

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 11 November 2021 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker (Chair), Barbara Holyome, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson, Thérèse Evans, and Diana Van De Klugt.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer), and Sharon Libby (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Sabrina Robinson, (Senior Development Management Officer), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), and Stella New (Senior Development Management Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

175. 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

176. Apologies were received from Richard Waring and Janet Duncton.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

177. Diana van der Klugt declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as a resident of Greatham, a Greatham Parish Councillor, a Horsham District Councillor and as she had submitted an objection to this application she would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item.

178. Rob Mocatta declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 as a resident of East Meon, a public service interest in Agenda Items 7 and 8 as an East Hampshire District Councillor, and a personal interest as he was acquainted with two of the speakers on Agenda Item 8, Councillor Paul Miner and Anthony Allen from The Petersfield Society.

179. Gary Marsh declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 8 as he was acquainted with one of the residents, a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as he was acquainted with the applicant, and a personal interest in Agenda Item 11 as he was acquainted with one of the speakers as cabinet member of his authority.

180. The Chair declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 on behalf of herself, Alun Alesbury, Barbara Holyome, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta and Andrew Shaxson as they were all acquainted with one of the speakers, David Coldwell, who was a former Member of the SDNPA.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9 SEPTEMBER 2021

181. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 October 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

182. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

183. The Committee was informed that decision notices had been issued for the following applications:

- SDNP/20/05682/CND – Penns Field, Heathfield Road, Petersfield, Hampshire

- SDNP/20/05236/FUL – Land adjoining the Northern Boundary (4th Arm) from the approved New Monks Farm A27 roundabout to Coombes Road
- SDNP/19/06161/FUL - Marwell Activity Centre, Hurst Lane, Owslebury, Hampshire

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

184. There were no urgent items

ITEM 7: SDNP/21/03811/FUL - Land Adjacent to Coppice Cottages

185. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.

186. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Michael Knappett spoke on behalf of Southcott Homes, as the Applicant.

187. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-23), the updates, and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- In view of the public speaker's request to defer, could the application have been withdrawn by the applicant?
- When was the last time the applicant was offered the opportunity to withdraw?
- Had the landscape architect been engaged with?
- Of what relevance was it that the land was slightly south, outside of the allocated site and outside the settlement boundary?
- An objector raised the issue that there was a sewage issue, why this was not addressed in the report?
- It was unclear if the sewage system was private or would it be connected to the public sewage system?
- Did following Policy EM16 make it hard to deliver a landscape led design?
- Why did the applicant reduce the offer of affordable housing?
- Paragraph 8.18 of the report referred to nitrate neutrality, but the update sheet referred to nutrient neutrality, what was the difference?

188. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The applicant was given a number of opportunities to withdraw the application. They were notified in October that the Authority recommended refusal. Further discussions had also been held between the Authority and the Applicant.
- The opportunity to withdraw had been discussed with the applicant and the agent during the last month. A review of the previous application highlighted that drainage and highways had been addressed. However, there was little change between the refused layout and the new proposed layout and that the landscape impact was a major issue on the first application which was a fundamental issue and needed to be reviewed holistically.
- All the submitted documents were considered and the Landscape Officer, reviewed the revised changes in the submission and had nothing additional to add. The revised changes in the re-submission did not change the original reason for refusal.
- The redlined boundary plan was part of the original application and had to remain the same as part of this application. The built form was in the settlement plan and the wildlife buffer was in the adjacent field and was considered as part of the proposal.
- No concerns were raised by the statutory consultees with regards to sewage issues.

- The sewage system was investigated and provided as a condition. Further investigation would be required on how to manage the sewage system via a public or private system, and consultees would work with the Authority to discharge the condition.
- There were aspirations in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for it to be landscape led and Policy EM16 provided challenges for it to be a landscape led design. Further discussions could have taken place for it to be more landscape led.
- The applicant's survey supported the viability of 33% affordable housing, however Bruton Knowles had confirmed that 50% affordable housing could be viable.
- The Case Officer confirmed that nitrate & nutrient neutrality were linked, and that Natural England used "nutrient neutrality" as an umbrella term that supported other minerals and elements found within the ground.

