

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: _____