

Unconfirmed Planning Committee Meeting Minutes to be approved at the next meeting

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 21 January 2021

Held: online via Zoom videoconferencing, at 10am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, Diana van der Klugt, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson and Richard Waring.

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: Rafael Grosso Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

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

- Due to the 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.

228. 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.

229. 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

230. Apologies were received from Thérèse Evans.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

231. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in item 7. Charles Louisson was a fellow councillor at East Hampshire District Council, and one of the speakers, Mr Lionel Fanshawe, was known to him as a former parish councillor for Stroud, which was in the area served by Robert Mocatta as a District Councillor.

232. Andrew Shaxson declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 7 as one of the speakers, Ian Ellis, had acted in a professional manner on his behalf at a past appeal.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 DECEMBER 2020

233. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 10 December 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

234. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

235. There were none.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

236. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/20/03965/FUL - Newton Valence Farm

Unconfirmed Planning Committee Meeting Minutes to be approved at the next meeting

237. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave a verbal update that two further comments had been received, one from the Environmental Health Officer at East Hampshire District Council and the other from the Highways Officer at Hampshire County Council. The points raised in their comments were covered in the officer's presentation.
238. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Cllr Charles Louisson spoke against the application as East Hampshire District Councillor for the Ropley, Hawkley & Hangers ward;
 - Cllr Bob Fewings spoke against the application representing Newton Valence Parish Council;
 - Jon Fountain spoke in support of the application representing the applicant;
 - Lionel Fanshawe spoke in support of the application representing the applicant;
 - Ian Ellis spoke in support of the application as the agent representing the applicant.
239. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-27), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Could the Officer confirm the expected number of extra movements of traffic to and from the Upper Yard site over the course of a year?
 - Would there be any potential noise impact to the proposed 10 dwellings which had recently had planning permission approved for the nearby Lower Yard site in Newton Valence (SDNP/19/03160/OUT)?
 - Was it possible to include a condition restricting overnight use of the grain dryer, or to mitigate for low frequency noise?
 - How many vehicular passing places were there on Newton Lane?
 - Would the grain dryer be used only in the weeks following harvest?
 - Was HGV access restricted to the Upper Yard site? The junction of Newton Lane with the A32 displayed a sign prohibiting use for vehicles above 7.5tonnes in weight.
 - Clarification that the current A32 site could not be expanded into neighbouring fields owned by the farmer?
 - Had there been any discussions between the farm owner and the local community about the proposed development?
240. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- There would be an expected increase of 34 HGV movements a year to and from the Upper Yard site. However, there would be a reduction in other traffic movements, such as farm traffic, as they would no longer need to take grain to the A32 site.
 - The Noise Report had assessed any impact of noise on the 3 residential properties nearest the Upper Yard site. The recently approved application site of Lower Yard was further away from Upper Yard than the assessed dwellings, therefore officers had concluded that the impact of noise would not be any more significant than that which had been taken into account in the Noise Impact Assessment report, and there was no need for a further assessment.
 - The independent Noise Impact Assessment had also covered all issues raised about noise impact, including low frequency noise and noise at night. This had been reviewed by both SDNPA Officers and the Environmental Health Officer (EHO). The EHO was satisfied that the conditions were sufficiently robust, and there was no need for further conditions to mitigate noise at night, as the noise impact was within levels permitted by British Standards.
 - There were several vehicular passing places on Newton Lane.

Unconfirmed Planning Committee Meeting Minutes to be approved at the next meeting

- Whilst the Noise Report and the Planning Statement stated different timeframes for use of the grain dryer, the Environmental Health Officer was satisfied that the noise levels produced would not have a significant impact on living conditions of local properties. Therefore, longer periods of use of the grain dryer, regardless of the time of year, was acceptable.
 - Paragraph 8.27 of the officer's report explained that the Highways Authority had confirmed that, whilst there was a 7.5 tonne weight Traffic Regulation Order for the area, this restriction did not apply to HGVs used in connection with the transportation of goods to and from premises used for agriculture.
 - Evidence provided in the Whole Estate Plan indicated that land to the east of the A32 site was in the ownership of Newton Valence Farm and that fields to the north and south of the site were not in their ownership. It was the officer's view that there were several constraints that would make it difficult to expand to the east of the site. Officers reminded Members that, whilst planning policy required that the most suitable site should be sought, it was important to determine the application before them on its merits and against any harm it may cause.
 - Officers were not aware whether Newton Valence Farm had carried out any public consultation about the proposed development with the local community.
241. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The Committee recognised that modern facilities were essential for farmers, and that good storage facilities were important for ensuring consistent food supply throughout the year.
 - Some members expressed disappointment that the A32 site could not be expanded further, however it was recognised that the only option for that site would be to develop into greenfield land to the east of the current site, and that this would have a significant impact on the landscape compared to using the existing, working farm site at Upper Yard.
 - The Committee expressed further disappointment that there had been little communication with the local community and encouraged farms to keep an open dialogue, as communication with local communities was very important to their understanding of farming needs.
 - The inclusion of solar panels on the roofs was commended. It was further noted that the proposed landscaping scheme for this site would create wildlife corridors, and was not centred around the building itself. This wider planting would ensure an enhanced environmental benefit from this application.
 - Members debated the impact of traffic to and from the site. Whilst there was concern amongst some Members on the impact on the rural lanes, it was agreed that the extra movements were not considered excessive, bearing in mind that 2,000 tonnes of grain were already stored at this site, and that other farm vehicle movements would be reduced on the lanes.
 - On the issue of noise, the Committee was satisfied that the Environmental Health Officer had raised no objections, and that Environmental Health law on noise provided strong protection for local residents if there were any issues with the grain dryer being louder than claimed. Members agreed that an additional condition should be included to require that noise levels from the grain dryer should be reassessed after a reasonable length of time of normal operation, to ensure it was still within the required standards.
242. It was proposed that full permission, in accordance with the recommendation as set out in the Officers report, should be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of the officer's report, as amended in the Update Sheet, and subject to an additional condition relating to noise monitoring and assessment after the grain dryer has been in use for a reasonable period of time.

Unconfirmed Planning Committee Meeting Minutes to be approved at the next meeting

243. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of the officer's report, as amended in the Update Sheet, and subject to an additional condition relating to noise monitoring and assessment, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

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

244. The Chair notified Members that this application had been withdrawn by the Applicant.
245. The Chair closed the meeting at 11:48am.

CHAIR

Signed: _____