

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 10 June 2021 at Lewes Town Hall.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson, and Richard Waring

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

Also attended by: Vicki Colwell (Principal Planning Officer) Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Rafael Grosso Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Kevin Wright (Planning Policy Officer), Hannah Collier (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Jess Riches (Planning Officer), and Robin Parr (Head of Governance).

OPENING REMARKS

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

- The Planning Committee was not a public meeting; it was a meeting held in public. The purpose of the meeting was for the Committee members to listen to the officers' presentations and the public speakers before debating the issues and coming to a decision on the items on today's agenda.

390. The Chair reminded those present that:

- SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthered 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

391. Apologies were received from Diana Van Der Klugt, Thérèse Evans, and Gary Marsh.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

392. Richard Waring declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as a Lewes Town Councillor and a personal non-prejudicial interest as he was acquainted with one of the speakers, Councillor Andrew Ross.

393. Barbara Holyome declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 7 as she was acquainted with Peter Earl who was a former officer of the SDNPA.

394. Andrew Shaxson declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 9 as a member of Harting Parish Council and a personal non-prejudicial interest as he was acquainted with public speakers Sheila Brambly, the Ashby-Rudd family, and Mary Ball. Also a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 7 as he was acquainted with Peter Earl who was a former officer of the SDNPA

395. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 8 as a Hampshire County Councillor and East Hampshire District Councillor and a personal non-prejudicial interest as he was acquainted with one of the speakers, Councillor James Deane.

396. Alun Alesbury declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 7 as he was acquainted with Peter Earl who was a former officer of the SDNPA.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15 APRIL 2021

397. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 April 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

398. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

399. Officers provided an update on SDNP/20/01855/FUL – Land South of Heather Close, West Ashling, and confirmed that the S106 had been signed and the planning permission issued.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

400. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/19/06103/OUT – OLD MALLING FARM, LEWES

401. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content, referred to the update sheet, and provided a verbal update on a late representation received this morning by email from the South Downs Society, who raised dissatisfaction with the timing of additional comments being uploaded to the website, particularly those from East Sussex Highways confirming their objection was withdrawn and the viability appraisal which was no longer relevant as the development was now policy compliant in respect of affordable housing, which would be secured through the S106.

402. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Peter Calliafas spoke against the application on behalf of himself
- Peter Earl spoke against the application on behalf of Cycle Lewes
- Councillor Adrian Ross spoke against the application on behalf of the local residents
- Graham Beck spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Landowner
- David Jobbins spoke in support of the application as the Applicant

403. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-47) and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- How would the £1.7m be allocated and who would be responsible for the allocation and decisions on spending as referred to in Page 14 of the report? Also, how was the figure of £1.7m reached?
- Could the housing mix correspond more closely with the identified need in Lewes, rather than simply complying with the Neighbourhood Development Plan?
- How likely was the access to the railway cutting from the south east corner of the application site to happen and how much of a priority was this access?
- Who would receive the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)?
- How was the figure of 451 car parking spaces arrived at? It did not seem aligned with the aim of reducing car reliance with the average car space usage in Lewes of 0.9 per household. Could the figure of 451 be reduced?
- When will we receive further details on how the sustainability and zero carbon will be achieved and how would it be monitored?

404. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The suite of projects for which funding could be allocated would be further detailed in the S106 Agreement, the broad principles of which had been reached through consultation with the Local Highway Authority and Lewes District Council. Funds would be held by SDNPA as secured by S106 and it would be up to the SDNPA how this funding would be spent, based on the projects/objectives outlined in the S106 Agreement.
- The amount of £1.7m for was reached via a series of in-house conversations considering the cost and scope of the works for the infrastructure required.

- Paragraph 4.15 of the report referred to the housing need and included comments made by the Lewes Housing Officer. The Lewes District Housing Officer confirmed they were happy with the allocation provided and tenure split.
 - The south east access was a priority but its status as a local wildlife site needed to be taken into consideration when deciding the most acceptable access in this location. This was being discussed with Lewes District Council and the SDNPA Cycling Project Officer and would be included in the S106 Agreement along with improvements in the railway cutting.
 - Payment of CIL would come to the SDNPA with 25% going to Lewes Town Council; others (including the Local Education Authority and NHS) would have the opportunity to bid for projects for development in that area. Allocation of the SDNPA CIL was with this committee, subject to projects being put forward.
 - The design brief made provision of up to two parking spaces per dwelling, this was a shortfall of approximately 50 spaces on what was set out in accordance with the Parking SPD calculator. A variety of other mitigation measures were proposed as part of this. Full details of car parking would follow as part of the reserved matters.
 - The detail for sustainability and zero carbon would come forward in the Reserved Matters Application with only the principles being secured through the S106 at this point.
405. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Although this was an outline application local residents had raised a number of other matters that needed to be taken into consideration at the appropriate time.
 - When considering the full application car parking and road infrastructure would need careful consideration.
 - Members expressed concern over the central belt of trees which separated the site, which currently had no protection. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was suggested to ensure stronger control over what happened to the tree band in the future.
 - Members expressed concern about making a decision on access without further information on the south east access via the railway cutting. Members stressed the importance of providing an all-purpose, non-motorised access to the SE corner of the site, while seeking to respect local wildlife as far as practicable in that context.
 - A condition similar to Condition 14, should be included for the south east access. This would set the sequence of events in place and ensure construction was completed before the houses were occupied.
 - There was local support for ambitious, car free developments and if this development was made as car free as possible it could be a catalyst for similar in both future and surrounding developments.
406. Members were further advised:
- The south east access funding and delivery would be secured through the S106. Due to the local wildlife site status of the railway cutting, further consideration needed to be given to the most appropriate access and to balance the highways specification with the preservation, and where possible, enhancement of nature. If an appropriate access could not be agreed upon the matter would be brought back before Members.
 - The making of TPOs on the central belt of trees would be progressed by officers, should permission be granted.
 - In response to Members comments an additional condition would be included with regard to the securing of the south east access, prior to occupation.

407. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, subject to the changes in the update sheet and an additional condition to secure the access from the site to the railway cutting from the south east.

408. **RESOLVED:**

1. That outline planning permission be approved subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of report PC20/21-47, and the update sheet, and the inclusion of an additional condition relating to the south east access, the final form of wording which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, and subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement the detail of which were set out in the recommendation of Report PC20/21-47, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning; noting that account has been taken of the environmental information as required by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, all matters referred to in the Director of Planning's report including comments received from statutory consultees and other interested parties, and all other material considerations.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the legal agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 10 June 2021.

ITEM 8 – SDNP/20/05058/FUL – PARIS HOUSE, PETERSFIELD

409. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content, referred to the update sheet and provided the following verbal update on late representations from:

- Petersfield Town Council and the Petersfield Society which reiterated previous concerns which were addressed in the report
- Additional individual representations which were covered by the bullet points included in the update sheet and included concerns about the meeting being held in Lewes
- A late objection from First Plan on behalf of Waitrose and Partners which reiterated previous concerns, which were summarised in the report, plus further comments on the uncertainty of Covid-19 impacts on the town centre and how they could not be accurately quantified at this time, the impact on the town centre including reduced visitor numbers, reduced linked trips and loss of spend in the town centre.
- The committee was also advised that Aldi had circulated a brochure outlining the merits of the scheme amongst Members.

410. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Councillor James Dean spoke against the application representing Petersfield Town Council.
- Mr Dan Pannell from Aldi spoke in support of the application as the Applicant

411. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-48), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Where did delivery lorries drive around the building?
- How frequent were deliveries and what were the delivery times?
- Why were car parking spaces a different colour on the site plan?
- As new use classes were introduced in 2020, did the site become Class E at that point or did it retain its previous use class?
- What did the boundary consist of between the rear of the houses on Rushes Road and the proposed parking area, and would the boundary protect the gardens?
- As the delivery ramp was close to the boundary of the gardens in Rushes Road was an acoustic boundary treatment being installed to protect residents?

