

## **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, Church Warden of Greatham Church, 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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 EMI6 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 was 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 11<sup>th</sup> 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:

- l) 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 11: 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: \_\_\_\_\_



## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

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

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker (Chair), Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson, and Diana van der 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: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), and Stella New (Senior Development Management Officer).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

228. 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**

229. Apologies were received from Thérèse Evans, Richard Waring and Gary Marsh.

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

230. Diana van der Klugt declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 7 and 8 as a resident of Greatham, Church Warden of Greatham Church and a Horsham District Councillor and, as she had submitted an objection to this application, that she would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item.

231. Vanessa Rowlands declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Items 10 and 11 as a Director of the South Downs Trading Company and that she would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item.

232. Tim Slaney declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Items 10 and 11 as a Director of the South Downs Trading Company and that he would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item.

233. The Chair declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 7 and 8 on behalf of herself, Alun Alesbury, Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, 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 11 NOVEMBER 2021**

234. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 November 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:

- Page 1, Those present: “Diana van de Klugt” to be amended to “Diana van der Klugt”
- Page 1, paragraph 177, delete “Greatham Parish Councillor” and replace with “Churchwarden of Greatham Church”.

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

235. There were none.

### **ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

236. An update on application SDNP/19/06024/FUL and the recently allowed appeal would be presented at the January 2022 Planning Committee as part of the Summary of Appeal Decisions agenda item.

**ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS**

237. There were no urgent items.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/21/05321/CND – The Granary**

238. Diana van der Klugt relocated from the committee table to the public gallery.

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

240. The following public speakers addressed the 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 spoke against the application 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.

241. Diana van der Klugt left the meeting at 10.45am.

242. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-28), the updates, and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Could assurance be given that in making the recommendation regard had been given to any principles arising from the 2019 Finney v Welsh Ministers case and any other case law as to the scope of Section 73?
- Should guest accommodation be limited to ancillary use, as this had not been included in the conditions?
- West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service had expressed concern over the distance of the fire hydrants from the premises. Could this application be progressed further noting this concern?
- Was the increased glazing on the northern elevation and particularly the eastern elevation considered a minor or major change to the application?
- How was the cart barn landscape led, as the new design appeared suburban with new doors?
- Could the number of bedrooms in this application and the 2014 application be confirmed?
- The update sheet referenced Section 5, Page 22 of the report stating “*Inappropriate use of Planning System; unacceptable that public funds used to assist the Applicant*”, however this was not referenced in the report, could an explanation be provided?
- Was it a material consideration for both Agenda Items 7 and 8 that the building was on the Buildings at Risk register?

243. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- Section 73 applied to minor material amendments. There is case law about what could be considered a minor material amendment and it was a planning judgement about whether the amendments to the conditions made a substantial alteration to the original application or not. SDNPA officers had considered this and addressed the matter in paragraph 8.2 of the report. Section 96a also applied to amendments, but this was a separate process and only for amendments that were very minor, non-material amendments which would have no impact. Furthermore, the application proposals do

not change the description of development which was an issue raised in the Finney Case which was cited.

- The condition on limiting the use of the guest accommodation to ancillary use was not originally included in the 2014 application and the Section 73 application was a variation of the previously approved plans, however, a debate could be had for an additional condition to be included.
- The West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service expressed concern that the distance exceeded the minimum distance; however, this was a building regulations requirement.
- When looking at the increased amount of glazing, over that agreed in 2014, the changes to the scheme needed to be considered as a whole and what their effects were, and should not be focussed on one particular aspect. It was confirmed that the 2014 scheme included glazing in the east elevation and the proposed changes in the glazing were considered reasonable under Section 73.
- In keeping with the whole site being landscape led, the application should be considered as a whole; the manor, the church and the barn (which lends agricultural history) which collectively have an historic association.
- It was confirmed that the current scheme included four bedrooms and three guest bedrooms. The 2014 application included five bedrooms and two guest bedrooms, therefore both applications included seven bedrooms.
- The comment in the Update Sheet “*Inappropriate use of Planning System; unacceptable that public funds used to assist Applicant*” was an objection received from the public since the report had been issued. Applications which included public funding were often considered by planning authorities, however, this was irrelevant to Member’s consideration of this application.
- It was confirmed that the status of the condition of the buildings, being on the at risk register, was a material consideration for both Agenda Items 7 and 8.

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

- Noting that the application complied with policy and other material considerations this application was a better scheme, which included an improved link building.
- The new layout was a vast improvement over the previous application, it maintained the sense of heritage and the integrity of the buildings. Additionally the raising of the boundary walls was a positive and supported good neighbourly relations.
- The northern and eastern elevations were traditionally external walls which did not have openings, however, the additional glazing was balanced by the other positives in this application over the 2014 application.
- Concern was expressed that the new design of the cart barn created a suburban feel, similar to a gated development.
- Whilst it was easy to find issue with certain elements of the application, there was not enough concern to result in the application being refused.
- It was acknowledged that the officer’s report was not quite correct in paragraph 8.12 where it was stated that “*Notwithstanding, a condition is recommended to limit its use as ancillary guest accommodation*”, however, no such condition was included in the proposed conditions. It should be proposed that a new condition be included that the guest accommodation remains ancillary.
- There were many minor changes which collectively contradicted the SDNP values. The link in the 2014 application was subservient to the two listed buildings, however, the current link was substantial and added little value as it dominated the buildings. The additional fenestration and the arrangement of windows was odd compared to the 2014 application and the cart shed reflected an executive garage. This equated to almost a new application.

- The main building had not changed substantially, with the cart shed change being a minor issue. Looking at the plans overall the changes were minor.
245. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the changes in the update sheet and the inclusion of an additional condition that the guest accommodation remained ancillary, with the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
246. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 10.1 of the report and the update sheet and the inclusion of an additional condition that the guest accommodation remained ancillary, with the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
247. Diana van der Klugt returned to the public gallery at 11.25am

**ITEM 8: SDNP/21/02752/LIS - The Granary**

248. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
249. The following public speakers addressed the 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 spoke against the application 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
250. Diana van der Klugt left the meeting at 11.40am
251. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-29), the updates and the public speaker comments.
252. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- It was incorrect to think, as referred to by the public speaker, that this proposal was the same as the application refused in 2018 on appeal. In a Listed Building Context, the scheme was on balance preferable to the one presented in 2014. The current application was a neat solution, and preferable to the scheme previously submitted.
  - The redesign was significantly improved from the refused 2018 application and was a good example of barn conversions for the future. Additionally the self-contained cinema room would help with sound issues and the roof on the link building was significantly improved from the 2014 application.
  - This application was a gentrification of a tight conservation area and was not in keeping with the environment nor did it complement the area.
253. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the changes in the update sheet.
254. **RESOLVED:** That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the update sheet.
255. Diana van der Klugt returned to the meeting at 11.50 am.

**ITEM 9: SDNP/21/00924/CND - Land at Rotherlea**



256. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and the update sheet.
257. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-30), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- What would happen if open grant funding was not received?
  - Was the previous application granted in 2019 the same as the application discussed in October 2021, which was not granted and therefore was not effective?
258. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- If grant funding was not received, the scheme would comprise of 20 open market and 14 affordable homes.
  - The 2019 permission is still extant but expires in 2022. The application is before members today was to consider an amended resolution from the October 2021 meeting in regard to affordable housing provision. This was in response to how grant funding from Homes England would be secured by the Applicant in order to deliver a 100% affordable scheme.
259. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- Given that the applicant was associated with Homes England (HE), who were experienced in such applications, it was difficult to understand why there were now issues with the resolution before Members in regard to securing affordable housing in the S106 Agreement.
  - It was hoped that the HE submission was successful. The report provided evidence that the applicant would proceed with the scheme, which would be a good outcome for the community in delivering an affordable tenure
260. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
261. **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.
    - 14 affordable dwellings comprising 10 social rented and 4 shared ownership.
    - A management plan securing the long term retention and management of the approved landscape details for the site.
  - 2) The conditions as set out in paragraph 10.2 of this report.
  - 3) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the Legal Agreement is not completed or satisfactory progress is not being made within 3 months of the 9 December 2021 Planning Committee meeting.
262. Tim Slaney and Vanessa Rowlands left the meeting at 12.05 pm

**ITEM 10: SDNP/21/05072/ADV - Seven Sisters Country Park**

263. The Officer reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
264. The following public speakers addressed Committee:
- Kate Miles read out a statement on behalf of Peter Cousin representing the applicant.
265. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-31), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Did the "I" on sign TS01 mean Information and where was the arrow pointing to, as it looked like it was pointing across the main road?
  - How were people persuaded not to cross the road at the dangerous junction where the sign was? Could the applicant work with East Sussex Highways to encourage visitors to walk along the south side of the road before they crossed the road?

