

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 9 June 2022 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

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

Also attended by: Sabrina Robinson (Senior Development Management Officer)

### **OPENING REMARKS**

454. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that South Downs National Park Authority (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**

455. Apologies were received from Gary Marsh and Robert Mocatta.

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

456. Janet Duncton declared a public service interest as a West Sussex County Councillor and a member of the Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee at West Sussex County Council.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 MAY 2022**

457. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 May 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

458. Following the approval of the Shoreham Cement Works Area Action Plan Issues and Options document at the May 2022 meeting of this committee, the public consultation was launched the week commencing 30 May 2022 and comments had already been received. A public consultation session was held on 8 June 2022 and was well attended with positive feedback received. Another public consultation event was planned to be held along with a virtual sessions via zoom.
459. Members requested that an update be brought to a future meeting of this committee on the status of SDNP/20/05627/FUL- Land and Building South of Clarefield Copse, Dumpford Lane, Nyewood, South Harting, West Sussex. There was concern that following this committee's discussion and grant of planning permission in June 2021 the conditions were not being adhered to, particularly in relation to the travel plan and monitoring plan.

### **ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS**

460. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/21/05281/FUL – YEOMANS, SEFTON PLACE, WARNINGCAMP**

461. The Officer presented the report, reminded Members of the report and the update sheet and provided a further verbal update to Condition 21 by adding standard implementation wording.
462. The following speakers addressed the committee:
- James Hutchison spoke on behalf of Corbil Estates & Planning Ltd representing the local residents.

- Steven Marley spoke on behalf of himself.
  - David King spoke on behalf of Warningcamp Planning Committee & Burpham & Wepham Parish.
  - Elizabeth Lawrence spoke on behalf of Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd the agent, representing the applicant.
  - John Brown spoke on behalf of himself, as the applicant.
  - Annie Murphy spoke on behalf of My Choice School.
463. Before moving onto the debate, the Chair asked the Officer to address some comments made by the public speakers:
- Whether this development would be a lawful use of the site with regards to the school use on the site and the proposal for the school sports building.
  - The number of dog walkers that were expected.
  - The intention to expand the use of the school.
464. Members were advised:
- . The school use of the site received planning permission in 2011 and thus the proposal for the schools sports building is a lawful use.
  - The numbers of dog walkers had not been provided in the application, but this would be included in a Site Management Plan (SMP) proposed in Condition 15.
  - It was understood that there was no intention to expand the use of the site. The proposed sports building would only be used by the students on site.
465. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-55), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- There was no indication of the age and number of children at the school.
  - If this application was permitted Condition 10 should be amended to confirm that the details should be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
  - Although the wildlife pond area was restricted to private use by the landowner, Condition 5 allowed that it could be used by other persons or groups as permitted by the landowner, which potentially opened it up to many other uses.
  - Were officers satisfied that a Site Management Plan (SMP) was suitable to ensure the site's use was as expected?
  - What was the size of the gap in the brick wall along the southern boundary of the site that was to be removed and set back to accommodate the new access?
  - Was the site within or outside of the settlement boundary and what was the overall size of the site?
  - What was the current use of the unbuilt area of the site?
  - Local residents had expressed concern that the dog walking area would be used for business purposes, which would mean one user walking several dogs. Would this be covered under the SMP?
  - Given that the hours of use were 9.00am to 7.00pm on any given day, including during the darker winter months, was there a restriction on lighting, or would consideration be given to summer and winter hours?
  - Concern was expressed that the objections raised by the Ecologist had not been addressed and that a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal had not been provided.

### Agenda Item 3

- No local representations were received in support regarding the dog walking areas and associated facilities.
- The requirement of a sports hall was understood. However, the need for the other buildings scattered around, including a storage barn of 250sqm and toilets for dog walkers were unnecessary. There were already wetlands in the area along with local dog walking areas, therefore there was no need for a car park and dog walking facility in this area.
- The inclusion of a wildlife pond, tree planting and a wildflower meadow was a welcomed biodiversity net gain. This, supported by the management plan and a likely online booking system made for an excellent facility.
- Highways had no objections to vehicle movements and the car park was only for four cars.
- Condition 16 needed to be improved as it only addressed the lighting for the buildings without any flexibility for lighting in other areas of the site.
- If the area was not a public open space, Condition 5 needed to be more secure as it was not clear on what could and could not take place on the site and it was currently at the owners discretion.
- Whilst it seemed there would be biodiversity gain, it was an extraordinary application, serving a number of uses for different users and purposes. The site was previously open countryside and was now divided into several different areas. There was a risk that the local area and residents would be disrupted by the change of use. The dog walking facility was meant for use by the locals, but the public speakers had expressed that this facility was not required.
- The school building proposal, the biodiversity gains and the overall amount of built structures being reduced made for a beneficial application.
- The application was to be considered as a whole and the school needs were very clear. Dog walking fields were supported by the SDNPA which also recognised the requirements of some dogs which needed to be exercised in a safe area.
- The success of the application was dependant on the conditions being strictly adhered to.

466. Members were advised:

- The Design and Access statement confirmed that the age group of the children was 10-18 years. There was no information regarding the number of children registered at the school..
- Condition 5 associated with the wildlife pond area was proposed to ensure that it was not used as a tourism activity and was only used by the landowner and not for public use.
- This site would be monitored to ensure that conditions were discharged for the SMP. Visits from the Monitoring Officer would also ensure the proposals were being built in accordance with the plan and conditions adhered to. Condition 20 had been included which required the operator to keep a register that would be available to the SDNPA.
- The gap in the wall along the southern boundary of the site would be the equivalent of the width of two cars, approximately 5 metres.
- The site was outside of the settlement boundary, as defined in SD25, and being a paddock surrounded by development was considered open countryside as per SDNPA policies. Details of the overall size of the site were not available at the meeting.
- The unbuilt area of the site was used as a paddock for grazing.

### Agenda Item 3

- The register would follow the SMP which would include site capacities. Condition 20 could be amended to include the number of users and the number of dogs per user.
  - There was to be no lighting available, however given the area was specifically for dog walking the area was relatively safe when compared to walking in the woods.
  - If condition 4 included hours of use according to the seasons, the condition would likely become overly complicated. Therefore, the condition was considered suitable.
467. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation subject to the update sheet, the oral update by the case officer in connection with condition 20 and the following amendments to conditions: .
- Condition 5 - to further clarify the public and private use of the wildlife pond area and viewing platform to ensure it was clear this would not be a public space.
  - Condition 10 - to include that the details should be *submitted to and approved in writing* by the Local Planning Authority.
  - Condition 16 - to ensure that any lighting in open spaces is dealt with through the condition as well as lighting on any building
  - Condition 20 - to include the number of dogs being walked as well as the number of users.
  - Condition 21 – the inclusion of a standard implementation clause.
468. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of this report and the update sheet and the following amendments to conditions:
- Condition 5 - to further clarify the public and private use of the wildlife pond area and viewing platform to ensure it was clear this would not be a public space.
  - Condition 10 - to include that the details should be *submitted to and approved in writing* by the Local Planning Authority.
  - Condition 16 - to ensure that any lighting in open spaces is dealt with through the condition as well as lighting on any building
  - Condition 20 - to include the number of dogs being walked as well as the number of users.
  - Condition 21 – the inclusion of a standard implementation clause.
469. The Chair closed the meeting at 11.20am.

### CHAIR

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