- Would the sequential test, outlined in paragraph 8.27, apply to all sites outside the town centre?
- How had policy RPI been considered and whether the proposals were contrary to the Development Plan?
- What effect new Class E had in relation to whether the development was contrary to the Development Plan?
- How was the marketing undertaken in relation to potential commercial uses including retail?
- Considering the allocation policy set out in the Petersfield NDP, was this application contrary to the development plan?

412. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The site layout plan showed the existing access is shared by customers and lorries. Delivery lorries would travel to the west side of the building and reverse into a service area, down a ramp which sloped downwards.
- The site retained its B2 and B8 uses but commercial use would now fall within Class E.
- The delivery times were detailed in paragraph 3.2 of the report, with times being later on Saturdays and reduced on Sundays and bank holidays. Paragraph 8.52 of the report provided details of the frequency of deliveries.
- Car parking spaces were proposed to be surfaced in a different material to the circulation space.
- Marketing was undertaken for the scope of commercial development and retail use was not separated out from this approach. The marketing was fairly broad in its approach. The application was submitted shortly after the Use Classes Order was amended.
- Aldi operated a Delivery Management Plan, which detailed how staff were to behave when a delivery took place, this can include provisions such as, for early and late deliveries, lorries not using their reversing audible beepers.
- The boundary on the western side had 2.4m fencing and there would be new native planting on the western boundary. Acoustic treatment along Rushes Road could be considered.
- Aldi looked at both town centre and edge of town centre sites within the sequential test considering the suitability and availability of alternative sites. The application site was the most appropriate as an edge of centre site readily accessible to the town centre.
- This proposal was not contrary to the Development Plan. Policies BP2 & SD35 sought to safeguard allocated sites, and marketing evidence had been submitted, scrutinised and was considered to be sufficient. Although the report indicated that the scheme didn't accord to RPI, which related to out of centre provision being limited to small scale retail development, it should be noted that the RPI policy in regard to retail only was now out of date in regard to the new use classes.

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

- There was concern that the applicant had not taken the Petersfield NDP into consideration.
- The creation of employment opportunities, was queried. Whether those jobs would be removed from other retailers in the town centre and if this was a missed opportunity to create further high quality jobs and employment, particularly considering the site's proximity to the A3. The site was a prime location for business uses.
- Condition 12 should be in perpetuity. If any planting was diseased or died it should be replaced at any time.

- Whilst the struggle trying to find a suitable location was appreciated, there was some concern as to whether this location was right for the development and for Petersfield town itself.
- There was also some concern over the economic viability and adverse impacts on the town centre.
- Disappointment was expressed with regard to the changes to the use classes which amalgamated retail with other commercial uses. By doing so this meant retail was being considered as business use and as an employment generator. But more flexibility in changing uses had been the direction of travel within Government.
- The following amended or additional conditions should be considered for this application:
 1. An amendment to Condition 12 extending the 5 years to become in perpetuity in the event that any planting became diseased or died at any time.
 2. An additional condition to require acoustic fencing along the Rushes Road boundary adjacent to the service area, to protect residents.
 3. An additional condition that Aldi operate in compliance with a Delivery Management Plan for deliveries.

414. Members were further advised:

- Concerning viability, while consultants had advised there could be some trade dilution, with a possible 8% drop for some stores, this was not considered a significantly adverse impact.

415. It was proposed and second to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the update sheet, amending Condition 12 so that 5 years became in perpetuity and two additional conditions requiring acoustic fencing along the Rushes Road boundary adjacent to the service area and requiring that Aldi operate in accordance with a Delivery Management Plan.

416. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:

1. The completion of a legal agreement to secure the following, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning:
 - Travel Plan for the operational management of the site and monitoring fees.
 - Off-site highways works on Frenchmans Road and at the junction of Frenchmans Road and Winchester Road.
2. The conditions as set out in paragraph 10.2 of report PC20/21-48 and the update sheet, the amendment of condition 12 to make it in perpetuity, and the inclusion of two additional conditions on acoustic fencing and the operation of a Delivery Management Plan, the final form of wording which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
3. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the S106 Agreement is not completed or satisfactory progress is not being made within 6 months of the 10 June 2021 Planning Committee meeting.

ITEM 9: SDNP/20/05627/FUL – LAND AND BUILDING SOUTH OF CLAREFIELD COPSE, NYEWOOD

417. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content, referred to the update sheet and provided a verbal update on two corrections in the report, within the proposal description and Condition 10.

418. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Sheila Bramley spoke against the application on behalf of Harting Parish Council
- Simon Ashby-Rudd spoke against the application on behalf of himself

- Mary Ball spoke against the application. A statement was read out on behalf of Mary Ball by Simon Ashby-Rudd
 - Angus Sprackling spoke in support of the application as the Applicant
419. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-49), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Would other areas of ownership have the same permitted development rights?
 - Had electric cars/bikes and parking charges been taken into consideration?
 - Further to the five month permitted period of application, could permitted development rights be relied upon for the remaining seven months of the year?
 - What was the justification for the expanded hardstanding parking?
 - Whilst cars were expected to park on hardstanding, there was no indication of the route for transporting goods from the parking to the campsite.
 - Could the location of the amenity block be confirmed as the detailed map in the report showed the amenity block in front of the cottage? However, the update provided on 11 May showed the amenity block to side of the cottage.
 - The current access to the site was the north east corner of Clarefield Copse. Would this remain an access to the campsite?
 - Had any residents complained to Environmental Health? If so, why had Environmental Health not commented?
 - Were campervans and/or caravans allowed on the campsite?
 - Was extending the parking area, further south of the area of rubble included in the application?
420. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Condition 15 restricted the permitted development rights to all land within the ownership of the applicant within the application site and adjacent fields.
 - As this was a low-key development of an off-grid nature there was no plan to provide charging points as no electricity was provided to the camping area. It was also considered disproportionate to require EV charging points to a small scale seasonal development.
 - Restrictions as part of this application would apply all year round.
 - The parking for 50 vehicles was considered appropriate given the car park served not only the campsite, but was also shared with other users.
 - A walking route from the parking area to the field was already in existence. There was to be no vehicular access to the field.
 - The revised site plan showed the proposed amenity hut in the correct location. The drawing would be amended as it currently also included the pre-existing amenity hut. It should be noted that the amenity hut was of a temporary nature and would be removed at the end of each season. Additionally, details of specific locations of items were required to complete the detailed location plans.
 - Although the North East corner of Clarefield Copse was currently an access to the campsite, as part of this application access was expected to be from the track access at Dumpford Lane that would lead to the car park.
 - This application was discussed with Environmental Health at Chichester District Council who did not bring up any history of complaints or issues previously raised.
 - No campervans or caravans were allowed on the site. Additionally there was a condition advising that sleeping in vehicles was prohibited.

- It was understood that the parking area was being redefined within its own limits, including the banks, rather than extending to encroach into the countryside.
421. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments.
- Concern was expressed about enforcement of conditions and how they could be monitored, particularly as there seemed to be issues on site at the moment, as raised by the local community.
 - There was concern about the low number of lavatories and shower facilities on site.
 - Whether there should be additional conditions to ensure the manager of the site is resident at the stockman's dwelling, and to ensure the 2m boundary fence is erected and maintained.
 - The old site access should be closed up.
 - There was insufficient detail on the management of the fields and boundaries and how this would enhance the landscape character and wildlife.
 - In order to minimise impact on the environment electric transport should be encouraged and should be included in the application.
 - A temporary permission could be a satisfactory compromise which would enable any impacts to be assessed.
422. Members were advised:
- In order to monitor the potential impacts of the scheme a temporary permission could be granted, until October 2024 to enable monitoring to take place. Any temporary permission should include a requirement for a travel plan and operational plan for the site.
423. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the grant of planning permission for a temporary period until October 2024 subject to the conditions set out in the report and update sheet..
424. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted on a temporary basis, until the last day in October 2024, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of report PC20/21-49, the Update Sheet and the requirement for a travel plan and monitoring operational plan, the final form of wording of the conditions and permission which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
425. The Chair informed the meeting that the agenda would be reordered and that Agenda Item 11 would be taken next.