- Could individual signs be approved or did as advert consent have to be granted to the collective group?
- Why was way marker FW19 such a short post, just 900mm above ground level?
- There was small area of grassland with an entrance adjacent to the wall with the Information sign on it; this could encourage people to cross the road at this point. Could a recommendation be put forward to make this entrance gated?

266. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The “I” on sign TS01 was for information and the arrow on the sign directed pedestrians using the Seven Sisters car park, with the wooden way marker post providing further directional guidance.
- With regard to the road crossing, there would be a wooden post on the south side which would direct visitors along the footpath before crossing the road. East Sussex Highways were content that the positioning of the sign, as part of the wider suite of signs raised no issues in terms of public safety.
- It was confirmed that a split decision on the signs was an option open to Members.
- Way marker FW19 replaced the existing post of the same height and consideration had also been given to the setting of the listed telephone box
- The adjacent area of grassland was not intended for public access. The request for an appropriate boundary treatment to discourage public access would be fed back to the applicant.

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

- Sign TS01 would guide visitors from the south side car park and was not an indication of where to cross the road.
- Consideration should be given to those walking on the northern side of the road and perhaps the sign could be made clearer by pointing upwards. However, it was acknowledged that East Sussex Highways had raised no concerns.
- The purpose of the wooden way marker posts was to provide clear direction of guiding visitors from A to B. A 900mm post could get lost behind larger objects (cars/pedestrians), and should be a similar size to a taller wooden finger post.
- The wooden way post to be installed was the same height as the previous post, which caused no issues previously. The post needed to be such a height to ensure it was accessible to all.
- East Sussex Highways should be advised that the installation of a second chevron sign next to PA06 would add additional clutter and would be intrusive.
- Prior to the application being considered, had East Sussex Highways already decided that a chevron should be installed at this location for safety issues, hence the need to relocate one of the signs, or did the application initiate this?

268. Members were further advised:

- The concerns expressed over the location of the “Information” sign and the road crossing were noted. However, it would be difficult to justify the refusal of planning permission on these grounds as East Sussex Highways had raised no objection on public safety grounds.
- Concern over the installation of a second chevron could be fed back to East Sussex Highways, however this was not part of the proposal before Members.
- The timing of the discussions between East Sussex Highways and the applicant was not known, however, the location of the sign next to the proposed second chevron was the preferred location of the applicant.

269. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
270. **RESOLVED:** That advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in 10.1 of the report and the Update Sheet.

**ITEM 11: SDNP/21/05703/LIS - Seven Sisters Country Park**

271. The Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet and also referred to paragraph 5.2 of the report which should refer to the Development Manager in place of the Director of Planning.
272. The following public speakers addressed Committee:
- Kate Miles read out a statement on behalf of Peter Cousin representing the applicant.
273. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-32) the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- How would the sign be affixed to the building ensuring the building was conserved and enhanced?
  - Did the functionality of the sign need to be addressed and monitored to ensure it was effective?
  - Was it a statutory or legal requirement that the sign must conserve and enhance a listed building or was it acceptable that it was placed on a listed building in a way that had regard to it being desirable that it was conserved and enhanced?
274. In response to questions officers clarified
- The Historic Buildings Officer had advised that the signage conserved and enhanced the building by allowing visitors better access to the site. The sign would be was screwed into the mortar without affecting the integrity of the historic flints
  - The site and signage would be monitored by the applicant when it became fully functional.
275. For the determination of the listed building consent, the legislation required that special regard should be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments.
- It was considered acceptable and justified to have a small modest sign that guided visitors towards the visitor centre.
276. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation as set out in the Update Sheet.
277. **RESOLVED:**
- 1) That authority be delegated to the Development Manager to grant Listed Building Consent subject to:
    - i) The conditions set out at paragraph 10.1 of the report;
    - ii) No further material considerations being raised prior to the close of the statutory publicity period on 10 December 2021.
  2. In the case that further material considerations are raised prior to the close of the statutory publicity period on 10 December 2021, that the application be considered by Planning Committee
278. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.45 pm

**CHAIR**

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



**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 20 January 2022 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robin Parr (Head of Governance and Support Services), and Sharon Libby (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Rafa Grosso-MacPherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Heather Lealan (Development Management Lead) and Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead).

**OPENING REMARKS**

279. 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**

280. Apologies were received from Thérèse Evans.

**ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

281. Gary Marsh declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 9 as a neighbouring property was owned by a member of his family, and that he would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item.

282. Barbara Holyome declared public service and personal interests in Agenda Item 10 as a member of Bramdean & Hinton Ampner Parish Council and confirmed that she had not taken part in any discussions or decisions on this application, and as she was acquainted with one of the public speakers, Matthew Morton.

283. Robert Mocatta declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 8 as a Hampshire County Councillor as he had been involved in discussions with regard to the site, and that he would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item. He also declared public service and personal interests in Agenda Item 9 as an East Hampshire District Councillor and a Hampshire County Councillor and as he was acquainted with two of the public speakers, Councillor Paul Milner and John Palmer.

284. Diana van der Klugt declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as she was acquainted with one of the speakers, David Coldwell, who was a former Horsham District Councillor.

285. The Chair declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 on behalf of herself, Alun Alesbury, Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, 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 11 NOVEMBER 2021**

286. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 November 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment:

- Page 1, Item 5 para 236 – the application reference number should read “SDNP/19/06024/FUL”.

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

287. There were none.

**ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

288. An appeal was received for SDNP/20/04118/FUL The Queens Hotel Selborne, which would be dealt with by written representations.
289. The decision notice had been issued for SDNP/20/04766/CND King Edward VII Hospital, Kings Drive, Easebourne.

**ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS**

290. There were no urgent items.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/21/04615/FUL – The Grange Development Site**

291. The planning application for this agenda item had been withdrawn, so there was no live application at this point.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/21/03755/FUL – Bulmer House**

292. Robert Mocatta relocated from the committee table to the public gallery.
293. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
294. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- James Scott spoke against the application representing himself.
  - Sarah Brooks spoke against the application representing herself.
  - Mark Slater spoke in support of the application on behalf of WWA-Studios, as the agent, representing the applicant.
  - Councillor Paul Milner spoke in support of the application on behalf of Petersfield Town Council.
295. Robert Mocatta left the meeting at 10:20am
296. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-34), the updates and the public speaker comments and requested clarification as follows:
- Due to the increase of units within the building was visitor parking increased?
  - Was it possible to see a photograph from a distance to see the building in the context of the overall townscape?
  - Was more planting on the walls planned to increase biodiversity?
  - What was the BREEAM rating?
  - The report highlighted several objections from both the Design and Landscape Officers, could this be expanded upon?
  - The new condition referred to in the update sheet included the phrase “substantial completion” which was a legal term. What did this mean in reality, when would it be triggered and how would it be monitored?
  - Would Condition 18, which referred to the Landscape Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), be submitted prior to the work being commenced? Would the same also apply to Condition 17?
  - What was the impact on the neighbouring listed building (Cliff Cottage) as raised by one of the public speakers?
  - Can the surrounding listed buildings be clarified as there was reference to a chapel and church?
  - What was the definition between extra care and rented ownership?
  - The public speaker, Mr Scott, advised that Ramscote was not a care home, please could this be clarified?

- How was the BREEAM expectation going to be achieved as there was no guarantee that it could be met?
- What was the impact on the other two listed buildings close to the site?
- Potentially many of the residents could be vehicle owners, had consideration been given to this?
- Had consideration been given for the storage of disability scooters or similar vehicles?
- Could further clarification be given with regard to SuDs as referred to by the Design and Landscape Officers in the report?
- What was the viability for the provision of extra care?
- In relation to Cliff House what was the difference in height between the existing building and the proposed building?
- Condition 10 referred to the Construction Management Plan (CMP); generally a CMP would only refer to the actual site. Could confirmation be given that lorries would not block the entrance to the cemetery?

297. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- There were currently 19 car parking spaces which would be increased to 23, which included minibus parking and delivery bay.
- The Officer showed the committee a diagram which highlighted the view of the building from Tor Way to demonstrate how it would affect the townscape. There was further information available in the Design and Access Statement.
- A new green roof was planned along with additional landscape planting with climbing plants on the lower storey wing of the property as additional planting and use within the overall surface water drainage scheme.
- The BREEAM rating for the building was categorised as Very Good, 70% was needed to be achieved to reach Excellent, and the current scheme was at 64/65%. This was a reasonably high score in the Very Good category. The credits targeted within this BREEAM score were those that would achieve the most environmental benefits in terms of energy efficiency for example. Condition 8 in the recommendation sought to meet the BREEAM expectation to try and meet Excellent rating.
- The views expressed by the Design and Landscape Officers in the report were addressed within the assessment section of the report regarding design matters. This outlined a balance in assessing the design concerns. There had been attempts throughout to address some concerns regarding the outdoor amenity space, the footprint of the building and creation of the courtyards and the mansard roof which allowed for accommodation in the roofspace to help reduce the heights of the building for example. A contemporary form of architecture gave more flexibility in the design process than a traditional form where it was likely its height would increase.
- The phrase “substantial completion” referred to the completion of the shell of the building ahead of more internal works in the Officer’s view, but it can be a matter of judgement. The Certification of timber to be used in the cladding would likely be sourced and installed at later stage of the construction process, rather than prior to reaching slab level. Condition 8, however, required this evidence at a much earlier stage which wasn’t feasible following further discussion with the agent. Therefore, an additional condition as per the Update Sheet proposed that this requirement be prior to the substantial completion of the building. Monitoring of compliance with conditions could cover this.
- The LEMP referred to in Condition 18 was not required as a pre-commencement condition because it would not be until the landscaping had been agreed and implemented that the LEMP would come into effect.

- The impact on the setting of the listed building (Cliff Cottage) was not significantly harmful as the site was behind a belt of protected trees and the building had a closer relationship with Ramshill (facing onto it) than the application site. Although no Heritage Statement had been submitted, the impact upon listed buildings was covered in the Design and Access Statement.
  - Extra care was about people needing varying degrees of care but who wanted to lead an independent life. The shared ownership properties would be managed through a registered provider and the affordable (rented) units would be managed by Hampshire County Council.
  - It was the Officer's understanding that Ramscoate was a care home, rather than sheltered housing. In any event, an assessment on the relationship and impacts between the proposals and Ramscoate would be the same.
  - Condition 8 sought to maximise the BREEAM score to try and reach Excellent. A lot had been achieved to reach a high Very Good rating such as no fossil fuels were proposed to be used for the heating and hot water, good energy efficiency and air tightness, use of renewables and more sustainable materials for example. A variety of options had been explored in line with the Sustainable Construction SPD and Policy SD48 and it was felt the policy requirements were largely met.
  - The presentation highlighted the other two properties, a Church and a Chapel, to the North West of the site which were grade II listed. It was considered that the proposals fell outside of their setting.
  - The scheme was for people of varying abilities and health concerns and included age restrictions. The building's use would be secured in a legal agreement as per the recommendation. Regarding parking, the Parking SPD was not explicit for this type of use but adopted a flexible approach on a case by case basis and this site was in a sustainable location. A S106 would include an obligation for a Travel Plan to seek to reduce reliance on cars.
  - It was confirmed that storage of disability scooters was included and shown on the ground floor plan near the entrance to the building where it would be accessible.
  - SuDs were part of the overall sustainability of the scheme. The existing building used traditional SuDs, and sustainability was being improved by the proposed drainage strategy, including green roofs, which would help with surface water management. Further details on drainage and landscaping via conditions could seek to integrate these to try to deliver a 'softer' and more holistic engineering approach at the discharge of condition stage.
  - 60 units was the minimum threshold for these schemes from knowledge and experience. The pre-application proposals included a larger scheme that was scaled down to 56 units. The 100% affordable tenure and the provision of the day centre does affect the viability and the scheme was at the viable/unviable threshold.
  - In relation to Cliff House, the lowest point of the proposed building was 9.8m high, and Bulmer House was lower.
  - It was confirmed that the Construction Management Plan could manage the parking of construction/delivery vehicles in order to not block the entrance to the cemetery. The Highways Authority would be consulted on the CMP before it was approved.
298. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The scale and design were issues and considered unacceptable. The site was however in an accessible and sustainable location for users of the site given it was close to Petersfield town centre. A lot of care homes had 60+ units but this smaller scheme did reduce numbers of residents and help with some better amenities.
  - To make the site work financially the building needed to be a minimum of 56 units. The previous building had 44 units. A mix of one and two bedroom flats significantly



increased the number of users on site and the building had to reflect this. There was a concern over the scale, bulk and massing of the building as well as its architecture. The Landscape Officer in the report expressed a view of the restricted areas for the users and lack of outdoor amenity space where, for example, there were few sunny aspects for people to enjoy.

- Insufficient parking was a concern, the increase from 19-23 spaces was insufficient, given this would also include vehicles for visitors, staff, deliveries, medical and other visitors. Whilst an Extra Care scheme was in line with the allocation policy for this site, the large size of the building was a concern.
  - Whilst it was a 100% affordable scheme, the amount of two bedroom flats was a concern and more one bedroom flats would be better which could help to reduce the scale of the building. The rear of the building looked institutional and the Landscape and Design Officers objections were relevant and correct. This application needed to be revised and re-addressed, there were too many objections from the Design and Landscape Officers.
  - The scheme had a lot in favour as an Extra Care scheme and was 100% affordable with a day care facility. Whilst there was no in principle objection from Petersfield Town Council, reservations were expressed due to the design and the neighbouring listed buildings and that the design should be more Landscape Led(LL). There was concern on the scale, mass and bulk of the building and the reservations from the Design and Landscape Officers needed to be taken into account. It was a privilege to be able to develop and build within the SDNP, but the required standards needed to be met, which this application did not reach at this point. A more modest building would be more appropriate.
  - The scale of the development was a concern, and Design and Landscape Officers objections to this scheme were summarised in paragraph 4.3 of the report.
  - Specifically on the design, concern was raised about 3 storeys, albeit the mansard roof helped to reduce its height, there was a 'monotonous' roof line to the building, its architecture was incoherent, and it's repetitive a-symmetrical fenestration was a concern. Also, the architecture needed more vertical emphasis in its design.
  - It was challenging to design a building for people with specific needs, it seemed this building was designed from the inside out. To meet the needs of the town (including day care facilities) balanced with the considerations of the park was a difficult challenge.
  - The lack of outside space was a concern and particularly parking could prevent users wanting to go out, mainly due to lack of parking spaces upon their return. The travel plan would need to be 'cutting edge' and robust in order to manage the parking demands effectively.
  - There were three areas of concern to consider for this application:
    - a. Mass/Bulk/Scale of the building and the impact of this on the landscape.
    - b. Design specific to the building.
    - c. Car parking provision, although this could be addressed through a travel plan.
  - The project needed to have a robust and cutting edge travel plan supported by another public body.
  - It was acknowledged that if this application was refused (based on 56 bedrooms) there may be no further option to be considered regarding less units.
299. It was proposed but not seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
300. It was proposed and seconded that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
- 1) The scale, bulk and massing of the building and the associated issues including amenity space and landscape impact.

- 2) The design of the building.

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

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

- 1) The scale bulk and massing of the building and the associated issues including amenity space and landscape impact.  
2) The design of the building

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

**ITEM 9: SDNP/21/03545/OUT – Land North & West of Windward, Reservoir Lane**

302. Janet Duncton joined the meeting at 11:35am.

303. Rob Mocatta returned to the meeting at 11:35am.

304. Gary Marsh relocated from the committee table to the public gallery.

305. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet. The Officer highlighted a typographical error on the front page of the report under the proposal which read: "...for up to 10 dwellings...." and should have read "... for up to eight self-build dwellings and two for affordable dwellings for rent".