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

- The site was a rural setting, but the NDP suggested an indicative plan which the developer generally followed but the scheme as proposed is more akin to an urban setting.
- This was an allocated new site on a new greenfield site on the edge of a village, with no unusual infrastructure expenditure, where we should expect a full complement of affordable housing. There was no robust explanation provided for the lack of affordable housing.
- The Design Officer in the report advised that EM7 of the NDP had been satisfied, but the reasons for refusal showed EM5, 6 & 16, not EM 7. So the materials had been accepted, but had not been mentioned in the refusal.
- Drainage and sewage was an issue for the whole village not just the site, therefore it was questionable if it was for the applicant to solve this issue. The issue of water was not clarified and surface water was the biggest concern for this site. There was an ongoing dispute between the village and the water company over the inadequate water situation. The wording in Condition 1 emphasised water and drainage was the issue rather than the size of the site.
- The applicant struggled to satisfy the concerns raised with regards to drainage and highways and this issue was highlighted in the report. This was a linear settlement and a landscape led design was key to the first purpose of the SDNPA. Therefore it was difficult to meet the requirements of both the NDP and the SDNPA for a landscape led layout to be supported.

190. Members were further advised:

- The Design Officer did not raise an issue with regards to lack of affordable housing on the previous application, which was refused due to the layout of the site.
- This was an allocated site and further thought was required for the number of entrances which led to hedgerows being removed and the requirement for a landscape led design.
- The word "layout" would be added to the first reason for refusal.

191. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the addition of the word "layout" to the first reason for refusal so that it read "... by reason of its layout, scale and design ...".

192. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused subject to:

- 1) The reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of this report subject to the addition of the word "layout" to first reason for refusal so that it read "... by reason of its layout, scale and design ...".

ITEM 8: SDNP/20/05058/FUL - Paris House, Frenchmans Road

193. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
194. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- George Cathcart spoke against the application representing himself
 - Councillor Paul Milner spoke against the application on behalf of Petersfield Town Council
 - Anthony Allen spoke against the application on behalf of The Petersfield Society
 - Dan Pannell spoke in support of the application on behalf Aldi Stores as the applicant
195. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-24), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Could an explanation be provided why the change to the Use Classes was not a significant material consideration?
 - Was it only Class B1 office and light industrial, under the change of Use Classes that was amalgamated with retail into Class E?
 - Was the former light Industrial use 24 hours a day,, 7 days a week?
 - How does the number of parking spaces relate to the requirements of the adopted Parking Supplementary Planning Document?
 - Paragraphs 8.36 to 8.47 of the report addressed the impact and the viability of the town centre. Could these concerns be summarised along with other factors that needed to be considered?
 - Public speaker Mr Cathcart referred to the Highways Authority policy referred to on page 35 of the report with regards to the infrastructure features on Frenchmans Road and Station Road. These features were not included under the conditions on page 58, of the report, did this mean they would be included in the S106 or not conditioned?
 - Condition 4 on page 54 of the report referred to the net sales floor area of convenience and comparison goods, how would this be enforced?
 - What was the status of the Petersfield NDP in the context of our Development Plan.
 - Had a robust marketing campaign been conducted for use as a business premises?
 - The Lichfield report stated that 85% of trade would be diverted from the town centre, which would lead to a knock on effect of employment from these stores. Would this improve the economy in Petersfield or simply move it around?
196. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Use Class E amalgamated retail with other employment/commercial uses. This is a wider material planning consideration and the officer assessment afforded it limited weight. Since the June committee meeting it has become clear that policy interpretation needed to be based on their meaning at the time of adoption. Greater weight had previously been afforded to the change to Use Classes, to the point that policy was almost overridden, which was incorrect. Therefore, it was revisited, where priority was now given to the Development Plan and the weight afforded to Class E as a material consideration.
 - Classes B2 General Industrial and B8 Warehouse & Distribution were still separate uses within the B Class of the Use Classes Order..
 - Proposals include 112 parking spaces whilst the Parking SPD would require 129. A reduced number of spaces was considered to be acceptable.

- Paragraph 5.1 of the report summarised a variety of representations, covering various principles and questions, such as, was there already too many supermarkets, was another supermarket needed, what was the impact upon the town centre, and would it divert people away from the town centre. With regards to need, the report was based on SD38 and NPPF which outlines an impact based approach.
- The travel plan would be part of the S106 and the road improvements on Frenchmans Road and Station Road were on the plans included on the decision notice. Additionally, off site highways works would be covered by a S278 Agreement which Aldi would enter into.
- A logical approach for management of the net sales floor space, would be implemented through a condition based on convenience and comparison goods of a 70/30 split. Enforcement of the condition on goods sold would be enforced the same way as other conditions having regard to assessing the matter if an issue arose.
- The Petersfield NDP forms part of the Development Plan in conjunction with the South Downs Local Plan.
- A robust marketing plan was conducted and scrutinised as a development site, rather than a business premises. Robust marketing had been undertaken which included the site as a re-development opportunity and not just the former premises being marketed.
- The impact upon the Town Centre would be most felt by the larger supermarket retailers and not the smaller stores. The Lichfield report provided a conclusion that there would be a 28.8% diversion from Lidl's, 10% Tesco's and 8% Waitrose. The Lichfield Report advised that there would be an overall impact upon the Town Centre turnover of 7.5%.

