SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), Janet Duncton, Therese Evans, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson, and Diana van der Klugt.

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

Also attended by: Sabrina Robinson (Senior Development Management Officer) Vicki Colwell (Principal Planning Officer), Jack Trevelyan (Enforcement Officer), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), and Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager).

OPENING REMARKS

384. 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

385. Apologies were received from Alun Alesbury, Barbara Holyome Gary Marsh, and Richard Waring.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

386. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 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 10 FEBRUARY 2022

387. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 10 February 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

388. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

389. There were none

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

390. There were no urgent items.

ITEM 7: SDNP/21/02014/FUL – LAND AT GREENWAY LANE

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

392. The following public speakers addressed the Committee

- Maggie Johnston spoke against the application on behalf of Buriton Parish Council
- Jonathan Jones spoke against the application on behalf of the Buriton Village Design Statement Group
- Alistair Harris spoke in support of the application on behalf of Metis Homes as the applicant

393. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-45), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- The Chair reminded members that this application had been deferred from the February Planning Committee, to enable further discussions for a footpath to be included.
- Officers were thanked for their further discussions with Metis Homes and the landowners' agent, for a footpath to be secured. It was disappointing that the policy aspiration of a footpath and expectations were not met.
- Whilst this application was policy compliant, SD62 paragraph 9.35 did raise an issue to consider when making policy in the future about whether policy should be more clearly defined to avoid the ambiguity which led to the situation with this application.
- Dependant on the length of the growing wall could hedgehog holes be inserted in the wall?
- Would parking on this site be monitored to ensure the requirement of all necessary vehicular parking being provided on site was being met?
- Was there wording missing as part of the reason for the condition on page 27 of the report, condition 15 referring to "Highways/Access/Parking"?
- Under SD62e, was the policy requirement for a new pedestrian access which linked to the existing pedestrian route linking Greenway Lane to Glebe Road resolved?
- The objection received from the Landscape Officer and the comments from the Design Officer that the design of the site was too intensive, with ten units, added together with the lack of a footpath were of significant concern.

394. Members were advised:

- When policies were written in the future it could be tested further how an aspiration could be translated into policy.
- The inclusion of hedgehog holes in the growing wall would be included as a condition or via an informal discussion with the applicant.
- The monitoring of car parking was dependant on the residents monitoring the level of disturbance and issues. If it was a matter of concern, it would be addressed through enforcement.
- Condition 15 on page 27 of the report was a standard condition and the reason was not part of the condition. However, the words "for the site" could be added.
- There was a pedestrian route being provided in front of the houses along Greenway Lane which met SD62e

395. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the inclusion of hedgehog holes in the growing wall

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

1) 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) Four affordable dwellings in accordance with paragraph 8.3 of the appended report;
    b) Highway works as detailed in paragraph 8.12 of this report.
2) The conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of this report subject to any amendment required in order to providehedgehog holes in the growing wall;
3) The authority to be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with the appropriate reasons if:
    a) The Section 106 Legal Agreement is not completed or satisfactory progress is not being made within 6 months of the 10th March 2022 Planning Committee meeting.

ITEM 8: RESPONSE TO NATIONAL HIGHWAY'S SECTION 42 STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON THE A27 ARUNDEL BYPASS

397. The Officer presented the response, reminded Members of the report and referred to the update sheet, and a copy of an additional response which was sent to National Highways which referred to the Grey route.

398. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Emma Tristam spoke on behalf of the Arundel Bypass Neighbourhood Committee
- Camilla Lambert spoke on behalf of Arun Countryside Trust
- Kay Wagland spoke on behalf of Arundel South Coast Alliance Transport and Environment (SCATE)
- Philip Maber spoke on behalf of Chichester & Arun Green Party and ChiCycle
- Andrew Jackson spoke on behalf of National Highways
- Jon Rooney spoke on behalf of National Highways

399. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-46) and commented as follows:

- The UK had led the world on destruction of the natural environment and was the bottom of the G7 and bottom 10% worldwide because of decisions made on the environment. There were ways of improving the existing road and the SDNPA's response needed to be strengthened.
- In addition to the road there were associated issues such as signage, construction and other visual aspects that needed to be considered.
- The response drafted by officers was good, however could the word "strongly" be included before the word "object" in the proposed response?
- The public speaker highlighted that bats had not sufficiently been addressed in the report and as a National Park there was a duty for the protection of bats and bat migration routes.
- Due to the length of the response the paragraphs should be numbered for ease of referencing.
- Could the paragraph "Approach in the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (PEIR)**"** on page 59 of the report be moved to the beginning of the response under the summary as an introduction, as it explained that the Committee were commenting on the PEIR and National Parks as protected landscapes, with a header "Comments on the PEIR" added?
- There was an opportunity for something visually appealing to be created by the viaduct.

400. Members were advised:

- The Authority was objecting to the scheme presented at this meeting as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process and not the grey route, or the approach to road building generally.
- The lack of information provided surrounding the visual impact and change upon landscape character had been addressed in the response. The need for further information had been highlighted in earlier discussions, as it was necessary to enable stakeholders to provide a fully informed response to the proposal, but had not been received. If received this may have enabled the response to provide a clearer stance on the impacts. However it was difficult to ascertain the full impact of the proposal based on the limited information provided to date, much of which is expected to be provided later in the DCO process.

- The final response needed to ensure that the objection was on the information received and concern was expressed that there was a lot of information not yet provided.
- The protection of bats was addressed in the technical appendix (referenced 8.7.10 on page 63 of the report) and on page 56 of the report under biodiversity and could be strengthened further. However, the baseline evidence concerning bats had not been provided and therefore the impacts could not yet be fully understood. Natural England were also expected to comment on this matter.
- It was important that the key issues and concerns associated with the impact on the National Park were highlighted at the beginning of the response, followed by the detail included under PEIR. However, a couple of sentences would be included which referenced the PEIR section at the beginning of the document.
- The word "strongly" would be included before the word "object" in the response.

401. **RESOLVED**: The Committee considered and provided comments on the contents of the draft response to be provided by the Chief Executive of the Authority as part of the Section 42 Statutory Consultation.

ITEM 9: ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

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

403. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-46) and commented as follows:

- There was frequent anxiety expressed at community level surrounding enforcement notices, how was this addressed?
- The Policy and Resources (P&R) Committee reviewed in more detail the figures highlighted in paragraph 3 which included two lines with over 600 applications, however, P&R Committee had minimal planning experience Who monitored the enforcers, on behalf of the SDNPA?
- It would be beneficial if the enforcement report considered by the P&R Committee could be circulated to Members, perhaps through the Members bulletin.

404. Members were advised:

- If an allegation was made by a community, it was not automatically assumed it was valid. The Enforcement Officer would address it purely from a planning and enforcement perspective.
- The figures presented were requested by the Planning Committee and the detailed report was discussed at the P&R Committee annually. The detail had previously been considered at the Planning Committee but members decided it should be considered at the P&R Committee, along with other governance and audit matters. Contracts were currently being renegotiated with the host authorities, which included stricter performance measures and the final report on S101 arrangements was due to be considered by the Authority on 24 March.

405. **RESOLVED**: The Committee noted the update on enforcement action.

406. The Chair closed the meeting at 11:43am

CHAIR

Signed: _____