

**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 7,844m<sup>3</sup> 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: \_\_\_\_\_



**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**

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 7.5 tonnes 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.
  - 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.
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/19/03709/FUL - Oaklands Farm**

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: \_\_\_\_\_



## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE 11 February 21 January 2021**

Held: online via Zoom videoconferencing, at 10am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Janet Duncton, Thérèse Evans, Barbara Holyome, Diana van der Klugt, 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: David Easton (Development Management Lead), Rafael Grosso Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Sabrina Robinson (Monitoring and Compliance Officer – Minerals and Waste), Kirsten Williamson (Planning Policy Lead), Jack Trevelyan (Enforcement Officer) and Jessica Riches (Planning Officer).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

246. 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.

247. The Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.

248. 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**

249. Apologies were received from Gary Marsh.

### **ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

250. Vanessa Rowlands declared a public service, non-prejudicial interest in item 7, as she was a parish councillor for Cuckmere Valley Parish Council, which included the area of Cuckmere Haven that adjoined the application site.

251. The Chair declared a public service, non-prejudicial interest on behalf of all Members for item 9, as one of the speakers, Doug Jones, was a Member of the SDNPA and known to all Members of the Planning Committee.

252. Robert Mocatta declared a public service, non-prejudicial interest in item 9 as the East Hampshire District Councillor for East Meon and Buriton and as the Hampshire County Councillor for Petersfield Butser. He also declared a public service, non-prejudicial interest in item 10 as a Hampshire County Councillor.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 21 JANUARY 2021**

253. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 January 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

254. There were none.

## ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

255. The Director of Planning updated the Committee that a claim had been filed to seek a Judicial Review on SDNP/19/06035/FUL – Land South West of Woodcote Manor Cottages, Bramdean, which came before committee in December 2020.
256. The Development Manager updated the Committee that an appeal decision had been received for SDNP/18/05963/FUL Market Gardens in Fulking, which came before committee in February 2019.

## ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

257. There were none.

## ITEM 7: SDNP/20/02390/FUL - Coastguard Cottages

258. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave the following verbal updates:
  - There was a typographical error on the update sheet commenting on page 11 para 4.9. 'West Sussex Wildlife Trust - Objection' should read: '*Sussex Wildlife Trust – Objection*'
  - The officer's report referred to Mr Patrick as the applicant. However, whilst Mr Patrick was the treasurer of the Cuckmere Haven (SoS) charity, it was the charity that was the applicant not Mr Patrick.
  - Whilst all representations had been taken into account in the summary provided at item 5 of the officers reports, the numbers provided were incorrect, and should read: 227 letters in support and 7 letters of objection had been received. An online petition containing 4,044 signatories in support of the application had also been provided.
259. Janet Duncton joined the meeting and did not vote on this item.
260. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
  - Henri Brocklebank spoke against the application representing the Sussex Wildlife Trust;
  - Angela Marlow spoke against the application representing the representing Natural England;
  - Sir Alan Moses spoke in support of the application representing the Trustees of the Cuckmere Haven SOS charity;
  - Lucy Mutter spoke in support of the application representing the representing herself, and other residents of the Cuckmere (Coastguard) Cottages and the Cable Hut;
  - Michael Doyle spoke in support of the application as the agent representing the applicant.
261. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-29), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
  - What was the current rate of erosion of the cliff line and could this affect the cottages in the future if they were protected and the cliff line either side of them eroded?
  - Were the Coastguard Cottages listed buildings, as there had been no comment received from Historic England?
  - Was the application contrary to the Shoreline Management Plan?
  - Who would be responsible for overseeing the decommissioning of the sea defences at the end of its life in 2105?
262. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
  - The average rate of erosion was 60cm per annum, dependent on the weather in any given year, but this would be reduced with sea defences in place. Coastal erosion would be likely to take place outside of the sea defences. The section of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) which covered Seaford Head did not recognise the interventions that had already taken but drew a conclusion that cliff erosion would continue to provide a small source of sediment to beaches up to 2105. It predicted a loss of four residential properties and one commercial property.