306. Gary Marsh left the meeting at 11:55am

307. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Councillor Paul Milner spoke in support of the application on behalf of Petersfield Town Council
- John Palmer spoke in support of the application on behalf of Petersfield Community Land Trust
- Jamie Oarton spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Petersfield Community

308. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-35), the updates, and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- As this was a self-build proposal, a management plan would be more of a challenge than it would be for a developer. The layout plan indicated a number of neutral spaces to be delivered. At what stage would the management plan be implemented?
- The update sheet referred to paragraph 4.2 of the report and mentioned a requirement for non-plastic windows/materials. As this was an outline application had the Design Officer gone beyond what was expected at this point?
- Why did the application only include two bedroom houses up to 100sq meters, when small houses within the SDNP could go up to 120sq metres? If these houses were 120sq meters this would allow for an additional room, for example, an en-suite bathroom.
- Did the application require the committee to consider the actual number of dwellings applied for?
- Was sustainability included in the Design Code, as it was hoped these houses would be made as efficient and sustainable as possible?
- If the Petersfield Land Trust ceased to exist would an opportunity be opened for another developer to present a different plan; was the decision to be made; (a) that the land could be built upon, or (b) only sustainable self-build/custom build properties could be built on the land?.
- Was there a definition of a self-build property?

309. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The management plan would be discussed with the applicant at the reserved matters stage with landscaping matters, and the applicant is aware that a management plan will be needed to be in place to maintain and manage the open spaces, road, etc.
- A range of materials have been put forward in the submitted Design Code, that are so far acceptable. The Design Officer would have preferred more on sustainability criteria, such as a ban on plastic windows in the Code, but that was not an LPA sustainability requirement and suitable conditions could be stated.
- The reference in the report was based on plans submitted by the applicant and annotated approximate floors paces. Floor spaces are not fixed rigidly and the SDNPA will retain control over number of rooms.
- The number of dwellings to be applied for is a fundamental element in the assessment of this application.
- Sustainability was included in the Design Code and the minimum requirements included in the Code were based on the Sustainable Construction SPD CO2 reductions in energy efficiency and renewable energy. Condition 13 also includes requirements on sustainability.
- The principle of the development was acceptable if another developer submitted another application for self or custom build as in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). There would be nothing beyond the framework and an S106 to ensure this. Whilst this was applicable to the current NDP a future NDP revision may not include the same allocation/requirements. This was an inherent risk albeit control measures were in place to limit this.
- It was confirmed that there is a legal definition of a self-build property, the NPPF also included a definition of a self-build property, which was read to members

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

- This was one of two sites identified in Petersfield for self-build, and the Petersfield Community Land Trust should be encouraged to continue this application. If permission was not granted the Petersfield Community Land Trust would cease and this was a crucial issue.
- As an edge of settlement site this was a sensitive location that had been allocated for low density housing in the Petersfield NDP. In comparing this application with the Petersfield NDP, the density of the development seemed to be too high. If the proposed density in the NDP was followed, this application should have been for no more than 8 dwellings.
- This was a good community site with adequate spaces and demonstrated people working together and easily integrated within the town of Petersfield without being over developed.
- Reservoir Lane needed to be a concern with Highways, if this had been a developer for the whole site, alternative options for Reservoir Lane would have been considered, but as this was for self-build, options for Reservoir Lane would not be addressed. If CIL payment was collected, this could support issues surrounding Reservoir Lane.

311. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, as per the Update Sheet, including a correction to a typo to reflect the referenced dates as 2022, not 2021 and the additional conditions in the update sheet.

312. **RESOLVED:**

- I. That outline planning permission be granted subject to:
  - The conditions at paragraph 10.1 and the update sheet

- The completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the delivery of the following:
    - a. Five affordable dwellings in accordance with paragraph 3.3 of this report;
    - b. Occupancy restrictions for the self-build dwellings in line with policy HP7 PNDP.
    - c. A phasing plan for the development
  - The completion of a preliminary feasible drainage layout supported with an additional groundwater assessment.
  - The completion of an acceptable detailed scheme of mitigation for reptiles.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if:
- The Section 106 agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 20 January 2022 Planning Committee meeting.
  - Drainage proposals are not demonstrated to be feasible with a supporting additional groundwater assessment within 6 months of the 20 January 2022 Planning Committee meeting.
  - A detailed scheme of mitigation is not submitted or found acceptable to mitigate impacts on reptiles within 6 months of the 20 January 2022 Planning Committee meeting.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/21/05479/FUL – Bramdean Farm**

313. Gary Marsh returned to the meeting at 12.30 pm
314. The Officer summarised the recent judicial review which was relevant to this application, reminded Members of the report content, referred to the update sheet and referred to two further letters of representation; (1) Friends of the South Downs which advised that the proposed building still presented an intrusion into the landscape and expressed concern with regard to highway impact (2) Owners of Woodcote Manor Cottages who advised of the ruination of unspoilt countryside and increased traffic, noise and pollution.
315. The following public speakers addressed Committee:
- David Coldwell spoke against the application on behalf of Friends of the South Downs
  - Matthew Morton spoke in support of the application representing himself as the applicant
316. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-36), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Would the proposed building be in conflict with the existing overhead power cable and is this an issue that the Planning Committee should concern itself with?
  - Paragraph 8.26 of the report referred to choice of materials with full details of planning materials to be defined. Could the materials be confirmed as it would be difficult to make a decision, without knowing the detail of the materials
  - If this application went to Judicial Review again was the Officer confident, particularly with regard to Ground 2 Heritage Impact, Ground 3 Noise Impact and Conditions, that there would be no further concerns?
  - The 2018 application for two buildings was considered a major development. The 2019 application was not considered as major development which was inconsistent. Was the Officer confident that the current application recommendation was not inconsistent with the 2018 decision?
  - Had the principle of development on this site been established due to this committee's previous decision or had that been quashed? Was this a material consideration?

317. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The exact location of the existing power cables in relation to the proposed building is not known, however this was a building control issue and not a matter of planning consideration.
- Officers advised that the building would be timber clad, with a condition that required the detail of the exact materials, colour and roofing. The report and the update sheet provided sufficient information on the materials for Members to make an informed decision on general appearance.
- With regard to any future Judicial Review, the Officer was confident that previous matters of concern had been addressed. The committee report had been reviewed by legal Counsel. Furthermore the Conservation Officers comments had been taken on board and balanced against the economic, social, environmental and heritage benefits of the scheme. Additionally environmental health were content that noise pollution issues had been addressed and could be controlled through the proposed planning condition.
- The Officer was confident that this application was not inconsistent with the 2018 decision and that the previous concern had been thoroughly addressed and that the proposal did not constitute major development for the purposes of paragraphs 176 & 177, footnote 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This was addressed in the committee report.
- Although this committee's previous decision in regard to this site was a material consideration, as the assessment was quashed in the High Court and no decision was ever issued, it was advised that the weight given to this consideration should be very modest.

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

- It was acknowledged that the concerns around a major development had been addressed for this application.
- This building had a visual impact on the landscape, therefore it was left to Officers to finalise the detail of the appearance of the building with landscaping being of key importance. Conditions 13 and 14 would need to be amended to ensure the landscape was protected.
- This type of development was an acceptable requirement for current times within the Park. This was the way forward to support sustainable agriculture..
- The scale of the proposal had been reduced considerably from the 2019 submission.
- There had been serious concerns regarding traffic on this stretch of the A272 including on a recent nearby application which was refused due to traffic issues, which holds the national speed limit and there had been previous near misses by Woodcote Cottages. The safety of staff, lorries and moving vehicles had not changed, from a highways safety aspect this was unacceptable.
- The farming industry had faced huge challenges; support and resources was required to change business models and encourage diversification.
- Roads had been a hazard in many applications; however this application was vastly improved.
- Committee Member advised that Hampshire County Council had confirmed that an average speed camera would be installed outside of Bramdean Farm later in the year.
- It was confirmed that Permitted Development rights would be removed as included on the Update Sheet

319. Members were further advised that conditions 13 and 14 could be amended to protect the landscape for up to 10 years.

320. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, subject to the extra condition on the update sheet and the amendment of conditions 13 and 14 to ensure the protection of the landscape for 10 years.
321. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report, the update sheet, and the amendment of conditions 13 and 14 to ensure the protection of the landscape for 10 years.