ITEM 11: MAKING OF THE BOXGROVE, BRAMBER, HENFIELD, UPPER BEEDING AND STEDHAM WITH IPING NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLANS

422. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report.
427. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-51).
428. Members commended the parishes for their efforts in the making of these plans.
429. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved to:
1. Note the outcomes of the Boxgrove, Bramber, Henfield, Upper Beeding and Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Development Plan Referendums;
 2. Agree to make the Boxgrove, Bramber, Henfield and Upper Beeding Neighbourhood Development Plans part of the Development Plan for that part of the Parishes within the South Downs National Park.
 3. Agree to make the Stedham with Iping Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan for the parish of Stedham with Iping.
430. Janet Duncton left the meeting.

431. The chair informed the committee that this meeting of the Planning Committee was no longer quorate and that standing orders stated that at the discretion of the Chair the meeting could continue but would not make any decisions, therefore Agenda Item 10 would stand adjourned to the next meeting of the Planning Committee.

ITEM 12: Summary of Appeal Decisions

432. The Planning Officer presented the report. The committee was also informed that Judicial Reviews (JRs) were now being recorded through this report, however, as applications following a JR were often live applications no discussion on them should be entered into at the meeting.
433. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-52) and requested clarification as follows:
- Appeal 8422 Market Garden Caravan Site, was the reason(s) known why this application was turned down?
434. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- There was concern around local concentration and visual impact.
435. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions.
436. The Chair closed the meeting at 15.50

CHAIR

Signed: _____

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 12 August 2021, at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker (Chair), Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Andrew Shaxson, Thérèse Evans, Diana Van De Klugt and Richard Waring

Officers: Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects & Performance Manager) Katie Kam (Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer), and Sharon Libby (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Rafael Grosso Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Jane Rarok (Major Planning Projects), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Stella New, (Senior Development Management Officer), Kevin Wright (Planning Policy Officer), Amy Tyler-Jones (Senior Planning Officer) and Chris Paterson (Planning Policy Lead).

OPENING REMARKS

1. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that:
 - SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthered 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

2. Apologies were received from Vanessa Rowlands

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

3. Thérèse Evans declared a public service interest as a Winchester City Councillor in Agenda Items 7 and 9.
4. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest as an East Hampshire District Councillor and a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 10 as he was acquainted with public speakers Councillor James Dean and Mr Gethan Morgan-Owen.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15 APRIL 2021

5. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 10 June 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

6. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

7. The Planning Policy Manager provided updates on:
 - The revised National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) which was published on 21 July 2021. An important change to paragraph 176 of the NPPF was highlighted for Members that development within the setting of a designated area namely National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. All officer reports for this Planning Committee had been updated accordingly.
 - The recent Dunford House appeal decision which was important for the cultural heritage of the National Park. The appeal was allowed for listed building consent but was dismissed for planning permission as it was a community facility and evidence of a robust marketing campaign had not been provided.
 - Members queried the committee's consideration of Judicial Review decisions following the receipt of an email on the subject from a member of the public. Officers advised

that Judicial Review decisions were already reported to Planning Committee on a quarterly basis and that an officer response to the email would be sent.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

8. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/20/01712/FUL - UNIT 3, MORESTEAD FARM, MORESTEAD

9. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
10. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Councillor Susan Cook spoke against the application as Councillor for Colden Common & Twyford Ward
 - Philip Kratz spoke against the application on behalf of neighbouring occupants and landowners (Chris Gordon Racing Stables & Anglozett)
 - Christopher Gordon spoke against the application on behalf of Chris Gordon Racing Stables
 - Thomas Roberts spoke in support of the application, on behalf of the Applicant.
11. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC21/22-01) and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- What had been in place along the boundary prior to the concrete blocks being installed?
 - The plan highlighted that the red line covered the site boundary and access road. What was the ownership of the rest of the site?
 - The Landscape Officer had a holding objection. Did that still stand or had it changed?
 - The proposed change was for Class B2 Use for waste management purposes and the application specifically referred to soil cleaning and concrete crushing. Did the Class B2 Use also include Hazardous Waste?
 - Was planning permission required for the physical works already undertaken?
 - Paragraph 3.4 of the report referred to the use of the concrete crusher, which would create the majority of the dust. If the application was approved, could it be imposed by condition that use of the concrete crusher was limited?
12. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Officers were not aware of what was in place before the concrete blocks were installed, as they were in place at the time of the application and subsequent site visit and there was no evidence of the boundary.
 - Ownership of the site had been investigated through the Land Registry who confirmed that the whole scrapyard was under the same ownership, and therefore a blue line should have been included on the application to confirm ownership.
 - The holding objection by the Landscape Officer was still in place.
 - Hazardous Waste was not included in the Waste Management Plan submitted with the application.
 - It was confirmed that the physical works required planning permission.
 - A condition could be considered limiting the use of the concrete crusher. The application stated that the use of the concrete crusher would be limited to five hours per week.
13. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:

- Whilst the proposed shorter hours of use of the concrete crusher were beneficial, it should be noted that the Authority currently had no way to regulate any noise that may be created under the site's current permission.
- Although the opinion of Environmental Health was that any dust issues could be controlled we have heard today that this would not be possible, particularly in the case of particulate matter.
- There was inadequate evidence that the application supported policies SD2 or SD9. This was a significant change of use of the scrapyards and there were too many barriers in terms of policy to overcome to demonstrate its suitability.
- It was feasible that an appropriate solution for a crushing site could be devised, which was no worse than its current permitted use. However, as a robust Dust Management Plan had not been provided as part of the application it could not currently be supported.
- Policy 29 in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan stated that the proposal should be compatible with the setting, however, this was not the case. Concern was expressed that Policy 29 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan was not referenced in the reasons for refusal, and it was requested that it was included.

14. Members were further advised:

- The scrapyards' current use was different to the use that had been proposed in this application and therefore the implications were different, specifically the creation of dust, which had not been identified in the original use.
- The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Policy 29 stated that development should be of a scale compatible with the setting. The size of the application site and amount of waste process was not considered sufficient to say it would be incompatible with regards to scale and that was why it should not be included in the reasons for refusal.

15. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.

16. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC21/22-01.

ITEM 8: SDNP/20/05236/FUL - LAND ADJOINING THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE A27

17. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content, referred to the update sheet, and gave a verbal update on biodiversity net gain which, when the offsite enhancements and mitigation were included, was circa 94%.

18. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Bill Freeman spoke against the application on behalf of Adur Residents Environmental Action & Lancing Manor South East Residents Network
- Bill Freeman read a statement on behalf of Bill Brock against the application on behalf of Coombes Road Businesses & Residents Group
- David Johnson spoke against the application on behalf of CPRE Sussex
- Councillor Carson Albury spoke in support of the application as Councillor for Manor Ward
- Dominic Oliver spoke in support of the application on behalf of Lancing College
- Mark Milling spoke in support of the application on behalf of Lancing College

19. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC21/22-02), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- With regards to the challenges faced by Non-Motorised Users (NMUs):
 - How were NMU's currently crossing the road at the Coombes Road/A27 traffic lights which were known as "the Sussex Pad"

- Once the traffic lights were removed how would NMU's cross the A27?
 - If approved how would this application benefit NMU's?
 - Is it thought that if the application was approved that Coombes Road from South to North would be used as a rat run up to Steyning?
 - Had traffic surveys been conducted, and if so, had the surveys included what the projected use of the new stretch of road would be when compared with its current use?
 - Was the crossing at the roundabout to be at grade and traffic light assisted, and was this different to what had already been permitted?
20. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The current crossing of the A27 at the Sussex Pad was by traffic light. When consent was granted to remove the Sussex Pad traffic lights provision for crossing by traffic light was made at the new three arm roundabout. Additionally consent was granted for a new link for cyclists, equestrian users and walkers along the northern side of the A27 which then dropped south along the west bank of River Adur. It was considered that there was a moderate benefit to NMU's as part of this application by the closure and landscaping of Coombes Road (East).
 - Paragraph 7.60 of the report referred to the concern of Coombes Road being a rat-run towards Steyning. The application was to relocate access from Coombes Road to a fourth arm on the roundabout. The design of the road was in a rural context and therefore it was not considered likely to be used as a rat run.
 - Paragraph 7.60 of the report referred to the data of vehicles used during commuting hours. Traffic modelling had been undertaken and the application was supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Highways England and Local Highways Authority were satisfied with the traffic data submitted.
 - The crossing itself was no different than that already permitted, which was at grade and traffic light assisted. The only change resulting from this application was that the fourth arm would carry the pedestrian link, rather than it running adjacent to the A27.
21. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- It was acknowledged that the NMU routes would be made marginally safer due to the closure of Coombes Road east to vehicular traffic.
 - It was considered extremely unlikely that this route would be used as a rat run.
 - The confirmation about access to the South Downs National Park and that there would be a traffic light controlled crossing at the new roundabout alleviated concerns for NMU's.
 - The original A27 scheme was reviewed in detail and the scheme to remove the traffic lights addressed the issue well. Concern was expressed about the need for this development and, whilst the need for Lancing College was important, their need did not necessarily satisfy the thirteen other local businesses.
 - Concern was expressed about the business objections towards the application.
22. Members were further advised:
- It was not required in development plan policy to demonstrate the need for this development and it was not considered a major development for the purposes of the NPPF. Through EIA regulations the applicant had demonstrated reasonable alternatives. The decision in this instance should be made on the planning balance of benefits and disbenefits..
23. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the update sheet.

24. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Section 10 of this report and subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning with obligations relating to:

- 1) The provision of species rich grassland/wild flower planting enhancements for a period of 30 years at land to the north of the site at Hoe Court Farm to include the provision of off-site reptile mitigation and an appropriate habitat management plan;
- 2) Deed of Variation to S106 agreement secured under SDNP/18/00434/FUL to reflect the amendments proposed to Coombes Road (east) junction with the A27 (stopped up, landscaping) and to ensure all other obligations within that agreement are secured.

and note that the Committee confirm in their decision that they have taken into account:

- 3) the environmental information as required by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;
- 4) all matters referred to in the Director of Planning's report including comments received from statutory consultees and other interested parties, and;
- 5) all other material considerations

That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the S106 and Deed of Variation are not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 12 August 2021.

ITEM 9: SDNP/19/06161/FUL – MARWELL ACTIVITY CENTRE

25. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet. A verbal update was also given on comments from the Dark Night Skies Officer who raised no objection subject to Condition 17 in the report related to lighting and additional comments which were received from the Highways Authority in response to Owslebury Parish Council's concerns regarding highway safety.

26. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Councillor John Foster spoke against the application on behalf of Owslebury Parish Council.
- Kim Blunt spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Applicant
- Digby Cooper spoke in support of the application as the Applicant

27. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-03), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Was it correct that the application was for the use of land and not the erection of buildings? Were officers satisfied that the lodges were similar to caravans, rather than buildings that required planning permission?
- How was Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) determined on this application and what were the permitted development rights?
- Could a condition be included for white lines and a STOP sign for the access/exit road or would this have to be done by the Highways Authority?
- Paragraph 3.3 of the report referred to one large car park. How did users gain access to the lodges with luggage etc.?
- As a 19% CO2 reduction improvement was required by SD48, if the lodges were not compliant could a condition be included?
- Was there a condition in place to manage noise from the site?
- Paragraph 3.9 of the report stated that "... the timber used for their construction would be UK sourced where possible" and that electric vehicle charging points were "proposed". Could this be more definitive?

- In regard to the wording of the recommendation, was permission being granted by the committee or was it being delegated depending on the response from Natural England on the matter of an acceptable foul water strategy?
- What were the implications if the site was not completed as a whole?
- Was it considered that the scheme met criterion G of policy SD23 of the South Downs Local Plan in terms of whether it would make a positive contribution (part g(i) of the policy)? If not, did this application set a precedent for future applications?

28. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Due to the nature of the construction and how they would be placed on the ground they were considered a structure as opposed to a building. They also fell within the Caravan Act, hence the application for the use of land was correct.
- Given the structures were technically moveable they would not be liable for CIL.
- As these were not dwellings they would not benefit from permitted development rights in the same way, e.g. extensions and outbuildings. A condition to control permitted development rights with regard to enclosures was in the report.
- From the communal car park, there was a narrow access, wide enough for buggies etc. and the activity centre could help to transport luggage to the lodges if needed.
- The Highways Authority did not object to the lack of road markings, however, as this was on the edge of the red lined area there was scope for this to be included as a condition.
- Although this application fell slightly short of Policy SD48, given the wooded character of the site, the technical advice received indicated that other solutions were not feasible at this location. This should also be balanced with the wider benefits of the application. There was an ambition to have a centralised photovoltaic array at the park in the future which would contribute to meeting SD48 requirements concerning energy.
- Noise management at the site would be addressed through a Site Management Plan as part of Condition 5(a).
- Condition 6 referred to resourcing of materials, and while detailed information was not included here, the supporting information as part of the decision notice would include this. The condition could be amended should Members consider it necessary. Additionally, Condition 19 related to Electric Vehicle Charging points and ensured that a minimum of four points would be included.
- The committee would be resolving to grant planning permission subject to the advice from Natural England and any further obligations or conditions that they may wish to impose. The grant or refusal of planning permission following receipt of this advice from Natural England was ultimately delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
- It was expected that the landscape framework would be in place as a minimum. A scheme of this size may be phased, and requirements of the conditions would help to ensure the scheme was completed.
- Officers were content that the application did comply with Policy SD23 of the South Downs Local Plan and that no precedent had been set for future applications. The scheme would also make a positive contribution in line with policy SD23(g)(i).

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

- The pandemic had increased the demand for UK Holidays. The site seemed well managed and professionally run with minimal noise.
- It would be good if white lines could be added at the entrance to aid the safe movement of traffic and address local concerns.

- Concern that some conditions appeared to relate more to buildings rather than use of the land as per the application description.
 - The site encouraged people into the National Park. It was important that conditions 3 and 4 were monitored to ensure duration of stay did not expire beyond that specified.
 - The campsite was well established and this was an excellent landscape led design. With the changes in permitted development rights (–e.g. 56 day use of land for camping) competition had increased and the site needed to survive.
 - The sustainability of materials was embedded into Condition 6.
30. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation subject to the inclusion of an additional condition for white lines and a STOP sign at the entrance/exit of the access road, and an amendment to condition 6 in relation to sourcing of materials following Members comments on the matter.
31. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
- 1) Receipt and consideration of further advice from Natural England by the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
 - 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to grant planning permission with any amended or additional conditions, or obligation, consequent to Natural England’s advice. Or, to refuse Planning Permission if it is determined that an acceptable foul water strategy cannot be achieved.
 - 3) The conditions as set out in paragraph 10.2 of report PC 21/22-03.
 - 4) An additional condition on the inclusion of white lines and a STOP sign at the entrance/exit of the access road within the red line of the application site, and the amendment to condition 6 in relation to the sourcing of materials, the final form of wording which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

ITEM 10: SDNP/20/05682/CND - VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING APPROVAL SDNP/15/06484/FUL

32. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content, and referred to the update sheet.
33. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Councillor James Deane spoke against the application on behalf of Petersfield Town Council
 - Gethin Morgan-Owen spoke against the application representing himself
 - Patrick Barry spoke in support of the application representing the Applicant
34. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-04), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was the temporary footpath put in unilaterally or with the Officer’s express knowledge?
 - Significant concerns were expressed about the footpath at the entrance to the site. Were all options considered for this layout?
 - Could wording be included with conditions 22 and 23 so that the conditions would be implemented prior to construction work starting?
 - Could the conditions also include consultation with all interested parties?
 - Could the path be placed on the north side of the access, which would then avoid the need for pedestrians to cross the carriageway?
35. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The temporary footpath was implemented without Officer’s knowledge.