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

- The site should be safeguarded and regulated by E class use. If it was used for light industrial use, this could lead to noise 24 hours a day 7 days week by the use of machinery.
- Planning should not be used to safeguard proposals, it should be used to enhance developments. This application focussed on 50 new jobs and the site required development. An acoustic wall would be implemented between the building and Rushes Road to eliminate noise and delivery lorries would be controlled.
- The impact upon retail was not a tenable basis to oppose this application. The Employment Policy SD35, which distinguished the difference between premises & land, did include employment sites. The marketing of the site reflected the way the policy was produced and it was agreed that sufficient marketing was conducted in accordance with the policy. Class E was appropriate and lends weight to use of this site
- The design was not ideal for a new building in the National Park usually, however it was appropriate for its location in Frenchman's Road.
- It was recognised that the building did include a significant "green roof" the largest of its kind within the National Park and that the car park was appropriately landscaped.
- Petersfield Town Council (PTC) had stated in their NDP that they would have preferred the site to be a modern business hub for small businesses, which formed part of their town vision for Petersfield. Petersfield NDP also included RPI which stated "new retail premises outside town centres should be limited to small scale convenience stores" which this was not. The application was contrary to this policy giving rise to the question of whether there should be a retail store here at all. This would have been assessed as part of the Petersfield NDP, which would have identified there were already four large supermarkets in a small town.
- The impact upon the town centre was not insignificant. .

- Thought and consideration should be given to the entire National Park regardless of location and standard of immediate environment and Petersfield Town Centre deserved better.
 - The condition of the site was not a point for consideration. Previous schemes, refused by the committee, were proposed on the aspirations of what may be achievable, rather than what was in accordance with policy.
 - Petersfield NDP, Policy BP5 was a crucial point to be considered. If this was a retail space, the implication may also go the same way which was a concern. This was a test site, if this changed, would similar areas in Frenchmans Road follow?
 - Although the site would make for a good business hub, how long should we wait for it to be developed? Marketing was conducted for 27 months on this site.
 - At the Planning Committee held in June 2021, there was an additional condition to maintain the planting in perpetuity. The green roof was welcomed and landscaping was key. Condition 14 should be amended to ensure landscaping was maintained in perpetuity.
 - The two previous planning applications were clearly against SDNP policy. The government changed, not the SDNPA, the use to Class E. This application would create employment and healthy competition.
 - The District Council had twice made an offer on this site for a use other than a supermarket and was turned down on both occasions.
 - The residents of Petersfield had clearly put a considerable amount of work into creating the Petersfield NDP.
 - The maintenance of the green roof was important.
 - This was a derelict site which required something on it. It created 50 employment opportunities and the sustainability proposals had led to a good application.
198. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the amendment of condition 14 to ensure the maintenance of landscaping in perpetuity rather than a period of 5 years and the update sheet.
199. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to:
- 1) The completion of a legal agreement to secure the following, to be 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 this report and the amendment of condition 14 to ensure the maintenance of landscaping in perpetuity rather than a period of 5 years and the update sheet.
 - 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 3 months of 11th November Planning Committee meeting.

ITEM 9: SDNP/21/04144/FUL – Broadview Farm, Alton

200. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and verbally updated Members on:
- a late representation which made the following additional comments:
 - drainage capacity of the lodge system and what it flowed into in terms of pipework into the industrial estate

- Highlighting enforcement action investigated on this site based on previous conditions.
- It was also highlighted that the update sheet referred to an update for Agenda 9. This was incorrect was an update to Agenda Item 10.

201. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Mrs Karen Clark spoke against the application on behalf of Hedley Clark Planning Consultancy representing Mr & Mrs Anderson of Broadview Cottage
- Mr Cullen in support of the application representing himself as the applicant
- Mr Stephen Andrew in support of the application on behalf of SDA Planning as the agent

202. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-25), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Was the new hedge on the boundary planted by the applicant or the neighbour?
- Were the biodiversity enhancements on the existing lodges, included in the previous application?
- Were the tents not portable as they were connected to services, suggesting that they were of a permanent nature?
- It was evident, from the site visit that the area was very stark. Was the lack of landscaping related to Footpath 55?
- One of the reasons for refusal was the regimented linear view of the tents. Was the applicant advised beforehand that a landscape led approach was required?
- Could officers comment on the Applicant's comments that he was dissatisfied with regards to the notification of various issues and Officers not working on finding solutions/a way forward in terms of working with them?
- It was difficult to ascertain when glamping sites did or did not require permission from SDNP. Was it correct that if they were freestanding and temporary they did not require planning permission?
- Was there any detail available with regards to heating, lighting and similar utilities?

203. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The new hedge was planted by the neighbour.
- Biodiversity enhancements relating to the lodges were part of the previous approval.
- Plans submitted provided indicated a degree of permanency and plots would be more permanent by virtue of connection to services (eg, drainage).
- Landscaping scheme reflected the more open nature of the site of the lodges and the footpath.
- The applicant did not seek pre-application advice. However, a landscape-led approach is advocated in the Local Plan and the published Camping and Glamping Technical Advice Note is further available guidance.
- The issues raised were being dealt with separately via the Authority's complaints procedure. The Authority were content that efforts were made by the Case Officer to advise on the areas of concern and the recommendation to Committee,, There had also previously been reticence to provide further information..
- Under current permitted development rights temporary glamping structure could be erected and used for up to 56 days without requiring further permission.
- The tents would be heated by wood-burning stoves and there would be a single light on each tent below the canopy connected to services.

204. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The scheme was extremely regimented and an application could not be approved if no proof of how foul drainage could be managed was provided.
 - Whilst no objections were received, the Landscape Officer in the report made nine points, three of which could be considered objections. The fourth point queried “how sustainable glamping tents would be in terms of heating?” Whilst it was confirmed they were heated by wood burning stoves, as these were canvas tents, there would be no insulation. If these were permanent structures they would need to satisfy building regulations. During winter the tents could be unsustainable/unsuitable.
 - The committee was reminded of the main purpose of the National Park; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty. The Sandford principle was supported by government policy which when in conflict with other issues, conserving the natural beauty should have greater weight. The National Park had the highest level of landscape protection in the NPPF.
 - The Local Plan outlines a landscape led approach.. This application would have benefited from the pre-application process which could have saved time and frustration. The SDNP encouraged sustainable tourism within the park, but concerns were raised about the sustainability of the scheme.
 - The details in the report outline that the tents would be plumbed in which indicated these are of a permanent nature.
 - Proposals would be an over intensification of the site for tourism and detracted from the prevailing agricultural character of the area.

205. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation.

206. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused subject to:

- 1) The reasons outlined in Paragraph 10.1 of this report.

ITEM 10: SDNP/21/02752/LIS – The Granary, Greatham

207. Diana van der Klugt relocated from the Committee table to the public gallery.

208. The Officer reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.

209. The following public speakers addressed Committee:

- Robert Englehart spoke against the application representing himself
- Janet Aidin spoke against the application on behalf of Wiggonholt Association
- David Coldwell spoke against the application on behalf of Friends of the Southdowns Society
- Diana van der Klugt representing herself as a local resident, Horsham District Councillor for Pulborough, Coldwaltham and Amberley Ward and Church Warden for Greatham Church
- Ian Eldred spoke in support of the application representing himself as the applicant
- Annie Ryden spoke in support of the application representing herself as a local resident
- Jonas Lencer spoke in support of the application behalf of DRMM Architects, as the agent

210. Diana van der Klugt left the meeting at 2.10pm

211. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-26), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Did the plans agreed in 2014, include glazing along the northern wall as advised by the inspector in 2018?

- As part of this Listed Building Consent (LBC), without a planning application, was the committee approving the double height link and the glazing?
- Why was LBC being considered separately?
- Could the work to stabilise the barn continue with the extant LBC and planning permission?
- The internal area of the granary barn would need to be insulated, would this cover up the interior frame of the building?
- Would putting doors on the cart barn damage the integrity of the barn and lose its open nature?
- Was deferring the LBC an option?
- If the LBC was not determined today could it fall foul of non-determination?
- If the LBC was approved today, could the planning application, which included elements approved as part of the LBC, be refused at a later date?
- Was the full planning application not presented with the LBC today due to water neutrality issues?
- At what point was the planning application likely to come forward to be considered?

212. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The 2014 plans approved new glazing on the northern elevation of the link and dairy shed. The current proposals included additional glazing compared with the 2014 consent, however, this was not as extensive as the 2018 scheme that was refused and dismissed at Appeal.
- The committee would be approving the works from a listed building perspective; physical works to the existing structures. The planning application would however also consider other matters, such as the impact upon neighbours. LBC was to consider the impact of the works on the special characteristics and setting of the building and how it would impact the listed building characteristics.
- Whilst it was common to consider a planning application and LBC together, it was not a requisite of law, partly as the LBC and planning application looked at different aspects as well as some linked aspects.
- Works to stabilise the barn could continue under the 2014 consent.
- There would be no additional infilling between the beams and the frame would remain visible as it currently was.
- The addition of doors to the cart barn was an evolution of its use and it was felt would remain in character of the building without losing its features.
- Deferral of LBC was an option, however, it was considered that there was merit in Members having the debate about the LBC elements of the work.
- If the committee did decide to defer then it could be appealed for non-determination.
- If LBC was granted at this committee, there would be elements which could be implemented, providing they did not also require planning permission. However, planning permission for those elements requiring planning permission could be refused at a later date.
- It was believed that the water neutrality issues led to this LBC being considered separate to the full planning application at this committee.
- Consideration of the planning applications was dependent on the water neutrality issue. An S73 application was in the early stages of consultation which sought to vary the

approved plans of the application, and could be presented to the committee within the next few months.

213. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments.
- It was difficult to ascertain the difference between the internal and external aspects in the LBC.
 - The building could still be stabilised under the extant permission even if a decision was not made at this committee.
 - It was highlighted that there was merit in the LBC being discussed separately.
 - LBC issues were complex and only by the LBC and full planning application being discussed as a whole could it be fully understood.
 - The water neutrality issue was going to take time to be resolved, so by the LBC being discussed further at this committee, this would give the applicant time to review and make any appropriate changes arising as part of the debate.
214. It was proposed and seconded to defer consideration of the Listed Building Consent until the associated planning application was ready to be considered. The vote was tied.
215. The Chair invited further comments from the Committee, and the following were made:
- It was unfortunate it was not known when the full application would come before the Committee.
 - It was very challenging to separate the internal and external elements in the LBC and the full application.
216. A further vote was taken and it was resolved that the application for Listed Building Consent be deferred for consideration alongside an associated planning application.
217. **RESOLVED:** That the Listed Building Consent be deferred.
218. Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands and Gary Marsh left the meeting at 2.45 pm
219. Diana van der Klugt returned to the meeting at 2.45pm

ITEM II: SDNP/21/00398/FUL – Ridgeview Winery, Ditchling

220. The Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
221. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Chris Wojtulewski spoke in support of the application on behalf of Ridgeview Wine Estate as the Planning Consultant
 - Sam Linter spoke in support of the application on behalf of Wine GB
 - Tamara Roberts spoke in support of the application on behalf of Ridgeview Wine Estate as CEO
222. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-27) the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- What was the biodiversity net gain?
 - Was an amended lighting scheme in place to not disturb bats?
 - The Landscape Officer had provided a neutral response, which included some unresolved concerns. Could assurance be given that these issues could be resolved by conditions?
223. In response to questions officers clarified
- It was difficult for the biodiversity net gain to be calculated approximately 400 square metres of woodland had already been lost, so the baseline was unknown. However the

new shaw shaw would provide 1680 square metres of woodland, which was acceptable to the ecologist.

- An amended lighting scheme had not been submitted, however, an external lighting scheme suitable for bats was secured by condition.
- The Landscape Officer's concerns arose mainly from the lack of attention to landscape led methodology in the development of the application; instead the design process had been led by business priorities. The view of the Design Officer was that harmful impacts were modest and could be controlled via standard conditions and to ensure the scheme was in accordance with the National Park's First Purpose.

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

- There were a complex number of conditions attached to this application to ensure a successful scheme. However, it was noted that complex conditions required complex enforcement.
- A successful scheme had been put forward which included use of local materials with a sustainable approach.
- This type of scheme encouraged businesses within the SDNP, which met the National Park's duty to foster the economic well-being of communities living within the National Park. These were modest plans for the expansion of an established business, which encouraged healthy competition and sustainable tourism.

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

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

- 1) The conditions set out at paragraph 10.2 and the update sheet.
- 2) The determination of planning application reference ESCC/2020/002/CB by East Sussex County Council, in relation to access and parking, and delegation to the Director of Planning to amend the conditions as necessary so that they operate in accordance with the planning permission granted by ESCC.

227. The Chair closed the meeting at 3.10pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____