**ITEM 11: Summary of Appeal Decisions received from 19 August 2021 – 29 December 2021**

322. The Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet
323. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-37) and requested clarification as follows:
- Page 122 SDNP/19/06024/FUL of the report references how the Inspector considered officers and Committee were incorrect in considering in such fine detail the design, scale and layout of the site and water. Was there any implications moving forward when discussing small rural sites?
  - In the report at the top of page 112, it stated; "all are delegated decisions unless otherwise stated". Could it be confirmed who the decisions were delegated to (i.e. were they delegated to SDNPA officers or to delegated to officers across host authorities as well?)
  - When an NDP was presented to the Committee, should guidelines be issued to communities, surrounding the allocated sites which further explained that illustrative plans could not be finalised until all evidence has been assessed.
324. In response to questions officers clarified:
- It was thought that the Inspector advised that the policy itself was not wrong, and that the scheme was broadly policy compliant, but that through allocating the site there should be an expectation for some harm. Where officers consider the Inspector was incorrect was in suggesting the Authority should be saying what a landscape-led scheme would look like; this is not for us to do. It has been a recurring issue in neighbourhood planning where communities rightly want to understand what an allocated site may look like, however given the stage the NDP developed and resources available, it is very tricky to produce illustrative plans that are realistic. The local community installed a huge amount of time and effort into creating an NDP, to find at the end of the process what was allocated was not as they had originally envisaged. This needed to be highlighted at the beginning of the neighbourhood plan development process.
  - Delegated decisions were delegated to Officers at the relevant Authority; the SDNPA or the Host Local Authority.
  - The Policy Team had been putting together advice on how to produce NDPs and other community led plans. This would include guidance on how to define site (e.g. red line, numbers, density), use of illustrative plans and the use of robust caveats. This was an issue to be discussed further outside of this meeting.
325. The Committee made the following comments:
- It was interesting to note two similar appeals; one which was dismissed and one which was approved;
    1. SDNP/20/03081/LIS Page 113 of the report, Post Cottage, referenced replacement windows (dismissed).
    2. SDNP/20/01960/LIS Page 128 of the report, ffowlers Bucke, referenced double glazed units allowed in place of single place units.
326. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions.

327. The Chair closed the meeting at 1:28pm.

**CHAIR**

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





**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 10 February 2022 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

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

Also attended by: Stella New (Senior Development Management Officer), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Naomi Langford (Major Projects Officer), Katie Sharp (Senior Development Management Officer), Sabrina Robinson (Senior Development Management Officer), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Amy Tyler-Jones (Senior Planning Policy Officer), and Chris Paterson (Communities Lead)

**OPENING REMARKS**

324. 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**

325. Apologies were received from Janet Duncton.

**ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

326. Richard Waring declared a public service interest in Agenda Items 7, 8 and 9 as a Lewes Town Councillor, and a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 as he was acquainted with one of the public speakers, Imogen Makepeace.

327. Gary Marsh declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 10 as a Mid-Sussex District Councillor.

328. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 11 as an East Hampshire District Councillor for Buriton and East Meon and a Hampshire County Councillor, and a personal interest as he was acquainted with the public speakers Maggie Johnston and Jonathan Jones.

**ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 20 JANUARY 2022**

329. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 January 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

330. There were none.

**ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

331. It was confirmed that decision notices had been issued for

- SDNP/21/00924/CND – Land at Rotherlea
- SDNP/20/05058/FUL – Paris House
- SDNP/20/05439/FUL – Iford Farm
- SDNP/21/00398/FUL – Ridgeview Winery Estate

332. Officers would update Members following the meeting on the campsite at Clarefield Copse and any agreed start date for Paris House.

**ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS**

333. There were no urgent items.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/20/05799/FUL - Pells Church of England Primary School**

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

335. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Jennifer Chibnall spoke against the application representing herself.
- Councillor Imogen Makepeace spoke against the application representing herself.
- Councillor Imogen Makepeace read a statement on behalf of Peter Earl representing Friends of Lewes & Cycle Lewes.
- Marc Marsh spoke in support of the application on behalf of Raven Housing Trust as the applicant.
- Edward Ledwidge spoke in support of the application on behalf of Montagu Evans, the agent, representing the applicant.

336. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-38), the updates and the public speaker comments and requested clarification as follows:

- Could it be confirmed that it was the decision of East Sussex County Council (ESCC) to close the school due to there being no need
- Was there a traffic management scheme in place for the construction works?
- The 3-bedroom houses were for families, what was the remainder of the allocation of the dwellings?
- Could some further information be given on the Green Infrastructure (GI) strip?
- What open space was provided for flats?
- Was the parking compliant with the Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)?
- There was insufficient cycle storage on the site, particularly when compared to the number of parking spaces allocated. Could the amount of cycle storage be increased?
- Where would the land drain running from behind the houses exit and how would this area be maintained?
- Was the housing mix compliant with Policy SD27?
- There was criticism of the layout of the scheme, to what extent was there public consultation?
- Was there any diversity to mix the bricks used in the houses to avoid a uniform look?
- Were the flat blocks positioned on the lower area of the site?
- How was the site considered to be Landscape Led?
- What had been secured to make the site child friendly?
- This was the one opportunity to secure upgrading of the footpath to a cycle route why could this not be done as part of this application?
- Were the 49 car parking spaces allocated or available on a first come first served basis?

337. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- It was confirmed that ESCC made the decision to close the school and that the site was now owned by Raven Housing Trust.
- A traffic management scheme would be secured under Condition 5, Construction and Environmental Management Plan.

- The breakdown of dwellings was confirmed in the report as:
    - 2No 2-bedroom and 12No 3-bedroom semi-detached dwellings (shared ownership)
    - 4No 1-bedroom and 10No 2-bedroom flats (affordable rental)
    - 4No 1-bedroom flats (Lewes Low Cost Housing)
  - Whilst the space for the GI strip had been allocated, the detail was yet to be finalised. The strip would provide multi-functional benefits including biodiversity net gain and sustainable drainage. These details would be secured by a landscape condition.
  - The area of public open space had been maximised, with multifunctional SuDS features that would contribute to amenity. A lower density site would have enabled more open space, however, this had been balanced with the viability of the scheme.
  - The Parking SPD allowed for a flexible approach. It was felt an appropriate balance had been achieved due to the nature of the surrounding road network and significant concerns of local residents about parking pressure, and the need to secure enough onsite parking whilst ensuring it was not too dominant in the development.
  - It was acknowledged that there was insufficient cycle storage on the site. Condition 38 would allow this to be increased and there was sufficient space within the site for its provision.
  - All excess surface water would drain into the public surface water sewer. The Maintenance and Management Plan for the entire drainage system, including SuDS features and the land drain, would be secured under Condition 23.
  - Officers confirmed that the housing mix met local need, as set out in paragraph 8.12 of the report, which detailed the need for Lewes.
  - The application had been re-publicised a number of times during the course of the application. The applicant had carried out a public consultation prior to submitting the application.
  - The Design Officer raised a concern regarding the uniform appearance of the single red brick which reflect the local built form but not the wider Lewes area which had a more varied palette. A mixed palette of facing materials was secured via condition 8
  - The blocks of flats were 9m high and the houses were 8m high, with the flats being positioned on the lowest part of the site.
  - The landscape evidence considered included the settlement pattern, the site's edge of flood plain location and high water table, and land form.. The layout of the development was led by the contours of the site he density was lower than surrounding development to reflect its edge of settlement location. Water was a significant feature of the site and the attenuation pond and other SuDS elements would reflect this character. Additional Green Infrastructure would be preferred, however, the layout had been developed iteratively to achieve the best layout,, led by landscape evidence, and the Landscape Officer had no objection.
  - Landscaping was secured by condition for public open space and amenity, which would include safe areas for children. Additionally there was access to the public recreation area opposite the site, with no road to cross. The community forest schools area would also provide additional space for school children and the local community. The footpath through the site had been moved behind the row of parking spaces to make a safe route.
  - The application was for affordable housing and was not considered reasonable or proportionate to request a contribution to upgrade the footpath..
  - It was confirmed that the parking spaces were not allocated to individual dwellings.
338. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:

- The loss of the school was regrettable, however the change from a community use to residential complied with Policy SD43.
  - Even though the local community had raised concerns regarding the design and layout, the best scheme had been achieved within the realms of what could be done.
  - This was a good exception site, and getting the best for the residents had been achieved. The town centre was a 15 minute walk away and the site was of high quality and eco-friendly with lower running costs. Raven Housing Trust were a respected organisation which provided high quality properties.
  - Potential flooding was an issue but the relevant drainage infrastructure was in place.
  - The scheme would be less dense than neighbouring development.
  - The construction methods to enable a net zero carbon development were impressive.
  - There was a missed opportunity to encourage sustainable travel and require the scheme to upgrade the footpath to a cycle route;
  - It was recognised that the scheme was for affordable housing rather than market housing and was already delivering multiple benefits;
  - Further consideration could be given to strengthening Condition 38 to improve the provision for cycle storage.
339. The members were further advised:
- Officers confirmed that the requirement for additional cycle storage could be addressed under Condition 38 as it was currently worded.
340. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
341. **RESOLVED:** It was proposed and seconded that planning permission be granted subject to:
- I) The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the update sheet and a legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
    - i) 32 affordable homes of the following mix and tenure:
      - 2No 2-bedroom and 12No 3-bedroom semi-detached dwellings (shared ownership)
      - 4No 1-bedroom and 10No 2-bedroom flats (affordable rental)
      - 4No 1-bedroom flats (Lewes Low Cost Housing)
    - ii) Highway works associated with:
      - Access from Arundel Green including, visibility splays and closure of existing access;
      - Provision of 2No on-street parking bays on the Arundel Green Spur;
      - The new footway along Arundel Green/Arundel Green spur;
      - Removal of relevant signage/barriers and associated lines on the public highway associated with the existing school keep clear markings;
      - Crossing points across Arundel Green Spur road at its junction with Lee Road/Arundel Green Road and across the access point;
    - iii) A £5K administrative contribution towards a Traffic Regulation Order for implementation of any parking restrictions required on and/or extension to the 20mph within the site;
    - iv) A permissive foot/cycle path through the site for public use;
    - v) Community use of the forest schools area.

- 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 been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 10 February 2022.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/21/01191/FUL – Tithe Barn**

342. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
343. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Susan Paine spoke against the application on behalf of the Parochial Church Council of St Laurence Church, Falmer.
  - Angela Stannard spoke against the application on behalf of the Residents of Park Street.
  - Melanie Cuttress spoke against the application on behalf of Falmer Parish Council.
  - Chris Wojtulewski spoke in support of the application on behalf of Parker Dann, the agent, representing the applicant.
  - Sophie Luhr (Events Manager @ Tithe Barn) spoke in support of the application representing the applicant.
  - Mark Woolley spoke in support of the application representing himself as the applicant.
344. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-39), the updates and the public speaker comments and requested clarification as follows:
- Was it acceptable to have the temporary catering marquee in its currently proposed location, due to its close proximity to the neighbouring property?
  - The exit from the village was traffic light controlled, but there was no reference in the report on what could happen at the junction. The lights are programmed with limited time to access the main road from the village, as the flow of the main road is the priority
  - Condition 26 references the hours of use for the barn. However, there was no further information on the hours of use of the other buildings. What hours of use are proposed for these?
  - Were the creative events and photoshoots covered under the existing permission or would permissions need to change? What events were currently able to take place if permission was not granted today under the 28/56 day permitted development provisions?
  - Regarding the Environmental Health no objection, was a baseline noise assessment carried out that took the A27 into account?
  - Was there any possibility of additional planting on the western edge of the site to reduce the impact of activity from car parking on the neighbours such as a hedge?
  - For the purpose of a wedding, would the barn be used for the whole event, including the service, or just the reception?
  - Was the football stadium consulted, to ensure that any events held there were not impacted by a wedding held on the same day?
  - Building B had a laboratory on the ground floor for hair products to be tested, how did this fit in with the ethos of the site?
  - Building B included holiday accommodation on the top floor and Building C was also proposed for accommodation, again how did this fit with the ethos of the site?
  - The Design Officer expressed concern that there was insufficient information on sustainability and energy strategy, was this addressed?
  - Was it acceptable for Buildings C & D to be sited so far apart creating sprawl?
  - Was it necessary to have such a large amount of glazing and where would it be?

- What were the combined dimensions of the buildings and what alternative uses could they have under this permission in the future?
- Could Condition 35 be amended to exclude weddings on Sunday to protect the tranquillity of the Church from events and associated preparation? Or that weddings were not held on consecutive days?
- How practical was Condition 27? Would people be happy for the doors to be closed when the weather was hot?
- Condition 27 stated that the doors would be closed at 2100 hours, could a more reasonable time be considered to perhaps 1900 or 2000 hours, with an automatic door closure device being installed?
- Would conferences be held in the barn as well as weddings and parties?
- Condition 31 referred to the modest accommodation, how long could people stay or how many days in the year could people stay?
- How were Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds worked out on this application and how much would Falmer Parish Council receive?

345. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- In addition to reducing the fire risk to the barn, it was important to also minimise the sub division of the open space in the barn. The catering marquee was not a permanent feature and the Event Management Plan would ensure minimal impact on the neighbouring properties. With the limited use of the cooking area, officers were satisfied this issue was addressed.
- ESCC Highways were consulted on the issue of traffic and were satisfied there was no severe impact on the transport network, with the flow of traffic being managed by the Events Management Plan.
- The primary focus was on the events held and use of the barn. The uses of the other buildings were of low impact (office/lab space/accommodation) and it was felt there was therefore no need to restrict the hours of use of these buildings.
- There were no existing permissions on the barn; it was still an agricultural barn. The 28/56 day rule did not apply to events hosted within buildings.
- An on-site study of existing background noise was conducted, the recommendations by the applicant's Noise consultant and Environmental Health had been interrogated, and the proposed mitigations, which would be conditioned, would go beyond the mitigation proposed by the applicant to better protect the amenities of the community.
- The management plan would ensure that parking was efficiently implemented with visitors encouraged to park on the eastern edge of the site first. The focus for day to day parking including accessible and electric charging would be in the yard.
- There was a landscaping condition in place which would allow further scrutiny of proposals for planting for the western boundary of the field.
- For a wedding service to be held within the barn a licence would be required, so was a separate issue. There was no planning restriction proposed.
- During the application process, officers worked closely with East Sussex County Council highways officers, who liaised with other stadium access management stakeholders. There was no concern expressed of any cumulative impact on the stadium of events being held on the same day as a wedding or conference.
- The collective set of buildings worked functionally together, for example, the hair products would be showcased within the studio, and there was a hair salon on site within the mezzanine in the barn to support the studio and photography events.

- Similar to the laboratory, the accommodation would support the use of the barn, whereby the bridal party or other guest could stay on site. Also, if there were consecutive days of filming, the guest accommodation could host the team. It would be restricted to guest accommodation but not tied to the use of the site, which would contribute to wider sustainable tourism aims.
  - The Officer confirmed that the application met the standard of sustainability including energy performance, thermal efficiency, the use of local sustainable materials which would be secured by condition.
  - With regards to the location of Buildings C & D, the proposals for the site needed to consider the relationship with other buildings. A key consideration was to keep the eastern boundary clear to protect the setting of the barn and it was also important to ensure the new and old were kept at a respectful distance. Historic mapping was used to influence the layout. Building D was a functional storage building, and the sensitivity of the courtyard justifies its location in the field.
  - The majority of the glazing was on the ground floor and the gable ends which were key for natural light and lower energy use. The design alterations including adding sliding doors, and overhanging eaves minimised light spill into the Dark Night Skies.
  - The dimensions of the buildings were confirmed as:
    - Building A – 7m to ridge on the higher ground Footprint 23m wide x 8.7m deep & Floor Space,
    - Building B – 7.3m to ridge footprint 17m wide x 6m deep).
    - 3m eaves heights which are comparable to lower eaves on the barn, With reference to historic building forms and historic building setting, the floor space of Building B would be smaller than the original granary. The Granary as extended is larger than proposed Building A, both in terms of height and floorspace.
  - The conditions would restrict building uses. Condition 34 limited Buildings A and B to Class E (g) Office and Light Industrial use.
  - Whether the limit of 30 weddings or parties per year was sufficient and the necessity of additional restrictions to prevent events being held on a Sunday would be appropriately discussed in the debate section of the meeting.
  - The purpose of Condition 27 requiring the closure of the doors was to keep the noise indoors, but it would not prevent people going outside for air. As the barn was a large building it could regulate its own temperature fairly well.
  - The Officer confirmed 21:00 hours was considered by officers to be an appropriate time for the doors to be closed given the sensitivities of the site, however, this could be debated by members. An automated door mechanism would likely be contrary to the special qualities of the listed building and were also not deemed necessary with a robust Events Management Plan in place.
  - Conferences and other events would be held within the barn. It was also confirmed that the condition for closure of the doors applied only to weddings and parties due to the higher potential noise impact.
  - Timescales were not proposed to be restricted for the use of the accommodation, provided it was used for holiday provision, and the applicant would need maintain records to ensure the correct use of short stay accommodation. Conditions on previous applications had however limited stays to 28 days and a condition could be added if members wished.
  - The new guest accommodation would be CIL liable. Without a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) the local Parish Council would receive 15%.
346. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:

- An improved landscape plan with more planting was requested to prevent noise transmission from the car park.
- Consideration was given to restriction of events on Sundays. This was not carried forward to be proposed as an amendment
- This was a good site and venue to preserve the tithe barn.
- The applicant lives next door so was unlikely to propose anything detrimental.
- There were varying interpretations on the impact and value of the guest accommodation. It was agreed that records needed kept, however this was a good opportunity for the accommodation to produce CIL and was a viable income generator. However, the priority for this application was the use of the barn for weddings and conferences and studio use and the guest accommodation was proposed to support that.
- This application regularises use of the barn which was positive, and alleviates concern expressed by local residents about previous unregulated events. The accommodation, particularly Building C is anticipated to be a good income earner for visitors to the local area and the South Downs. The 28 day limit for the accommodation needed to be included and enforced by the provision of accommodation records.
- The A27 noise was noticeable when members visited the site, but if the open grassed area was divided with hedges this would not sit well within the surrounding countryside context. The orchard was positive.
- Pleased to see the collaborative work with Historic England, revisions to the scheme and review of the noise impacts.
- Looking at the overall area, including the stadium, station and cycle path, there were fantastic transport networks and linkages to capitalise on.
- This was a good development of a special building that avoid subdivision. It is supported by a positive business plan and was an opportunity to work with and support the local community and the Church.
- Recognise the concerns of the community, including in response to unauthorised events and on the basis of worst case predictions. The regulation of activity through management plans has proven to be an effective method. Enforcement measures are available.
- This is an extremely important building and asset to the SDNP, there is a need to find a viable economic and sympathetic use for such a structure. Supporting buildings are recreating a historic pattern and have been designed sympathetically and subordinately. Any detrimental effects should be reduced. Concerns about the use of a marquee for catering and the related opening of the western door as this is a potential source of noise, from the catering activity and from the barn via the western doors. Yet acknowledge that there is no known satisfactory alternative.
- Economics are an important consideration when looking after significant heritage assets.
- The concern of the local residents was understood due to the lack of clarification of use of the other buildings..
  - a. Buildings A and B - clarification was required for the Class use of Office & Light Industrial use and the hours of use; these could be in use when something else was happening in the barn or in separate ownership. These buildings could in the future be used for a more noisy use. These buildings need to be considered fully, noting their location in the setting of the listed barn.
  - b. Building B – the top floor could be used for something else, it is a not inconsiderable area and has an external stair so could be used separately.
  - c. Building C - required conditions to confirm the use.



However, if problems did arise by either the applicant or residents, these needed to be addressed with the SDNPA if the conditions were not adhered to or the District Council for environmental health concerns

- Frequently villages who have experienced weddings, had expressed concerns with noise. A 200 person wedding could generate noise. A condition for the doors to be closed permanently (not just from 21:00) would benefit residents and not impinge on the use of the barn. Amplified music or speech late afternoon or early evening when the doors are open could be harmful. The closure of the doors would not likely be necessary when no amplified sound was taking place.
- The conditions needed to be tightened to minimise the impact upon the local communities. A condition, to prevent weddings on Sundays, or consecutive days, could be included to protect the Grade II\* Listed Church in the area. 200 people attending is still a large amount. Welcome a debate about reducing the guest totals to 150. Note football matches are played on a Sunday.
- Reservations were expressed on the guest accommodation but enforcement would support this.
- Ensuring and enhancing the tranquillity of the local area would be benefitted by the closure of doors during any periods of amplified sound. With regard to policy SD7 the proposal should take opportunities to enhance relative tranquillity where these exist, not reducing standards due to existing noise. Closing the doors would assist this.
- Members noted the application was proposed by an established business.
- Perhaps consideration should be given to reducing the number of guests permitted to attend an event.

347. The Members were further advised by Officers:

- That the conditions included within the report meet the required tests, including that they would be enforceable.
- It was acceptable for the restriction that the guest accommodation was limited to 28 days per guest and this can be included in the condition (32).
- The uses of Buildings A and B would be acceptable uses within a residential area and the use was restricted by Condition 33. Officers were satisfied no additional conditions on hours of use of these buildings were necessary, there is a high degree of separation between these buildings and neighbouring properties.
- 21:00 hours was the recommended time for closure of doors, members have the option to reduce the hours further if considered necessary.
- Concern was acknowledged of the close proximity of the catering tent to the neighbouring residential properties, although the benefits of the use of a temporary catering tent in this location were also recognised. Condition 30 restricted the siting of the marquee to 90 days per year.
- With regard to the 200 people condition, it was rare that a restriction was put on the amount of people accommodated within a building, but it was considered appropriate on this occasion due to the size of the venue and sensitivity of the surroundings. This cap would be secured under Condition 24. Officers were satisfied with this restriction. Members could lower this if thought appropriate.
- Weddings were restricted to 30 per year. Officers considered it was appropriate to give the applicant some discretion as to when these would take place. Where weddings were held on consecutive days this would take up some of the allowance which would result in other days being free of events. This approach was considered acceptable by Officers. If members, in their planning judgment, considered there would be significant and deferential harm from hosting events on consecutive days a further restriction could be applied.

- Members have heard the concerns of the Church regarding Sunday closing. Officers don't regard closure on a Sunday as necessary given the planning conditions already proposed but again members have discretion on this matter.
348. After a further debate on whether amplified music or speech or both ought to be restricted, it was proposed and seconded and resolved that Condition 28 be amended so that all external doors were closed when there was amplified sound within the barn or by 21:00 in any event, with wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning to confirm.
349. It was proposed and seconded and resolved that Condition 32 be amended so that holiday accommodation was limited to 28 days per visitor in any calendar year (Buildings B and C) with wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning to confirm.
350. After a further debate, members did not propose to vote on restricting the number of guests to below 200, or to require additional screening on the western field boundary
351. It was proposed and seconded to move to a vote on the officer's recommendation amended as set out in the paragraph below.
352. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 10.1. and the update sheet plus the changes to the following:
1. Amendment to Condition 32 (Holiday occupation only) to reflect the fact that the holiday occupation shall be limited to 28 days per visitor in any calendar year (the final form of wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee)
  2. Amendment to Condition 28 (Doors Closed) so that all external doors are closed when there is amplified sound within the barn or after 21:00 in any event (the final form of wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee).

**ITEM 9: SDNP/21/01192/LIS – Tithe Barn Listed Building Consent**

353. The Case Officer presented the application, and reminded Members of the report content. There was no amendment in the update sheet to this application.
354. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Chris Wojtulewski spoke in support of the application on behalf of Parker Dann, the agent, representing the applicant
355. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-40), the updates, and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Had Building Control consent been given, as this building was for public use?
  - Was heating considered?
  - How temporary was the curved wall and what materials were used?
356. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The remit for the SDNPA was for the planning aspects of this application. Officers would work with Building Control to find a suitable resolution if any issues arose.
  - Heating options were addressed early on in the proposal, but insufficient information was available at that point to rule out detrimental impacts on the heritage assets. Therefore no heating was proposed at this time but officers would work with the applicant to look at a holistic approach for sustainable heating across the whole site in due course, including generating energy from renewable sources and reducing energy use.
  - The critical criteria for this application was how the structure would be secured to the building. It would be a lightweight structure, typically timber or metal and used as a backdrop. While it was requested as a temporary structure (to enable easy removal if required in the future), retention on a permanent basis would be acceptable to officers.