- A number of alternative routes for the temporary path had been suggested by third parties and the Petersfield place-making group had a long term aspiration for a link with a route along Tilmore Brook.
 - Condition 23 asked for details for a suitable footpath, which could be amended to include wording requiring the existing temporary footpath to be removed within a specified period of time.
 - During the process of discharging condition 23, which required the provision of an appropriate temporary path, officers would also consult with appropriate third parties with regard to siting.
 - As development had already commenced, pre-commencement would not be appropriate for condition 22. The time periods set out for this condition were considered appropriate, however, a clear timetable for the implementation of the permanent shared path could be sought along with a time period within which the temporary path would also be removed.
 - It was advised that moving the legal line of an adopted right of way and the path to north side was an involved undertaking and would also require a new full planning application.
36. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments.
- During the construction phase, it was requested that a banksman was required at the entrance to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
 - The cycleway/footpath was heavily used and there was a potential for conflict during construction. A footpath the other side would not resolve the issue during the construction period.
 - The track was frequently used by cyclists which was encouraged by national and local policies. The entrance to the site was a problem which needed to be addressed.
 - The introduction of a Banksman during the temporary construction period was considered satisfactory. Once the development was completed, traffic was unlikely to be an issue.
 - A risk of conflict between vehicle and cyclist remained at the crossover.
 - Traffic calming in condition 22 should be significant, not just a road hump.
 - Both vehicle drivers and cyclists were responsible for safety when using the road/path.
 - As a result of a discussion it was proposed that condition 23 be amended to secure the removal of the temporary footpath within a period of time (2-4 months) and a further condition added to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists during construction
 - The committee was content with the traffic situation when the original planning application was considered.
 - The new Highway Code had changed priorities for traffic on UK roads. It was suggested that Officers went back to the Highways Authorities and checked that this road was compliant with the new Highway Code. If not, it was requested that a crossing point be installed for cyclists and cyclists be given priority.
 - As planning permission was given irrespective of land ownership, and permission had been granted for a path on the south side, why was planning permission now being sought for a path on the north side?
37. Members were further advised:
- Although the approved construction management plan ensured onsite supervision, a further condition could be included to secure further safety measures at the entrance to the site, which should include a banksman.

- Caution should be taken as there was no objection from the Highways Authority to the proposal. Also, it was understood that the amended Highway Code would be published later in 2021.
 - While planning permission can be granted on land not owned by the applicant, the lack of any third party agreement required an amendment to the permission
38. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to:
- the conditions in the update sheet and at appendix I of the update sheet
 - the amendment of condition 23 to include the removal of the temporary footpath within a period of four months; and
 - an additional condition requiring a further Construction Management Plan which secured safety measures at the entrance to the site.
39. **RESOLVED:**
- 1) That planning permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the update sheet, and appendix I of the update sheet, and subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation linking this variation application to the original permission and to the already secured S106 agreement with its obligations relating to:
 - A provision of 34 dwellings (40%) on site for affordable housing;
 - A contribution of £44,511 towards Public Open Space;
 - A contribution of £300,670 towards Highways Infrastructure;
 - A contribution of £103,920 towards Community Facilities;
 - A contribution of £66,493 towards employment opportunities (if requirements set out in the Agreement to provide on-site construction jobs are not met);
 - A contribution of £21,250 towards a community project worker.
 - 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application, with appropriate reasons if the Deed of Variation is not completed or substantial progress has not been made within 3 months of the 12 August 2021 Planning Committee meeting.
 - 3) That condition 23 be amended to include the removal of the existing temporary footpath within a period of four months, and that a condition be added requiring a further Construction Management Plan which secured safety measures at the entrance to the site, and that the final form of wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
40. Gary Marsh and Richard Waring left the meeting @ 14:25

ITEM 11: REVIEW OF SDNPA STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

41. The Planning Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
42. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-05) and requested clarification as follows:
- Engagement and consultation arrangements with Town and Parish Councils were agreed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the County Level Associations of Local Councils and the Authority. Should the MOU be amended, especially as it stated there were two meetings per year and now there were three, which included the webinar?
 - There was a concern that pre-applications had been missed when considering applications and that matters agreed at pre-app were not being considered when the application came forward.

- Concern had been expressed by Cheriton, Selbourne and Worldham Parish Councils that they had not been consulted on the changes. Should Parish Councils be consulted more frequently?
43. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- It was agreed that it would be considered whether the MOU needed to be reviewed and updated.
 - Officers were unaware of any pre-applications being missed. The Authority strived to ensure continuity of officers between pre-app and application but it was not always possible. Pre-application advice was a material consideration when an application came forward, but new considerations may come up when the application is considered.
44. Members were advised:
- That the importance of communicating with Parish Councils was acknowledged. In the case of this document, the changes were mainly factual and related to legislation and policy, so even if Parish Councils had commented on them the Authority would not have been in a position to make any amendments. Therefore, consultation was not appropriate in this case.
 - Any further minor changes were to be emailed to officers to be incorporated into the document.
45. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the report and the update sheet.
46. **RESOLVED:** The committee resolved to:
- 1) Approve the SDNPA Statement of Community Involvement (Version 4) 2021 subject to any changes agreed to Planning Committee: and
 - 2) Agree that further minor amendments may be made by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee

ITEM 12: MAKING OF THE ROGATE AND RAKE, WESTBOURNE AND UPDATED ALDINGBOURNE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLANS

47. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report
48. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-06) and requested clarification as follows:
- Natural England had advised Southern Water there had been issues providing water in some areas and consequently some Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs) had been suspended. Was that the case?
49. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Officers were aware of water issues and were working with Natural England on the issue, however, NDPs continued to be progressed.
50. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved to:
- 1) Note the outcomes of the Rogate and Rake and Westbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan Referendums;
 - 2) Agree to make the Westbourne and updated Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Development Plans part of the Development Plan for that part of the Parish within the South Downs National Park.
 - 3) Agree to make the Rogate and Rake Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan for the parish of Rogate and Rake.

ITEM 13: HALF YEAR UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING

51. The Planning Policy Lead presented the report

52. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-07) and made the following comments:
- Concern was expressed, following the Planning White Paper, on what the way forward was for Neighbourhood Planning.
 - The turn out for the Rogate referendum was disappointing with less than 20% when other areas had 40%.
 - Page 358, Table 1 reported that Sheet and Singleton NDPs has been abandoned. Could this be clarified?
53. Members were advised:
- The Planning White Paper had made a number of proposals related to Neighbourhood Planning, including a proposal for Neighbourhood Plans to focus only on design which was disappointing. The Government's intentions were expected to be made clearer later in 2021.
 - If a referendum vote was held on the same day as other elections then numbers were usually higher. Turnout can also be impacted by poor weather.
 - Sheet and Singleton were designated for Neighbourhood Planning but made the decision not to progress the development of their plans, hence why they were recorded as being abandoned.
54. **RESOLVED:** The committee resolved to note the progress to date on the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans across the National Park.
55. The Chair closed the meeting at 2.58pm.