- The Coastguard Cottages were not listed buildings but were considered to be non-designated heritage assets which contributed to the iconic view across the Cuckmere Haven and the Seven Sisters.
- The SMP did not comment specifically on the existing sea defences and did not provide a management plan for the existing sea defences.
- As there was currently no clear guide as to when the existing sea defences might fail, and no current management plan for them, this application sought to ensure that the sea defences would last until at least 2105, and provided an outline management plan for the existing defences. The proposal would allow time for a more permanent solution to be found, and for the existing defences to be decommissioned should a more permanent solution be found prior to the proposed end date.

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

- The decision for this application required a balanced judgement regarding the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area of this site, which were integral to the first statutory purpose of the National Park. Members considered whether a greater harm would occur in allowing or not allowing the application.
- The Committee recognised that the cottages were part of an iconic landscape in the South Downs National Park, and that the area also held important cultural heritage significance as a result of its maritime and military history.
- Members noted the considerable public support for this application.
- It was argued that the presence of the cottages in relation to this location made this view iconic and internationally recognised, and as such it was reasonable to continue to provide sea defences. However, a counter argument proposed that it was the coastline of the Seven Sisters that was iconic, irrespective of the cottages.
- Some members raised concern that, should sea defences continue to protect the cottages, they could end up on a defended peninsular with the coast around them eroded, and asked at what point should it be accepted that the properties cannot be defended further? It was the view of some of the Members of the Committee that this application could be deferring the difficult decision regarding the loss of the cottages, and that the current sea defence should have provided an opportunity to consider alternatives, such as moving the cottages.
- The effect of chalk erosion on wildlife was of great concern, especially with the current need to enhance biodiversity due to the climate crisis. Members debated whether greater harm would result from the loss of the cottages and erosion of the coast at this point if no action was taken to protect them, versus the potential harm from extending the sea defences.
- Members commended the officer on their report, which dealt with a very complex issue and clearly outlined the reasons for the officer recommendation.

264. It was proposed to vote on the officer's recommendation.

265. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in paragraph 10.1 of the officer's report.

#### **ITEM 8: SDNP/20/01796/FUL - Smugglers Copse**

266. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet and gave a verbal update that a third party objection letter had been received which was accompanied by a statement outlining concerns on the application's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The Case Officer also referred to a representation made by Rogate Parish Council with regards to the time in which the committee report was written, before the Parish Council's latest comments were received. The Case Officer reminded Members that the Rogate Parish Council representation did not raise any new material consideration that haven't been addressed in the report.

267. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Deirdre Walkling spoke against the application representing Rogate Parish Council;
  - David Campion spoke against the application representing himself;
  - Nick Jacobs spoke against the application representing himself;
  - James Shorten spoke in support of the application as the agent representing the applicant;
  - Gillie Tuite spoke in support of the application as the applicant;
  - Richard Bates spoke in support of the application representing himself.
268. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-30), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Slide 5 of the officer's presentation showed a map of the area indicating that it consisted of replanted ancient woodland. Could ancient woodland be replanted and was this relevant to this application?
  - The amendment to condition 6, as detailed in the update sheet, required 'no burning of waste at any time'. Could the officer clarify whether this included woodland waste, as a campfire was permitted on the site.
  - What were the red dots on the proposed site plan on slide 12 of the officer's presentation?
  - The fire and rescue service had requested that a fire hydrant should be provided on the site, however the officers report provided good reasons why this was disproportionate and not necessary. Would there be any legal implications by not having a hydrant on site if a fire were to occur?
  - Was condition 8 sufficient to ensure that there would be no future creep of parking into the adjoining woodland, and that the track remained a forest track?
269. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Replanted ancient woodland was a classification for the designation of ancient woodland, and suggested that it had been felled and replaced at an unknown point in the past. As it was likely to have occurred many years ago it was not considered relevant to this application.
  - The amended condition 6 referred to the burning of general, hazardous or polluting waste that would not be naturally found on this site. It did not include the natural by-products of woodland management.
  - On the proposed site plan (slide 12 of the officer's presentation), the larger red dot represented the only permitted campfire within the camp area. The smaller red dots related to trees on the site.
  - Members were reminded that it was important to make a proportionate decision, based on the size of the site and the conditions that had been recommended. Whilst members should take into account the response of the fire service, other regulatory matters would also need to be complied with. An amendment to condition 6 was proposed in order to explicitly control where a fire was allowed.
  - The applicant had confirmed that the track and designated parking areas, and their surfacing, would not be changed. Condition 8 stated that parking should only take place in a specific area, which will prevent encroachment into neighbouring woodland.
270. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The Committee agreed on the importance of managing woodlands, and that education in the countryside and development of rural skills was in keeping the SDNPA policies. The proposed conditions were considered proportionate and sufficient to control the activities on this fairly small site.

