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendations and the additional conditions from the Local Highways Authority as set out in the Update Sheet.
139. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the additional conditions from the Local Highways Authority, as set out in the Update Sheet, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning.
140. The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute comfort break. On resumption of the meeting the Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

ITEM 9: SDNP/19/05026/FUL - Westbury House

141. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave the following verbal update:
- Further comments had been received from West Meon Parish Council, who did not raise any objection to the proposals. Should planning permission be granted, they would like to see a traffic management plan covering movement of construction vehicles put in place. In response, the Officer proposed an update to the recommendation, to include additional criteria to condition 8 requiring further details to be submitted as part of the Management Plan regarding routing of construction and delivery vehicles to the site.
142. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Jonathan Michael Moritz spoke against the application representing himself
 - Sally Miller spoke against the application representing The Hampshire Gardens Trust
 - Andrew Barr spoke against the application representing himself
 - Scot Masker spoke in support of the application as the Agent representing the applicant
143. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-14), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- How would the phasing of funds, used to carry out works to the heritage assets, be set out in the S106 legal agreement?
 - Had Officers received a financial viability analysis for the project, and had the option of a commuted sum for affordable housing been considered or was that not an option at this stage?
 - Who held responsibility for the bridge used to access the site, which was in disrepair?
 - Considering the number of issues that needed to be addressed, could the 3-year requirement be reviewed and extended in light of covid-19 pandemic?
 - Would electric vehicle charging points be included in the carpark?

144. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The phasing of works to the heritage assets would be negotiated when the S106 legal agreement was drawn up. The S106 would contain various trigger points indicating where works would be required to be undertaken, and the developer could plan their revenue to those points to ensure funding was available for the scheme as a whole.
- Officers had been given some information on viability in regard to the principle of a residential use being the optimal viable use, and some costs of what was needed to repair the heritage assets through discussions with the developers, but not through a fully detailed report. 12 units were considered the most sensitive number of dwellings in regard to the subdivision of the House, in order to achieve a certain number of units from which to secure preservation of the heritage assets. Officers had discussed options with the EHDC Housing Officer and concluded that it was a positive outcome to secure the provision of affordable units of an intermediate tenure on site.
- The bridge was the responsibility of the owner of the premises, but this was outside of the planning remit in the considerations of the application.
- The 3-year requirement was standard practice but if Members' were minded to alter this they could. However, it would be preferable to implement a scheme sooner given the state of the property and declining assets. The applicant could ask for extension of time at a later date should that be necessary.
- Electric vehicle charging points were covered by condition 13.

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

- Members commended the Officer and the applicants for their work on this application.
- Members agreed with the principle of housing on the site and welcomed the restoration of the main building and external heritage assets on the site. This application was considered a reasonable use of the building, which had previously been used as a care home and a preparatory school and would have had a considerable amount of traffic coming and going from the site.
- Concerns were initially raised about the financial sustainability of the development, considering the amount of work needed to restore the heritage assets, and given that only 6 of the 12 proposed dwellings would be sold on the open market. However, Members acknowledged that the developers viewed the proposal as viable, including the affordable housing units, and that sustainability of the project would be covered by a robust S106 legal agreement and enforcement of the conditions by Officers. Members therefore welcomed the proposal which would both restore heritage assets and deliver the Local Plan policy of 50% affordable housing units.
- There was currently no sustainable access to the site, however, it was noted that the site was only 1 mile from the village and there was a proposed link from the site to the hub of the village.
- A Member queried how much the service charge for maintenance of grounds would be and whether that might affect those living in the affordable housing units.
- Members would like to have seen a community use for some of the grounds, such as allotments or an inclusive community growing project.
- Members debated whether to defer the determination of the application to allow time to secure the S106 legal agreement however it concluded that the property was at a tipping point and it was imperative not to delay the work needed to restore it and the heritage assets.
- As the required S106 legal agreement was considered to be complex, if officers considered it to be necessary, an appropriate third party should be engaged to advise on the preparation of the S106 legal agreement to ensure it was thorough and robust. It was

proposed and agreed to consider the use of services of a third party to assess the S106 legal agreement, as necessary, and ensure it was robust.

146. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, as amended in the Update Sheet, with the additional amendment to condition 8 requiring further details to be submitted as part of the Management Plan regarding routing of construction and delivery vehicles to the site, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, as proposed by the case officer.

147. **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That planning permission be granted subject to:
 - A. the completion of a S106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the following:
 - a) 6 dwellings of an affordable housing (intermediate) tenure with an appropriate mix of properties;
 - b) A phased programme of works to restore the heritage assets on site; and
 - c) Secure the permissive path through the site, the exact routing to be agreed with the applicant; and
 - B. The completion of a further bat survey and provision of a suitable policy compliant mitigation and enhancement strategy, to the satisfaction of the SDNPA, the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning; and
 - C. The submission of a revised car parking layout, to the satisfaction of the SDNPA, the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning; and
 - D. The conditions, substantially in the form set out in paragraph 10.2 of this report with the amendment of condition 8, the form of wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, requiring further details to be submitted as part of the Management Plan regarding routing of construction and delivery vehicles to the site, along with any additional conditions, the form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning to address those mitigation matters that arise from the completion of a bat survey and strategy and revised car parking layout.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if:
 - a) The S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 10th September 2020 Planning Committee meeting.
 - b) A further bat survey and provision of a suitable policy compliant mitigation and enhancement strategy is not completed or sufficiently progressed within 6 months of the 10 September 2020 Planning Committee meeting.

148. The Chair closed the meeting at 1.45pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____