CHAIR

Signed: _____

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 9 September 2021 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), Barbara Holyome, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Andrew Shaxson, Thérèse Evans, Diana Van De Klugt and Richard Waring

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer), and Sharon Libby (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Graeme Felstead (Development Management), Stella New, (Senior Development Management Officer), Vicki Colwell (Principal Planning Officer), Kevin Wright (Planning Policy Officer), Kirsten Williamson (Planning Policy Lead), Chris Paterson (Planning Policy Lead), Jessica Riches (Planning Officer), and Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead).

OPENING REMARKS

56. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthered 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

57. Apologies were received from Alun Alesbury and Janet Duncton.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

58. Diana van der Klugt declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 9 as a Horsham District Councillor.
59. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as an East Hampshire District Councillor and a personal-non prejudicial interest as he was acquainted with one of the speakers, Councillor David Ashcroft.
60. Barbara Holyome declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 7 as she was acquainted with one of the speakers, Councillor David Ashcroft.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 AUGUST 2021

61. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 August 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

62. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

63. SDNP/19/03160/OUT – Lower Yard, Selborne Road, Newton Valence June 2020 was subject to a complex legal agreement which had now been agreed and the decision was issued on 20 August 2021.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

64. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/20/04118/FUL – QUEEN'S HOTEL SELBORNE

65. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet. Additionally the Case Officer advised the Committee that further comments had been received from the Sustainable Economy Officer with no

objections, and from the Landscape Officer with a holding objection, but it was considered the objections could be overcome through conditions.

66. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Councillor Joanna Clay spoke against the application as a Selborne Parish Councillor.
 - Geraldine Dawson spoke against the application on behalf of Community Interest Group "Save the Queens".
 - Andrew Roberts spoke against the application representing himself.
 - Councillor David Ashcroft spoke in support of the application as an East Hampshire District Councillor for Binsted, Bentley & Selborne Ward.
 - Wendy Megeney spoke in support of the application representing herself.
 - Khalid Aziz spoke in support of the application on behalf of Gilbert Whites & Oates Collections.
67. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-08), the updates, and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- The Update Sheet referred to a 99 year lease for the ground floor, with the option of a five year break, what would happen if Gilbert White Museum used the five year break option?
 - Could it be confirmed, in accordance with SD43(c) that prior local community engagement had taken place?
 - Was the link between the hospitality units and the museum supported by a condition?
 - A public speaker mentioned that this was an Asset of Community Value but had been previously refused recognition by East Hampshire District Council, could the detail be clarified?
 - Had a robust marketing campaign been conducted under SD43 2a?
 - Did the Committee have the authority to issue a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) as suggested by one of the speakers?
 - The recommendation stated that planning permission be granted subject to a Legal Agreement agreeing "The use of the Queens Hotel tied to the Gilbert White Museum and the Wider Community". How would this be tied to the wider community?
 - When the Field Study Centre was used for pupils, it was assumed that parking would be required for school transport, did the facility have sufficient parking space?
 - Was the tourist accommodation first come first served, or did the public have to wait to see if Gilbert Whites had a pending engagement?
68. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The Business Plan referred to the five year break itself only, with no further detail. If the applicant exercised the five year break the legal agreement would have to be revisited.
 - Engagement took place in the form of a leaflet drop with online updates and a facebook group with responses had been completed. These were considered prior to the application being submitted.
 - The detail surrounding the Asset of Community Value being refused was not known. However, it was confirmed that the Queens Hotel was not recognised by East Hampshire District Council as an Asset of Community Value.
 - A marketing campaign was not requested, nor conducted as the proposal was considered to satisfy policies SD23 & SD43 as officers considered there was no loss of, or an unacceptable impact upon community facilities given what was proposed was

considered to be of equivalent or better quality than that existing as commented on in paragraphs 7.5 and 7.6 of the report.

- The SDNPA did have the authority to issue a CPO, but it was not considered appropriate or likely to be successful in this case.
- The use of the Queens Hotel tied to the Gilbert White Museum and the Wider Community would be implemented via an S106 agreement which included a management plan. This would include details of operational hours and availability of the Field Study Centre and the TAP room.
- There were no suitable parking facilities on site for larger vehicles, however there was no objection from the Highways Authority. There was parking in the area, and potentially space for a drop off point in front of the newly refurbished building.
- For tourist accommodation availability, Gilbert Whites had priority, but would make vacant units available on cottages.com. It was confirmed that planning permission existed to Gilbert Whites for 25 social events annually, of which no more than 10 could have amplified music, which gave clarity to the approximate number of events that Gilbert Whites could host per year.

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

- It was not felt that the replacement facilities were equivalent or better, than those offered when previously open as a hotel.
- As the Queens Hotel was a historic coaching inn it was not felt this application conserved or enhanced the cultural history of the national park, and therefore did not meet the first purpose of the SDNP.
- There was concern about the overdevelopment of the site, particularly around the development that would take place along Huckers Lane, the proposed removal of the existing hedge and its replacement with a smaller hedge or wall climbing plant, neither of which were considered appropriate.
- The combination of the uses for the building for school children and the general public was considered to possibly be incompatible and may raise child protection issues.
- The fact that the village hall, an already existing community facility, was only a few doors away seems not to have been considered. What effect would an additional room for hire have on the community, particularly as the Field Study Centre's hours of use would be restricted?
- Although the development may work for Gilbert Whites Museum, it was felt that it may not work for the village of Selborne.
- Concern was expressed that with the five year break agreement, the developer could change its purpose and bring forward a new proposal.
- This did not seem like the right location for an educational facility given the risks of children by the busy road and no dedicated parking for school visits.
- As the building was not considered an Asset of Community Value, if this application was declined there was no mechanism to make the developer return with a more suitable application.
- Tying this proposal into the Gilbert Whites Museum made the proposal innovative including the enhanced education centre and the TAP room which encouraged workshops. With the enhancement of disabled access it was a good way of reviving an old public house. This was a good opportunity for both the local and wider community.
- This approach seemed to be an appropriate, sustainable and the most viable use of this building which would work well for the community.
- The development along Huckers Lane could be considered typical of a small lane in a village.

- Although there was some desire to see the building returned to its previous use as a hotel it was considered very unlikely this would come forward.
- There were two main reasons to visit Selborne, one was the cycling and walking routes in the area, the other was Gilbert White and the excellent facilities put in place by the trust. This Committee had an obligation to encourage businesses such as these to be as viable as possible, which this application supported.
- It was appreciated the village was divided over this issue, however, the solution before the committee was appropriate and the village should support this to help both the building and village move forward.
- The engagement of the local community seemed to be limited; the postcard drop only asking for support and no public meeting being held. The significant amount of correspondence received against this application demonstrated that leaflet drops were not the answer to community engagement. It should be reconsidered whether this application had the support of the local community or not.
- Whether this development was in line with Policy SD43 was a judgement call and some Members felt it did satisfy the policy.
- Could the developer be made to return the building to its original state, both externally and internally?

70. Members were further advised:

- The Authority only had the power to request a developer restore a building if it was a listed building and certain inappropriate actions had taken place. If a site became extremely unsightly a S215 discontinuance notice could be used, but that was only external works in the interests of public amenity.

71. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.

72. The recommendation was not resolved.

73. It was proposed and seconded that planning permission be refused for the following reasons with the final form of words delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee:

1. The proposals would amount to an overdevelopment of the site, notably to Huckers Lane, and would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the area and the Conservation Area.
2. It had not been demonstrated that the proposed alternative community facilities to be provided were of an equivalent or better quality to those lost and the proposal was therefore contrary to Policy SD43 of the South Downs Local Plan.

74. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. It had not been demonstrated that the proposed alternative community facilities to be provided were of an equivalent or better quality to those lost and the proposal was therefore contrary to Policy SD43 of the South Downs Local Plan; and,
2. The proposals would amount to an overdevelopment of the site, notably to Huckers Lane, and would therefore have been an unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the area and the Conservation Area.