357. No members volunteered matters to debate, therefore it was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
358. **RESOLVED:** That listed building consent be granted, subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 9.1.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/20/04255/FUL – Field Opposite Clayton Wood Burial Ground**

359. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
360. The following public speakers addressed Committee:
- Michelle Golds spoke in support of the application representing herself as the applicant
361. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-41), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Had the site been in use for 18 months?
  - If the committee agreed with the recommendation, would enforcement action follow?
  - The site was not accessible for all users. How far away was the nearest residential area and how would pedestrian users access the site?
362. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The site had been in use for approximately 18 months.
  - The application came to the committee as a result of an enforcement enquiry. If Members agree with the recommendation for refusal then the Authority's enforcement team would take matters forward.
  - Pedestrians accessed the site via a footpath that ran down the Brighton Road, with Hassocks as the nearest developed town approximately 1KM away. Access to the site was shared with the Public Right of Way.
363. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- There was mention of dog waste, and if approved there would need to be provision for dog waste.
  - An agility area would come with other props and various equipment, which if permission was granted, would change the nature of the currently agricultural field.
  - This application had inadequate information on highways matters, there was no information regarding knowledge of species within the grassland, if this information was available approval could be considered.
  - Access and visibility splays were of concern. Whilst there was a need for dog exercising fields within the countryside, this particular field was in a protected landscape and needed to be addressed accordingly.
  - Dog exercising areas were required to protect the national park and wildlife, however, this application was inappropriate due to the urbanisation and visual impact and the highways concern was an issue.
  - Approval of this application would change the nature of the field, parking would change the surface, the application was not Landscape Led and did not add peace and tranquillity to the SDNP.
364. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
365. **RESOLVED: Recommendation:** That planning permission be refused subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report.
366. Gary Marsh left the meeting at 2.20pm

**ITEM 11: SDNP/21/02014/FUL – Land at Greenway Lane**

367. The Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
368. The following public speakers addressed the Committee
- Maggie Johnston read a statement on behalf of Jonathan Jones representing the Buriton Village Design Statement Group
  - Maggie Johnston spoke on behalf of Buriton Parish Council
  - Alistair Harris spoke on behalf of Metis Homes as the applicant
369. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-42) and requested clarification as follows:
- Who would take responsibility for the roads?
  - Was the land to the north of the application site under the same ownership as the application site?
  - Page 192/193 paragraph 9.35 of the South Downs Local Plan stated that “All suitable opportunities should be taken to create a new public footpath.....” What more suitable opportunity was there, other than now, for this to be addressed?
  - The public speaker Maggie Johnston suggested a deferment, would this enable a conversation between the applicant and the landowner to discuss the viability of footpath?
  - What was the objective of getting to the railway bridge on the causeway?
370. In response to questions officers clarified:
- All public areas of the site would be the responsibility of the freeholders of the site via a maintenance company.
  - The landowner north of the site entered into a contract with the applicant for the planning application so that the applicant would only have control of the application site and no control over the land to the north of the site. Significant efforts had already been made for a footpath to be included in the application but without success, so it was felt that a deferment was unlikely to change the situation.
  - Connection to the railway bridge would allow connection to the wider rights of way network and a connection to Queen Elizabeth Country Park.
371. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- A deferment should be proposed for a month, to enable further discussion between the landowner and the applicant to ensure that all opportunities to create the new footpath had been fully explored. This application was an opportunity to further open up access to the park.
  - This was an excellent application with affordable housing which had the benefit of air source heat pumps, it would be disappointing to lose this opportunity due to a footpath.
372. The members were further advised:
- Officers were keen to maximise the potential from any site, but were of the view that the maximum had been achieved for this application. Developers had worked with the Authority to get to this point ensuring no door was shut to potential access in the future. However, discussions had broken down on the matter of the footpath and Officers were not confident that a deferment would make any difference.
  - This site had an allocation for 8-10 houses. The developer has provided the majority of the link. Given the distance, members needed to consider whether it was proportionate that this development included the link to the railway bridge?
  - The requirements of the specific wording of Allocation Policy SD62 had been met and the provision of the footpath was an aspiration detailed within the explanatory text for the policy.

373. It was proposed and seconded to defer this application
374. **RESOLVED:** That this application be deferred to allow consideration to be given by officers and the applicant as to whether the footpath link could be provided.

**ITEM 12: Community-Led Renewable Energy Technical Advice Note (TAN)**

375. The Officer presented the report and advised of an omission on the update sheet and the following should have been included in the update sheet: paragraph 6.3 of the TAN ‘Uses locally sourced materials in construction and operation’.
376. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-43) and commented as follows:
- Could a wind map be considered to determine where wind turbines would be most suitable?
  - As every Local Authority would in the near future have to collect food waste and may need to move food waste by road outside of their district to their nearest anaerobic digester, there was concern that the SDNPA did not rule out potential sites on planning terms before having considered them. Also, a digester restricted to the scale of only one farm was unlikely to be viable; there needed to be enough source material, which could come from the Local Authorities.
  - Was this Technical Advice Note (TAN) a draft?
  - The document is headed “Community Led...” but paragraph 1.3 referred to “householders”. Was the TAN for the community or for householders?
  - Could the document be reviewed so fuel poverty was included under paragraph 3.1 of the TAN?
  - Paragraph 5.6 referred to bio mass boilers. These boilers had a poor reputation due to pollutants, was this taken into consideration?
  - Would the title of the document be changed to “Renewable Energy” TAN
  - Was it Committees role to review wind turbines?
  - Was energy waste and insulation going to be included within the TAN?
  - Was attention paid to the historical sites of windmills which were of various shapes and sizes. Additionally, there had been new studies where painting one of the blades black helped birds to see them.
  - A cautionary approach should be applied on the proximity of ground source heat pumps around trees as they had potentially damaging impacts on tree roots and growth; this should be highlighted in Table I of the TAN.
377. Members were advised:
- When the Local Plan is reviewed an evidence based study will be required on the suitability of different areas of the Naitnal Park for wind turbines although it would be expensive to complete. Whilst it would not be implemented in the current TAN, it could be included in a future update of the TAN.
  - The future increase in transport of food waste was an interesting development and would be monitored. If the digesters were major development they should go outside of the SDNP, however, each scheme would need to be considered on its own merits.
  - It was confirmed the TAN was a draft for approval. Any further minor changes would be included as agreed by the Director of Planning and the Chair of the Planning Committee.
  - It was confirmed that the TAN applied to both communities and householders, most fell under permitted development rights.
  - A short paragraph could be included in the TAN on fuel poverty.

- Although the issue surrounding bio mass boilers needed to be considered, a discussion was worthwhile as these boilers could be a suitable form of renewable energy. Further investigation was needed around the balance between less polluting fuel sources that could not locally sourced and more polluting fuel sources but that were available more locally.
- If the title of the document would be changed, however, it was important to ensure it was not a TAN for large schemes. It was agreed that the document title would be changed to 'Small scale Renewable Energy.'
- The local plan review and the NPPF, provided governance and advice on where there was potential sites for wind turbines and would be looked at in future.
- It was confirmed that energy waste and insulation was addressed by SD48 of the Local Plan.
- An assessment of wind turbines on historical sites would form part of a Wind Energy Study. Additionally the Officer was unaware that one windmill blade could be painted to help birds but was a sensible idea and would be looked at in the future.

378. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

1. Approved the draft Community-led Renewable Energy Technical Advice Note set out in Appendix I for publication subject to any changes proposed by the Committee and the update provided by officers.
2. Delegated authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to make any minor changes to the draft Community-led Renewable Energy Technical Advice Note.

379. Rob Mocatta left the meeting at 3.25pm

### **ITEM 13- Making of the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan**

380. The Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet

381. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-44) and acknowledged that the completion of 40 NDP's in the SDNP was a significant achievement.

382. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

1. Noted the outcome of the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan Referendum;
2. Agreed to make the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the SDNPA's Development Plan for the Parish of Twyford

383. The Chair closed the meeting at 15:31

### **CHAIR**

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