

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 November 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, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson and Ian Philips (ex. officio).

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

Also attended by: Rafa Grosso Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer) and Hannah Collier (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Duncan Keir (Drainage Engineer, Chichester District Council).

OPENING REMARKS

165. 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 purposes.

166. 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.

167. 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

168. Apologies were received from Tim Slaney and William Meyer.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

169. Janet Duncton declared a non-prejudicial, public service interest for item 7 as Fittleworth was in her division as a County Councillor for West Sussex.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 8 OCTOBER 2020

170. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 October 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

171. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

172. The Planning Policy Manager gave an update on the Soft Sand Single Issue Review (SSR), which was being worked on jointly by the SDNPA and West Sussex County Council. An Examination Hearing in Public had been undertaken online at the end of August 2020, and the Inspector made some minor modifications. These modifications will go out to consultation from 16 November 2020 to mid-January 2021, and it was hoped that the SSR would be adopted at the Full Authority NPA in March 2021.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

173. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/20/03676/FUL - Land at Limbourne Lane and The Fleet

174. Duncan Keir, Drainage Engineer for Chichester District Council, joined the meeting
175. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave a verbal update that one further objection had been received. The issues raised in this objection were covered in the Officer's report.
176. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Hilary Jeffs spoke against the application representing herself
 - Walter Jones spoke against the application representing himself
 - Colin Kiely spoke in support of the application as the agent representing the applicant
 - Lee Scott spoke in support of the application representing Fittleworth Parish Council
177. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-21), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- How often would the proposed Sustainable Urban Drainage scheme (SuDS) need maintenance, whose responsibility would this be in the future and who would pay for ongoing maintenance?
 - Was the proposed wetland habitat sufficient to support drainage of the site, and was this covered by the conditions?
 - Why 14 dwellings were proposed in this scheme when the local Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) proposed that about 12 dwellings were acceptable for this site?
 - What was the size of the site and the housing density of the proposal?
 - Why were chimneys proposed for some dwellings but not all?
 - How was the sum of £4,000 reached for the developer's contribution towards traffic calming, and was that sufficient?
 - Was there anything in place to protect the trees which lined the A283 along the southern boundary of the site, which included some very mature oak trees?
 - Would the telegraph pole at the proposed entrance be moved?
 - Was the open space by the pond open to all villagers?
178. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Condition 11 ensured that development would not commence, other than works of site survey and investigation, until the full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme had been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme was also required to submit full details of the proposed maintenance and management of the SuDS system (including the on-site pond and watercourses) in a site-specific maintenance manual. It was for the developers to decide how future maintenance would be managed, however this would usually be the responsibility of a Management Group, which could be an independent management company or a residents group. The Management Group would be liable for ensuring the maintenance manual was adhered to. It was likely that residents would be expected to pay for any future maintenance through a residents group or management company.
 - The existing pond would be restored and expanded to increase the wetland habitat that would provide drainage of water from the site. Both the current pond and the ditch running along the southern boundary had not been maintained for many years and restoring these, along with expanding the pond, was considered sufficient to provide drainage to the site.
 - A NDP provided an indication of community support for development on a given site. It is good practice that NDPs are not specific regarding the number of dwellings on a site, in order that each site should be considered on its own merits. In this case, the Examiner added the word 'about' to allow for some flexibility. 14 dwellings was considered acceptable.

- The site was 0.92 hectare. This equated to a housing density of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare, which was considered reasonable.
- Four of the detached units would have working chimneys and this was considered reasonable by Officers. Details of all chimneys would be controlled through the conditions.
- The developers had met with Officers and the local Highways Authority to discuss the costs of implementing a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a 30mph speed limit along the A283. Officers considered £4,000 was a reasonable contribution towards these costs.
- Whilst 5 trees would be removed to create the entrance to the site from the A283, officers had not felt a protection order was needed for the other trees as there was no benefit to the developer to remove further trees. However, taking into account Members' concerns it was agreed that a Tree Preservation Order would be sought for the remaining trees on the boundary with the A283 under delegated authority.
- The telegraph pole would be moved and developers had been in discussions with the utility company to re-site it.
- The open space by the pond would be available for public use.

