

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 10 December 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, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson and Ian Philips (ex. officio).

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), 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: Heather Lealan (Development Management and Enforcement Lead) and Amy Tyler-Jones (Senior Planning Policy Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

194. 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.

195. 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.

196. 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

197. There were none.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

198. The Chair declared a non-prejudicial, public service interest on behalf of all Members as David Coldwell, who was a speaker on item 8, was previously a Member of the SDNPA, and had been a member of the Planning Committee, and was therefore known to the majority of Members of the Committee. Diana van der Klugt was also a Councillor on Horsham District Council where David Coldwell had previously been a Member.

199. Barbara Holyome declared a personal and a non-prejudicial interest in item 9 as the applicants, and some of the speakers, were known to her. She was also a member of the Bramdean Parish Council but had not sat on any meetings which had discussed this item.

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

200. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 November 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

201. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

202. The decision has been issued for SDNP/18/06292/OUT - Land North of Buckmore Farm, Petersfield.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

203. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/20/02616/FUL - Dangstein

204. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
205. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- David Campion spoke against the application representing clients who objected to the proposal;
 - Cllr Steve Williamson spoke against the application representing Rogate Parish Council;
 - Nick Jacobs spoke against the application representing himself;
 - Paddy Cox spoke in support of the application as the agent and the applicant;
 - Dylan Walker spoke in support of the application representing himself;
 - Archie Yellop spoke in support of the application representing himself.
206. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-24), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Could the Committee approve a temporary permission until 18 November 2022, in order that the renewal of planning permission would be considered at the same time as the other application for this site (SDNP/17/03623/FUL)?
 - How would enforcement of the conditions be monitored? Could condition 3 be amended to require a vehicle log to be kept, in order that Officers could monitor that conditions were being met, rather than relying on local residents to notify the Enforcement team if a breach had occurred?
 - Clarification on the number of vehicle movements permitted in and out of the site.
 - When would forestry work be considered light industrial as opposed to ancillary work, and therefore outside of the constraints of this application?
 - How was woodland management being achieved to ensure any trees that were removed were being replaced?
207. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Members could decide to limit the length of a permission to coincide with the appeal decision.
 - Members could agree to amend condition 3 so that it required the applicants to keep a vehicle log for the site. It was considered normal practice that enforcement teams for Local Planning Authorities relied on local residents to inform them of any concerns regarding breach of conditions. However, it would not be expected that neighbours should police events as that was down to the enforcement team to investigate and consider appropriate action.
 - The conditions allowed for 6 commercial vehicle movements into the site and 12 commercial vehicle movements out of the site annually.
 - Officers regarded the work on this site to be low-key, supplementary use rather than light industrial. Conditions were in place to restrict what work could be done. If the work on the site increased to a level which meant it breached the conditions, then a further application would need to be submitted to the Planning Authority.
 - This application sought to manage the wider woodland through the sustainable use of timber. Officers thought that this was sufficient for this site given its limited size. To include a condition requiring a woodland management plan was considered excessive and difficult to justify for an application of this size.
208. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Due to the history of this site, the Committee recommended that any conditions for this planning application should provide clarity on what was permitted and what was not permitted on this site.

- The Committee agreed to amend condition 3 so that it required the applicants to keep a vehicle log for the site. It was accepted that local residents can be useful in informing enforcement officers should conditions not be met.
 - Members discussed the merits of approving a temporary planning permission in order that it be considered for renewal alongside the permission given by the Planning Inspector for SDNP/17/03623/FUL. However, it was recognised that the two applications were separate, and that this application related more closely to the lawful use of the land for commercial forestry.
 - This was considered a small, low key operation with very few movements in and out of the site. The SDNP was a working landscape, and this operation helped to keep traditional skills and heritage alive, which supported the purposes of SDNPA. Should it grow beyond its current scope then a further application would have to be submitted for decision by the Planning Authority.
 - Members welcomed that the operation provided local employment, provided training opportunities for young people and enabled them to live and work in their communities.
209. It was proposed and seconded that temporary planning permission should be granted until 18 November 2022. The proposal was not carried.
210. It was proposed that full permission, in accordance with the recommendation as set out in the Officers report, should be granted subject to the amendment of condition 3, which should require a vehicle log to be maintained, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
211. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report, and subject to the amendment of condition 3 to require a vehicle log to be maintained, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning
212. 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.
213. William Meyer left the meeting.

ITEM 8: SDNP/19/06035/FUL – Land South West of Woodcote Manor Cottages

214. The Case Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
215. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- David Coldwell spoke against the application representing the South Downs Society;
 - Michael Curtis spoke against the application representing Mr. Terry Collyer of Woodcote Manor Cottages;
 - Richard Peers spoke against the application representing himself;
 - Richard Goodall spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
216. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-25) and requested clarification as follows:
- Why was the previous application described as major development whereas this application was not?
 - Was the proposed site the most suitable site, and had an analysis of other sites been presented to Officers?
 - What were the relative size and volume of the proposed building compared to the buildings on the existing farm site?
 - Would any redundant buildings on the existing farm site be removed?
 - What consideration had there been for materials of the new building to limit its visual impact, and had there been any discussions on installation of solar panels on the grain store to provide energy for the drying facility or for a community energy project?