The final form of words delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

ITEM 8: SDNP/20/04766/CND – KING EDWARD VII ESTATE

75. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content, and referred to the update sheet. The officer drew Members attention to a response received from South East Water who highlighted the significant response from local residents with regards to water supply, which had been occurring for a number of years.
76. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Simon Vernon-Harcourt spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.
77. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-09), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was there a plan to install Swift boxes or bricks for bats into the blocks?
 - There was a draining issue where lawns which did not have enough soil depth were damaged, had this been resolved.
 - Had the gymnasium been reduced in size and was this for the one block or the whole site?
 - Was it correct that 5 l gas boilers were being installed?
 - Was the underground parking being reduced?
 - Were the measured historic walkways impacted by the development?
78. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Whilst swift boxes were not covered in the ecology statement, this was discussed with the applicant who confirmed this could be considered.
 - The application was reviewed by a draining engineer who raised no objection. One resident had a concern over the drainage and the existing garden area and this was being discussed further with residents.
 - The gymnasium was comparable with that previously provided for residents of the estate and that was still the case.
 - The boilers used in the units was out of the remit of this application.
 - There was no reduction in parking allocation.
 - The historical measured walks were not impacted by this application.
79. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- It was acknowledged that the new layout presented an excellent solution, taking it away from the chapel.
 - A great improvement was shown in the woodland area and the dormers along with the improved view in between the buildings.
80. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the inclusion of an amended ecology condition requiring swift boxes.
81. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
- I. A deed of variation to the substantive Section 106 Agreement being completed to incorporate the application details and subject to the conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of this report subject to the inclusion of an amended ecology condition requiring the provision of swift boxes.

ITEM 9: SDNP/20/00627/OUT – Lodge Hill Education Centre

82. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet. The Case Officer additionally advised the Committee that a further letter of objection had been received with regards to the access at Waltham Park Road and the timing of this meeting as they were unable to attend.

83. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Matthew Wykes, spoke in support of the application on behalf of Lodge Hill Trust
 - Lisa May, spoke in support of the application on behalf of Lodge Hill Trust
 - Peter Cleveland, spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant
84. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-10), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was there no ancient woodland within the site?
 - At the time of allocated site SD64 being considered as part of the Local Plan, was this site also considered and rejected or was the site not put forward?
 - How many trees would be cut down for the development?
 - Under Key Matters (third bullet within the report) it referred to capital funds for Lodge Hill, with an anticipated amount of £700,000. Was that the entire income of the site, or had overage or other payments already been taken from this figure?
 - The application stated this was for up to five houses, how was this decision reached?
 - How was the Landscape Led objection on page 56, paragraph 4.9 of the report addressed?
 - Would the submitted Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) be approved or was there a condition to secure it?
85. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- It was confirmed that there was no ancient woodland within the site.
 - This site was not put forward at the time of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). However, it was put forward at the time of the Local Plan examination along with a number of other omission sites. As the inspector had no issue with any of the allocated sites none of the omission sites were considered.
 - Approximately 25 trees would be removed (Category A x1, Category B x 18, Category C x 5, Category U x 1). Replacement trees, of an equivalent if not more, would be planted around the site buffers and within the wider site.
 - It was confirmed that the figure of £700,000 of capital funds from the land sale was an estimate, prior to any overage or payments being deducted.
 - The application originally proposed 16 dwellings, which was considered to be an over-development. The site's capacity for development was unknown at this stage, however officers considered it suitable for up to five dwellings and capable of meeting SD4.
 - The in-principle landscape objection related to the pattern of settlement, south of the A29, which this site did not follow. There were also concerns with regard to the loss of a section of the bank due to the widening of access and the impact on Waltham Park Road. However, the trees in this location were of a lower category and non-native species and considered on balance not to be contrary to SD21.
 - An amended LEMP would be secured by Condition 21.
86. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Whilst Lodge Hill was an incredible facility and a worthy charity, it was not the only one within the park, and approving this application could set a precedent for similar 'enabling' residential development.
 - The entrance on Waltham Chase Road would significantly change a very rural secluded lane.
 - The application was contrary to the local plan because it was outside of the settlement boundary. There was also a key objection from the Landscape Officer.

- There were concerns due to there being no footpath available on Waltham Park Road and it was not possible to create one. Additionally, the proposed houses would produce light pollution.
 - The tenuous benefits did not outweigh the shortcomings of the development in terms of planning policy compliance and harm to the landscape and bio diversity.
 - The landscape objections and SD25 were of concern. One side was urban and the other was semi-rural and this application led to a more urban feel.
 - The replacement of any tree loss was welcomed. Although the trees were of poor quality the disturbance to the ground flora and soil should also be taken into account.
 - The woodland area above Waltham Park Road was sparsely developed and the introduction of five dwellings potentially changed the nature of the wider environment. However, it was acknowledged that a balanced approach was needed as this was an exceptional charity.
 - This was only an outline planning application, to agree access and the request to build up to five houses. Full details of the proposal would be brought back to the committee via a reserved matters application.
 - This application was an exception and as stated in paragraph 4.12, page 56 of the report “... *Reduced quantum of development may achieve the necessary balance of SD1 (4) that would enable the continued operation of Lodge Hill*”. The Committee should support initiatives like this, as Lodge Hill is an extremely unique environment.
 - The access was already in place and the Highways Authority did not object.
 - The impact upon the landscape was limited and the proposal was capable of conserving the landscape.
 - The final quantum would be considered once negotiations regarding the overage had been concluded, albeit officers understood Members concerns over the maximum number suggested.
87. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation, subject to an amended recommendation to increase the length of time for the completion or sufficient progress of the legal agreement from six to twelve months, with the final form of the legal agreement delegated to the Director of Planning..
88. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
1. The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and a legal agreement to secure proceeds from the sale of the land for essential maintenance works to the Centre, the final form to be delegated to the Director of Planning
 2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the legal agreement is not completed or sufficient progress not made within twelve months of the Planning Committee meeting of 9 September 2021.
89. Gary Marsh and Robert Mocatta left the meeting at 13.45

ITEM 10: RAMPION 2 RESPONSE TO RAMPION EXTENSION DEVELOPMENT LTD’S SECTION 42 STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON THE RAMPION 2 OFFSHORE WIND FARM

90. The Officer reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet. The Officer also updated Members on a further email received from Dr Ross of Protect Coastal England which reiterated previous comments that Rampion 2 was not required to meet the government’s offshore wind energy generation requirements.
91. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Vaughan Weighill spoke in support of the Rampion extension on behalf of RWE Renewables

92. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-11), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was there a 10 year period for works to be made good with Rampion 1, the same as was proposed for Rampion 2?
 - Why was Rampion 2 close to the shore?
 - Was the red line area onshore (i.e. the cable corridor) always a 50m wide construction zone, or would the construction line need to be extended to allow for haulage access and storage, etc.?
 - The life cycle was 25 years, when the cable was replaced would the cable be re-laid?
 - Could the cabling be upgraded via conduits, or would it have to be dug up?
93. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- There was a 10 year monitoring period that started in 2020 for Rampion 1.
 - The Crown Estate issued the licences for wind farms and this was one of those areas which went through a licensing round and permission was granted for Rampion 2 to continue to the next stage (i.e. seeking a development consent order). It was also close to the shore due to the shipping lanes in the English Channel.
 - There were locations along the cable corridor where it was wider for techniques proposed to navigate the cable through the area. Construction compounds were also additional to the 50m wide zone. Although there were a couple of areas where it was slimmed down to 30m so storage areas could go beyond the corridor but not the red line boundary of the scheme.
 - Re-laying of a cable after 25 years was dependent on the evolution of technology. If turbines were replaced the cables may require upgrading.
 - It was not known how cables would be upgraded.
94. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments.
- By concentrating on the visual impact of the cable route, rather than other details, the Authority may be too concerned about one area and missing others which may be of greater concern.
 - Frustration was expressed that Rampion 1 was not future-proofed to account for additional cabling that may be required.
 - The response was not strong enough in highlighting the negotiations that had already taken place and that the SDNP had not been afforded its status or value as a protected landscape and that insufficient regard was being given to the national park purposes. The facts presented had not been given sufficient attention.
 - The response was overly diplomatic in places.
 - The application proposal should present more alternatives than those currently given.
 - Some of the questions posed in the response needed some context around them to ensure they were not lost.