- Members noted concerns raised by objectors to the scheme regarding enforcement of the conditions. They emphasised the need for the conditions to be adhered to and for enforcement to take place if it was required.
  - It was proposed that a further condition should be included to require the applicants to provide information within a set timeframe detailing how the conditions were being met.
271. It was proposed that planning permission be granted subject to completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, and subject to a further amendment to the amended condition 6 in the update sheet, in order to explicitly control where a fire was allowed; and subject to the addition of a further condition requiring the applicants to provide information within a set timeframe to ensure that the conditions were being met, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
272. **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 that Smugglers Copse (as shown on the location plan in blue) is managed in accordance with the submitted Woodland Management Plan (January 2021) and adequately monitored for a minimum period of 10 years.
    - ii. The conditions as set out in paragraph 10.2 of this report, subject to a further amendment to condition 6 as set out in the update sheet to explicitly control where a fire was allowed, and the addition of a further condition to require the applicants to provide information within a set timeframe to ensure that the conditions were being met, the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
  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 11<sup>th</sup> February 2021 Planning Committee meeting.
273. Janet Duncton left the meeting.

**ITEM 9: SDNP/20/01535/FUL – Butser Hill Lime Works**

274. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
275. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Doug Jones spoke against the application representing Buriton Parish Council;
  - Tina Cuss spoke against the application representing Hampshire Countryside Service;
  - John Palmer spoke in support of the application as the agent representing the applicant.
276. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-31), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- How many car parking spaces would be provided? Would it be acceptable to require parking at the existing Queen Elizabeth Country Park (QECF) car park and only have provision for disabled parking on this site?
  - Could the number of vehicle movements to and from the site be reduced?
  - Were the highways conditions sufficient to protect cyclists using the new cycleway linking Petersfield to Queen Elizabeth Country Park (NCN 222,) which used the entrance road to this site, to ensure adequate segregation between cyclists and vehicles accessing the site? Could the Operational Management Plan detailed in condition 13 require details of segregation of cyclists from vehicular traffic?
  - Could conditions 27 and 28 be combined, and could Hampshire County Council be included in the community liaison group?
  - What would happen to the rest of site that was not in the applicant's ownership?

- This permission would bring forward the expiry date to 2024 from the existing expiry of 2042 in the extant permission. Would this signify a period of intensive extraction of chalk between now and 2024?
- Was the importation of soil as part of the restoration scheme the right decision, and what would happen if the site was left to regenerate naturally?

277. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The proposed car parking was considered to be modest in size and informal, with no delineated parking spaces. The car parking accorded with SDLP policies and Purpose 2 to enable people to access the Park, and officers considered it reasonable to provide parking on this site for visitors to access the lime kilns and habitats on this site. The site was at a significant distance from other parking facilities. However, should Members be minded not to permit the car parking at this stage the agent had agreed in writing that they were willing to remove the car parking from the scheme.
- There were currently no restrictions to vehicular movements on site and this application sought to limit the number of movements to and from the site. A weekly total of 750 HGVs in and 750 HGVs out of the site was considered reasonable to allow for the work required.
- Condition 17 required details of the proposed works for the protection and enhancement of the adjacent public rights of way and cycle routes to be submitted. This was additional to the requirement of condition 13 to provide a Highways and Rights of Way Operational Management Scheme. Condition 17 had been included separately in order to strengthen the protection of cyclists using the National Cycle Network route. Both the Operational Management Scheme and the details required by condition 17 would need to be submitted for approval by the SDNPA, who would consult both Highways England and Hampshire County Council (HCC) to ensure consistency and protection for cyclists using the cycle path.
- Conditions 27 and 28 were separate conditions which allow them to be enforced separately. Specific bodies, such as HCC, could not be listed in conditions, however officers agreed to recommend that the liaison group included HCC.
- The original extant permission dated from 1945 when it was common to stipulate 2042 as a standard expiry date on most quarry applications. This application proposed a more realistic date for the extraction of the chalk and a plan for restoration of the site by 2028.
- Whilst the modern view was to leave quarries to restore themselves naturally, the topography of this site made it different and it was not satisfactory to leave it to natural restoration. The infill and restoration was required to blend the site in with the adjoining land at QECP.