- Had a tree protection plan and an Arboricultural Method Statement been submitted, as requested by Landscape Officer?
- Was the noise report undertaken during the covid-19 lockdown when levels of traffic would have been reduced in comparison to normal traffic levels?

217. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Determining whether proposals were major development in terms of paragraph 172 of the NPPF was a matter of planning judgement to be decided by the decision maker, based on all the circumstances relevant to the proposals and the context of the application site. This application had been amended from the previous application, and the Case Officer had concluded that the development proposed in this application was not major development for the purposes of paragraph 172 of the NPPF.
- A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) had been submitted, which identified this as the most suitable site.
- The proposed barn would be capable of storing approximately 7,844m³ of grain, depending on the type of grain stored.
- The unsightly grain silos on the existing farm site would be removed.
- Condition 4 required that a sustainability report be produced to ensure more consideration was taken regarding the use of sustainable materials and design, including opportunities for solar panels and the use of local timber. Condition 5 required a schedule and samples of external materials and finishes to be approved prior to commencement.
- A tree protection plan and an Arboricultural Method Statement had been submitted and approved by the Tree Officer at Chichester District Council.
- Data that informed the noise report had been collected during a period of lockdown, and this was made clear when the report was submitted to the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) who reviewed the report. Taking into account these conditions, the EHO had been satisfied with the noise report and was confident that no further conditions were necessary. However, the Case Officer had recommended inclusion of a further condition, as set out on the Update Sheet, which required the site to operate at all times in accordance with the recommendations in the Noise Impact report. It was also noted the background ambient noise may have been lower during this time too.

218. The Committee discussed the report, making the following comments:

- Members recognised that a need for larger agricultural buildings for farm machinery and to dry and store grain was an inevitable outcome of the intensification of agriculture.
- It was unfortunate that a more suitable site had not been found but Members appreciated that an appropriate assessment had been undertaken and found this site to be the most suitable.
- Whilst there was concern that the proposed building would be seen in the landscape with open views across fields, it was accepted that both the existing trees and the use of planting on the site would make it less conspicuous.
- The barn being situated higher up than the existing site would reduce any risk of flooding and aid drying of the grain.
- The location of this site, leading straight onto the A272 and providing access to the primary road network, would reduce the amount of farm traffic on smaller lanes and facilitate the distribution of grains. This was a key main A road in the National Park suitable for the type of traffic generated.
- There was some concern that slow farm traffic would be joining the A272 at a point where the national speed limit applied, whereas a 30mph speed limit was in place where the existing farm entrance joined the A272. However, it was noted that the Highways Authority had not objected to this application.
- It was hoped that the sustainability report could make recommendations for provision of solar PV which could provide a benefit to the community.

219. It was noted that Therese Evans had lost connection for a minute during the public speakers and was precluded from voting on this application.
220. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendations
221. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 and the additional condition included within the update sheet to Members.

ITEM 9: The South Downs National Park Authority's response to Submission (Reg 16) consultation on the Rogate & Rake Neighbourhood Development Plan (RRNP)

222. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report.
223. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:
- Cllr Steve Williamson spoke in support of the item, representing Rogate Parish Council.
224. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-26) making the following comments:
- The Committee congratulated the Parish Council and steering group for their hard work in developing the RRNP over such a long period of time.
 - Page 114 of the full committee papers, the SDNPA response to page 13, section 2.5.4 should include the word 'approximately', to read: "For clarity, Policy SD26 of the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) identifies a housing provision of approximately 11 new homes in Rogate during the plan period 2014-2033."
 - It was noted that the site allocation for land on the north side of B2070 London Road (West of Flying Bull PH, Rake) was outside the settlement boundary, however met the criteria for Policy SD26 of the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP). As part of the boundary extended into Liss parish any planning application would require consultation with Liss Parish Council. They had been consulted on the RRNP and had not raised any objection.
 - It was further noted that the total housing provision in the RRNP went beyond the allocation in the SDLP as it took into account local housing need from the housing survey for the area.
 - It was agreed to add the above points to the comments on 'Policy H6: Allocation of Sites Suitable for Development' in the SDNPA Response to the RRNP submission document (pages 117-119 of the full meeting papers for the December 2020 Planning Committee).
225. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the table of comments as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, which will form SDNPA's representation to the Independent Examiner of the RRNP, subject to the minor comments made in the discussion at this planning Committee, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning.
226. The Chair closed the meeting at 1:40pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____