

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

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

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

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

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

### **OPENING REMARKS**

1. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that:
  - SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthered the National Park Purposes and Duty. Members regarded themselves first and foremost as Members of the Authority, and would act in the best interests of the National Park as a whole, rather than as representatives of their appointing body or any interest groups.

### **ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

2. Apologies were received from Vanessa Rowlands

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

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

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

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

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

6. There were none.

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

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

- Members queried the committee's consideration of Judicial Review decisions following the receipt of an email on the subject from a member of the public. Officers advised that Judicial Review decisions were already reported to Planning Committee on a quarterly basis and that an officer response to the email would be sent.

#### **ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS**

8. There were none.

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

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

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

14. Members were further advised:

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

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

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

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

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

18. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

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

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

- With regards to the challenges faced by Non-Motorised Users (NMUs):

- How were NMU's currently crossing the road at the Coombes Road/A27 traffic lights which were known as "the Sussex Pad"
- Once the traffic lights were removed how would NMU's cross the A27?
- If approved how would this application benefit NMU's?
- Is it thought that if the application was approved that Coombes Road from South to North would be used as a rat run up to Steyning?
- Had traffic surveys been conducted, and if so, had the surveys included what the projected use of the new stretch of road would be when compared with its current use?
- Was the crossing at the roundabout to be at grade and traffic light assisted, and was this different to what had already been permitted?

20. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The current crossing of the A27 at the Sussex Pad was by traffic light. When consent was granted to remove the Sussex Pad traffic lights provision for crossing by traffic light was made at the new three arm roundabout. Additionally consent was granted for a new link for cyclists, equestrian users and walkers along the northern side of the A27 which then dropped south along the west bank of River Adur. It was considered that there was a moderate benefit to NMU's as part of this application by the closure and landscaping of Coombes Road (East).
- Paragraph 7.60 of the report referred to the concern of Coombes Road being a rat-run towards Steyning. The application was to relocate access from Coombes Road to a fourth arm on the roundabout. The design of the road was in a rural context and therefore it was not considered likely to be used as a rat run.
- Paragraph 7.60 of the report referred to the data of vehicles used during commuting hours. Traffic modelling had been undertaken and the application was supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Highways England and Local Highways Authority were satisfied with the traffic data submitted.
- The crossing itself was no different than that already permitted, which was at grade and traffic light assisted. The only change resulting from this application was that the fourth arm would carry the pedestrian link, rather than it running adjacent to the A27.

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

- It was acknowledged that the NMU routes would be made marginally safer due to the closure of Coombes Road east to vehicular traffic.
- It was considered extremely unlikely that this route would be used as a rat run.
- The confirmation about access to the South Downs National Park and that there would be a traffic light controlled crossing at the new roundabout alleviated concerns for NMU's.
- The original A27 scheme was reviewed in detail and the scheme to remove the traffic lights addressed the issue well. Concern was expressed about the need for this development and, whilst the need for Lancing College was important, their need did not necessarily satisfy the thirteen other local businesses.
- Concern was expressed about the business objections towards the application.

22. Members were further advised:

- It was not required in development plan policy to demonstrate the need for this development and it was not considered a major development for the purposes of the NPPF. Through EIA regulations the applicant had demonstrated reasonable alternatives. The decision in this instance should be made on the planning balance of benefits and disbenefits..

23. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the update sheet.
24. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Section 10 of this report and subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning with obligations relating to:
- 1) The provision of species rich grassland/wild flower planting enhancements for a period of 30 years at land to the north of the site at Hoe Court Farm to include the provision of off-site reptile mitigation and an appropriate habitat management plan;
  - 2) Deed of Variation to S106 agreement secured under SDNP/18/00434/FUL to reflect the amendments proposed to Coombes Road (east) junction with the A27 (stopped up, landscaping) and to ensure all other obligations within that agreement are secured.
- and note that the Committee confirm in their decision that they have taken into account:
- 3) the environmental information as required by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;
  - 4) all matters referred to in the Director of Planning's report including comments received from statutory consultees and other interested parties, and;
  - 5) all other material considerations

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

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

25. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet. A verbal update was also given on comments from the Dark Night Skies Officer who raised no objection subject to Condition 17 in the report related to lighting and additional comments which were received from the Highways Authority in response to Owslebury Parish Council's concerns regarding highway safety.
26. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Councillor John Foster spoke against the application on behalf of Owslebury Parish Council.
  - Kim Blunt spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Applicant
  - Digby Cooper spoke in support of the application as the Applicant
27. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-03), the updates and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was it correct that the application was for the use of land and not the erection of buildings? Were officers satisfied that the lodges were similar to caravans, rather than buildings that required planning permission?
  - How was Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) determined on this application and what were the permitted development rights?
  - Could a condition be included for white lines and a STOP sign for the access/exit road or would this have to be done by the Highways Authority?
  - Paragraph 3.3 of the report referred to one large car park. How did users gain access to the lodges with luggage etc.?
  - As a 19% CO2 reduction improvement was required by SD48, if the lodges were not compliant could a condition be included?
  - Was there a condition in place to manage noise from the site?