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

- Whilst it was recognised that this application would place some restrictions on the number of vehicle movements to and from the site, there was some concern on the number of HGV movements permitted each week and the risk to cyclists using the NCN 222 cycle path.
- The Committee stressed the need for a strong Aftercare Management Plan for the site.
- Members were divided on the need for car parking provision on the site. Whilst it was agreed necessary to provide disabled parking provision on the site, it was disputed whether the car park at QECP was considered a suitable alternative or whether it was too far from this site to encourage visitors once it had been restored. It was suggested that the issue of parking provision could be included in the Aftercare Management Plan for the site which was required by condition 31.
- It was recommended that the representation on the community engagement panel could be widened to include representatives from HCC and QECP.
- Members asked that the timeframe for condition 28 was brought forward to 9 or 6 months (not 12 months) in order to protect the lime kilns from further degradation.

279. It was proposed that the decision whether to grant planning permission should be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, and that planning permission, if granted, should be subject to the conditions in the report and the minor amendments to the conditions as listed in the update sheet, and addressing the points associated with car parking and protection of the kilns, which were raised in the member debate at the 11 February 2021 planning committee.

280. **RESOLVED:** That the decision whether to grant planning permission be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, and that planning permission, if granted, should be subject generally to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the officer's report and the update sheet, and addressing the points associated with car parking and protection of the kilns, which were raised during the member debate at the 11 February 2021 planning committee.

281. Ian Philips joined the meeting.

#### **ITEM 10: Hampshire Waste and Minerals Plan Review 2020**

282. The Planning Policy Lead presented the report and referred to the update sheet.

283. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-32) and requested clarification as follows:

- It was possible that a new recycling plan would be put forward for consultation in Hampshire in 2021. Would that delay the timetable for the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP)?
- Policy number 5 regarded restoration, which may not always be the right decision for a site. Should this policy be updated?

284. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The first stage of the plan would include gathering evidence and reviewing any strategies which were coming through. The Hampshire recycling plan would be picked up in this stage if it were to come forward within the next 6-12 months. The timetable put forward was realistically set to enable the Plan to be adopted in 2023.
- The management plan for any site would consider whether a site should be left alone or require work to reach an acceptable state. Leaving a site alone to restore naturally would still fall under banner of restoration, so policy 5 did not require modifying, however it was recognised that views on restoration were changing and it was hoped that the process of reviewing the HMWP would enable these views to be incorporated into the final plan.

285. The Chair asked if any member wished to object to, or abstain from, voting in favour of the officer's recommendation. No members raised an objection or wished to abstain.

286. **RESOLVED:** The Committee recommended that the National Park Authority:

1. Approve the 2020 Review of the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013)
2. Progress a partial update to the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan (2013) as indicated in the review document and the revised timetable (Appendices A and B)
3. Agree to the publication of a summary of the review process and the decisions on the Hampshire County Council website

#### **ITEM 11: Enforcement Update**

287. The Enforcement Officer presented the report and gave a verbal update that since the report was published, one appeal had been dismissed (APP/Y9507/C/20/3251190 Land east of Pony Farm, Findon) so there was 1 enforcement notice being appealed.

288. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Alan Glendinning spoke on the Enforcement update representing himself.

289. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-33) and made the following comments:

- The Committee noted the public speaker's comments.

- Members noted the large case load for a small team of enforcement officers, including an increased email workload during the period of lockdown due to covid-19.
- Members acknowledged that officers were working on a report to be able to include further details on the number of open cases as well as closed cases, and asked if future reports could also include figures for the host authorities in order that they could compare to them to the SDNPA figures.
- Communication with parish councils was considered important, and appreciated by parish councils as part of partnership working to report on enforcement matters.

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

**ITEM 12: Summary of Appeal Decisions Update**

291. The Planning Officer presented the report and gave a verbal update that on page 305 of the committee papers, Penn House (SDNP/19/03374/CND / APP/Y9507/W/20/3251448) was a planning committee decision by Winchester City Council, not the SDNPA.
292. There were no questions or comments from members.
293. **RESOLVED:** Members noted the outcome of appeal decisions.
294. The Chair closed the meeting at 3:30pm.

**CHAIR**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_