95. Members were further advised:
- The visibility of the cable route also identified impacts on ground conditions which affected land and crop management.
 - Future-proofing of Rampion I had previously been raised; it seemed that future proofing was only employed where it suited the company.
96. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, with the final form of words delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to amend the response in accordance with the comments of the committee resulting in a strengthened objection.
97. **RESOLVED:** The committee considered and provided comments on the contents of the draft response to be provided by the Chief Executive of the Authority as part of the Section 42 Statutory. The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to amend the response in accordance with the comments of the committee.

ITEM 11: EAST SUSSEX, SOUTH DOWNS AND BRIGHTON & HOVE WASTE AND MINERALS LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

98. The Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
99. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-12) and requested clarification as follows:
- Were Novington sandpit and Stantons Farm one and the same, which although being inactive had a 250,000 ton reserve?
 - Was it for convenience that the SDNPA had separate East Sussex and West Sussex Minerals Plans which the SDNPA have fed into, to or was it through legal necessity that it was handled this way? Because of this was a situation arising because of this where the SDNPA was approving new soft sand sites in West Sussex despite there being soft sand reserves remaining in another?
 - How was planning effectively undertaken when confidential figures were not seen?
 - Why did it take four years to complete the review of aggregate policies started in 2017, which was to be followed by a five year plan to be completed in 2023?
100. In response to questions members clarified
- Novington sandpit and Stantons Farm were the same facility. It was for the operator to bring the site forward if they chose to.
 - Officers did look at the issue of minerals movement across the three counties and nationally, informed by a 4 year survey, which unfortunately was delayed for a year. That information was taken into account when the SDNPA planned, as required by the NPPF, for a steady and adequate supply of minerals. The SDNPA was required to consider minerals movements and could not control movements in and out of boundaries. These matters were also considered at a regional level at the South East Aggregate Working Party.
 - Officers did have sight of the confidential figures when undertaking minerals planning. Future reports would be amended to make this clear.
 - The delay in the review was due to significant discussions related to a large site in an SPA RAMSAR designated area where the operator was keen to continue the provision of aggregates and whether that was appropriate. The 2017 plan only addressed a few specific issues and there would be a need to consider all policies in the current plans under the five year review required by regulation and national policy. This was likely to take place in 2022/2023.
101. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.

102. **RESOLVED:** The Committee recommended that the National Park Authority:
1. Approve the consultation draft of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Local Plan Review, as detailed in Appendix 1 (a) of this report, for Regulation 19 Consultation in autumn/winter 2021 subject to any comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed, and subject to any minor changes that arise prior to the start of the Regulation 19 publication being agreed by the Director of Planning in consultation with East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council
 2. Note the main issues arising from Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Habitat Regulation Assessment Screening document (HRA) as detailed in Appendices 2 and 3.
 3. Delegate authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority, East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council, to make any minor changes arising from the consultation and then submit the Waste and Minerals Local Plan Review to the Secretary of State under regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 for examination.
 4. Note that if major changes are required to the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Local Plan Review that a further public consultation and decision by the Authority may be required.

ITEM 12: PROPOSED LOCAL CONNECTION TEST FOR APPLICANTS TO THE SELF-BUILD AND CUSTOM HOUSEBUILDING REGISTER

103. The Officer presented the report and referred to the Update Sheet.
104. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-13) and requested clarification as follows:
- The Authority had a duty, not an obligation for sufficient plots. What defined “Local Connection”?
 - How would this be managed within the local plan?
 - How did the plots become available and did the builder still have to get planning permission? What happened if sufficient plots were not made available within the three year base period?
 - Was there a clear set of criteria that defined self-build so it was not left open to dispute?
 - Was there a right of appeal for ones excluded from the register, and who would the right of appeal be to?
 - Concern was expressed that Grandparents were included within the self-build register, as that was a separate generation and not immediate family? If the aim was to restrict the number of self-build home that could be built, then removing grandparents would restrict it further. This may also bring it into line with criteria for affordable housing.
 - What would happen, if after consultation, it was requested that Uncles and Aunts were to be included in the register?
105. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- A local connection was defined as a parish wholly or partly in the SDNP.
 - The register showed people that had an interest in building their own home and provided evidence of the demand. By being entered on the self-build register there was no guarantee of receiving a plot when one became available. Planning permission for building a dwelling was required for those persons entered on the self-build register.
 - The government had not specified what would happen, if anything, if the demand was not met.
 - The definition and criteria of self-build was set out in the Self-Build and Custom Housing Act.

- The right of appeal needed to be clarified further, but it was expected it would be submitted via the SDNPA.
- Grandparents were included within the scope by the SDNP, but this could be reviewed.
- If, as a result of public consultation, it was requested for example, Uncles and Aunts to be included in the local connection test criteria, the Director of Planning under delegated authority would decide whether to include, for this or other minor matters. If major matters arose from the public consultation, these issues would be brought before the Planning Committee for a decision on how to proceed with the proposed local connection test.

106. It was proposed, seconded and agreed to amend the recommendation to:

1. Remove Grandparents from the local connection test so it was in line with affordable housing criteria.
2. Implement an appeals process for any persons failing the local connection test and therefore excluded from Part I of the self-build register.

107. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the amended recommendation.

108. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved to:

1. Approve the draft local connection test to the Self and Custom Housebuilding Register for public consultation (Appendix I) subject to the following amendments:
 - Remove Grandparents from the local connection test so it was in line with affordable housing criteria.
 - Implement an appeals process for any persons failing the local connection test and therefore excluded from Part I of the self-build register.
2. That the authority be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair, to make further minor changes to the local connection test prior to public consultation.
3. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to consider the response from the public consultation, and subject to there being no major matters arising implement the local connection test.

ITEM 13: ADOPTION OF HAMBLEDON VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT AS A SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

109. The Officer presented the report

110. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Doctor John Thornton spoke in support of Hambledon Parish Council.

111. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-14) and made the following comments:

- Village Design Statements (VDS) and Neighbourhood Development Plans added incredible value in recording what made these places unique to the SDNP. Had officers experienced a local awareness that went beyond the planning system?
- Did a “How to Guide” exist for other parishes? If a Parish published their own VDS and did not consult SDNPA, would it still carry weight in the determination of planning applications?
- What was the difference in the status of a VDS if it was adopted only by the parish as opposed to by the SDNPA as well?

112. Members were advised:
- In some areas yes, for example, Lodsworth issued their VDS to new residents as part of a new home pack.
 - Officers were working with parishes and other Local Planning Authorities to develop a template for a VDS.
 - A VDS adopted by a parish only would have limited weight when considering an application, whereas one adopted by the SDNPA would have greater weight.
113. **RESOLVED:** The committee resolved to approve the adoption of Hambledon Village Design Statement as a Supplementary Planning Document

ITEM 14: SUMMARY OF APPEALS DECISION UPDATE

114. The Officer presented the report
115. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-15) and made the following comments:
- There was a need to resolve the issue of gypsy and traveller sites within the park.
 - Following the Judicial Review on the Cuckmere Haven application, was there a live application that remained to be determined?
116. The committee were further advised;
- The applicants for the Cuckmere Haven application were considering the situation and the way forward.
117. The Chair closed the meeting at 3.20pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____