- Paragraph 3.9 of the report stated that “... the timber used for their construction would be UK sourced where possible” and that electric vehicle charging points were “proposed”. Could this be more definitive?
- In regard to the wording of the recommendation, was permission being granted by the committee or was it being delegated depending on the response from Natural England on the matter of an acceptable foul water strategy?
- What were the implications if the site was not completed as a whole?
- Was it considered that the scheme met criterion G of policy SD23 of the South Downs Local Plan in terms of whether it would make a positive contribution (part g(i) of the policy)? If not, did this application set a precedent for future applications?

28. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

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

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

- The pandemic had increased the demand for UK Holidays. The site seemed well

managed and professionally run with minimal noise.

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

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

32. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content, and referred to the update sheet.
33. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Councillor James Deane spoke against the application on behalf of Petersfield Town Council
  - Gethin Morgan-Owen spoke against the application representing himself
  - Patrick Barry spoke in support of the application representing the Applicant
34. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-04), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Was the temporary footpath put in unilaterally or with the Officer’s express knowledge?
  - Significant concerns were expressed about the footpath at the entrance to the site. Were all options considered for this layout?
  - Could wording be included with conditions 22 and 23 so that the conditions would be implemented prior to construction work starting?
  - Could the conditions also include consultation with all interested parties?

- Could the path be placed on the north side of the access, which would then avoid the need for pedestrians to cross the carriageway?
35. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The temporary footpath was implemented without Officer's knowledge.
  - A number of alternative routes for the temporary path had been suggested by third parties and the Petersfield place-making group had a long term aspiration for a link with a route along Tilmore Brook.
  - Condition 23 asked for details for a suitable footpath, which could be amended to include wording requiring the existing temporary footpath to be removed within a specified period of time.
  - During the process of discharging condition 23, which required the provision of an appropriate temporary path, officers would also consult with appropriate third parties with regard to siting.
  - As development had already commenced, pre-commencement would not be appropriate for condition 22. The time periods set out for this condition were considered appropriate, however, a clear timetable for the implementation of the permanent shared path could be sought along with a time period within which the temporary path would also be removed.
  - It was advised that moving the legal line of an adopted right of way and the path to north side was an involved undertaking and would also require a new full planning application.
36. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments.
- During the construction phase, it was requested that a banksman was required at the entrance to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
  - The cycleway/footpath was heavily used and there was a potential for conflict during construction. A footpath the other side would not resolve the issue during the construction period.
  - The track was frequently used by cyclists which was encouraged by national and local policies. The entrance to the site was a problem which needed to be addressed.
  - The introduction of a Banksman during the temporary construction period was considered satisfactory. Once the development was completed, traffic was unlikely to be an issue.
  - A risk of conflict between vehicle and cyclist remained at the crossover.
  - Traffic calming in condition 22 should be significant, not just a road hump.
  - Both vehicle drivers and cyclists were responsible for safety when using the road/path.
  - As a result of a discussion it was proposed that condition 23 be amended to secure the removal of the temporary footpath within a period of time (2-4 months) and a further condition added to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists during construction
  - The committee was content with the traffic situation when the original planning application was considered.
  - The new Highway Code had changed priorities for traffic on UK roads. It was suggested that Officers went back to the Highways Authorities and checked that this road was compliant with the new Highway Code. If not, it was requested that a crossing point be installed for cyclists and cyclists be given priority.
  - As planning permission was given irrespective of land ownership, and permission had been granted for a path on the south side, why was planning permission now being sought for a path on the north side?
37. Members were further advised:



- Although the approved construction management plan ensured onsite supervision, a further condition could be included to secure further safety measures at the entrance to the site, which should include a banksman.
- Caution should be taken as there was no objection from the Highways Authority to the proposal. Also, it was understood that the amended Highway Code would be published later in 2021.
- While planning permission can be granted on land not owned by the applicant, the lack of any third party agreement required an amendment to the permission

38. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to:

- the conditions in the update sheet and at appendix I of the update sheet
- the amendment of condition 23 to include the removal of the temporary footpath within a period of four months; and
- an additional condition requiring a further Construction Management Plan which secured safety measures at the entrance to the site.

39. **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That planning permission be granted for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the update sheet, and appendix I of the update sheet, and subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation linking this variation application to the original permission and to the already secured S106 agreement with its obligations relating to:
  - A provision of 34 dwellings (40%) on site for affordable housing;
  - A contribution of £44,511 towards Public Open Space;
  - A contribution of £300,670 towards Highways Infrastructure;
  - A contribution of £103,920 towards Community Facilities;
  - A contribution of £66,493 towards employment opportunities (if requirements set out in the Agreement to provide on-site construction jobs are not met);
  - A contribution of £21,250 towards a community project worker.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application, with appropriate reasons if the Deed of Variation is not completed or substantial progress has not been made within 3 months of the 12 August 2021 Planning Committee meeting.
- 3) That condition 23 be amended to include the removal of the existing temporary footpath within a period of four months, and that a condition be added requiring a further Construction Management Plan which secured safety measures at the entrance to the site, and that the final form of wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

40. Gary Marsh and Richard Waring left the meeting @ 14:25

## **ITEM II: REVIEW OF SDNPA STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

41. The Planning Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
42. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-05) and requested clarification as follows:
  - Engagement and consultation arrangements with Town and Parish Councils were agreed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the County Level Associations of Local Councils and the Authority. Should the MOU be amended, especially as it stated there were two meetings per year and now there were three, which included the webinar?

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

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

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

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

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

### **CHAIR**

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