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

- This was considered a well-designed scheme, which took landscape and ecology into account and met sustainable construction policies. The design gave a feeling of space on this edge of settlement site and the majority of the mature trees were to remain to ensure the site was in keeping with the rest of the village.
- Members welcomed that the scheme provided both 50% affordable housing and a number of smaller dwellings which were needed in the village. Whilst it was recognised that the total number of units was greater than outlined in the Fittleworth NDP, as the housing density and scheme design were satisfactory 14 dwellings was considered acceptable for this site.
- It was agreed that the proposal was a good solution to current flooding issues. However, concern was raised about the financial responsibility for maintenance of drainage of the site and that residents in the affordable housing units may need support if they were expected to pay maintenance fees.
- Members asked that the recommendation include the wording "from the developer", to ensure it was clear that the £4,000 towards traffic calming would be provided by the developer.
- It was noted that further information had been emailed to Members by one of the speakers during the course of the meeting. Members were advised to disregard the email as all speakers had been given a fair opportunity to present their views to the Committee.

180. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation, subject to insertion of the words come "from the developer" in the recommendation, so that the first resolution (i,b) should read "A financial contribution of £4,000 from the developer towards traffic calming measures in the area".

181. **RESOLVED:**

- I. That planning permission be granted subject to:
 - i) 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) 7 affordable dwellings, of which 5 of social rented tenure and 2 of shared ownership;
 - b) A financial contribution of £4,000 from the developer towards traffic calming measures in the area;
 - ii) The conditions as set out in paragraph 10.2 of this report.

2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 12th November 2020 Planning Committee meeting.
182. 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.
183. Duncan Keir and Janet Duncton left the meeting.

ITEM 8: Draft Camping and Glamping Technical Advice Note (TAN)

184. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
185. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-22) and requested clarification as follows:
- Was there any leeway on whether CIL could be charged or not, and whether CIL funds could be used to support landowners to open up permissive paths across their land to enable users to get from the campsites out into the countryside or to access local facilities.
186. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- What the CIL funds were spent on was not up for negotiation on a site by site basis but the Planning Policy Manager agreed to look into this further.
187. The Committee discussed the report, making the following comments:
- It was agreed that the TAN should include guidance on both the provision for waste management for each site, and the visual impact of hardstanding and car parking, which was often required for campsites.
 - It was suggested that more guidance on appropriate design should be provided rather than precluding prefab or off-the-shelf pods. In some circumstances these may be considered acceptable providing they could be sited appropriately.
 - Members proposed that farmers from the SDNPA Farm Clusters should be included in the consultation for the TAN, as farm diversification was often a reason for increased camping and glamping sites
 - Members discussed whether wild camping should be included in the TAN as it was not a planning matter, however it was recognised as a key issue due to an increased interest in camping and public confusion on whether wild camping was permitted. It was agreed to improve the wording on wild camping to ensure clarity, and to state that wild camping is unlawful, rather than illegal as stated in the TAN.
 - It should be made clear that the reference to covid-19 was a temporary change and only relevant during any period of restrictions imposed due to the covid-19 pandemic.
 - Members expressed concern that the diagram for Figure 4 (Jill's campsite – Ecosystem Services) was too simplistic and should be made clearer.
 - A number of minor amendments to the text were suggested:
 - Section headed 'Planning Policy', second paragraph: remove the word 'gentle' so that it reads: "The SDLP is landscape led and sets out a balance between development and the landscape itself"; change 'how camping can take place' to 'how camping may be able to take place'.
 - Section headed 'Planning Policy', third paragraph: change the word 'can' to 'may be able to' and add text to the end of the first sentence so that it reads: "Camping may be able to provide low cost, overnight stays within the beauty of the natural landscape but without harming the beauty, tranquillity for other users".
 - Section headed 'SD23: Sustainable Tourism: remove the word 'blocking' and change text in bullet c) so that it reads "New camp sites should not detract from the special qualities of the National Park. for example, by lessening tranquillity or appearing prominent in views."

- Section headed 'Jill's Campsite': bullet c) should ensure that restored hedgerows do not interfere with established views.
188. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations, subject to the comments made at the 12 November 2020 Planning Committee being taken into account.
189. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
1. Approved the draft Camping and Glamping Technical Advice Note for public consultation, subject to the comments made at the 12 November 2020 Planning Committee being taken into account. and
 2. Delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair, authority to make further minor changes to the Technical Advice Note prior to public consultation.

ITEM 9: Half Year Neighbourhood Planning Updates

190. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
191. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-23) making the following comments:
- It was noted that a map of 'made' and 'not made' Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs) was included in the annual Authority Monitoring Report to the NPA. The map also showed neighbourhood areas without NDPs. For the majority of neighbourhood areas it was beneficial to have a NDP in place as the community could benefit from a higher rate of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) being received.
192. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the progress to date on the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans across the National Park.
193. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.50pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____

