

**SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 14 July 2022 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker (Chair), Janet Duncton, Therese Evans, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Ian Phillips, Andrew Shaxson, Isabel Thurston, and Richard Waring.

Also attended by: Barbara Holyome (Item 7 only).

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

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead - West) and Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Specialist Lead).

**OPENING REMARKS**

1. 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.
2. As a result of the committee appointments made at the Annual General Meeting, the Chair welcomed Debbie Curnow-Ford, Ian Phillips and Isabel Thurston as new members of the Planning Committee, and advised that Barbara Holyome, Vanessa Rowlands and Diana van der Klugt were no longer members of the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

3. Apologies were received from Debbie Curnow Ford.

**ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

4. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 6 as a councillor of East Hants District Council

**ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 9 JUNE 2022**

5. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 June 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the amendment of minute 459 to reflect that, rather than the conditions not being adhered to, as planning permission had not yet been granted the conditions had not been discharged, hence the site was operating outside of permitted development rights.

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

6. There were none.

**ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS**

7. There were none.

**ITEM 6: SDNP/21/04848/FUL – LISS FOREST NURSERY**

8. The Officer presented the report, reminded Members of the report and the update sheet.
9. The following speakers addressed the committee:
  - Councillor Oliver Rook spoke against the application on behalf of Greatham Parish Council

- Abi Goddard spoke against the application on behalf the residents of Bakers Field and Deal Farm
  - Anna Dale-Harris spoke against the application on behalf of herself
  - David Murray-Cox spoke in support of the application on behalf of Turley, the agent representing the applicant
10. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC21/22-56), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Significant weight had been given to the evaluation of the viability statement provided by Bruton Knowles; was there a specific reason why members had not had the opportunity to review the viability statement, which appeared to form the key reason for refusal?
  - Given the statement from the public speaker, Mr David Murray Cox, that he was not aware of the Bruton Knowles viability statement, was there no communication on this with the applicant?
  - Paragraph 3.7, page 11 of the report advised that the dwellings would achieve a 13.99% reduction in CO2 emissions in addition to a 39% reduction via heat pumps, this was also referenced in paragraph 7.15 on page 17 of the report, what formed the basis for these figures?
  - As tandem parking often seems to be a provision in applications, had the implementation of tandem parking been monitored to establish if it worked and achieved its purpose?
  - What were the materials and arrangements for the run off of floodwater from the roadways and driveways towards the south of Bakers Field?
  - Could it be clarified if there was any visual impact from surrounding higher land?
  - Was the application and effectiveness of the affordable housing policy being monitored?
  - Concern and disappointment was expressed on the housing mix, the lack of affordable housing, and the dominance of larger dwellings compared with what was set out in SD27. The application also appeared to be non-compliant with SD71 (2a); had justification been provided as to why?
  - Had new tree planting been proposed in accordance with SD71 (3)?
  - Was the site heavily contaminated?
  - Concern was expressed over the lack of a shop as part of the application.
  - It was suggested that the site had the potential to be more densely developed which could provide a more village style development in keeping with the area. This could have the potential benefits of more affordable homes and a greater number of smaller houses, rather than the currently proposed larger houses, which gave the development a more suburban feel.
  - The lack of affordable homes could arise in further negotiations with the developers, along with opportunities for the design and layout to be reconsidered. The current design of the site was mediocre with much of the communal space allocated to SuDs, about which further information was required.
  - As an allocated site in a national park it was important that an outstanding housing development was provided. It was a privilege for the developer to work on such a site and there were elements missing which could have added value, such as the shop and cycle links.
  - Was there a significant change in the levels between the rear of Bakers Field properties and the proposed levels for the new development?

- Concern was expressed on the objection raised by Natural England regarding the site being close to a Special Area of Conservation; Woolmer Forest, Site of Special Scientific Interest.
- If the application was presented to the committee again, would there be a management plan for new planting?
- The climate change emergency should have motivated developers to aim for a higher reduction of CO2 omissions far in excess of 13.99%
- Did parking spaces include garages, or were garages in addition to the allocation of parking spaces?
- No negotiations and lack of communication by the developers with the local community was disappointing.
- What was the public transport provision linked to the site?

#### 11. Members were advised:

- The viability appraisals were available on the case file on the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) website for members to review beforehand.
- The additional six affordable dwellings, in addition to 8 dwellings proposed by the Applicant, highlighted in the presentation was information received verbally quite recently from Bruton Knowles. There was no written advice from Bruton Knowles to confirm this additional contribution.
- SD48 required the energy performance of new dwellings to achieve a 19% reduction in CO2 emissions via their fabric/construction beyond Building Regulations standards. Additionally, the SDNPA required a further 20% reduction in CO2 emissions through the use of renewable technologies (requiring a total 39% reduction). The Developer was proposing a 13.99% reduction through the construction/fabric of the building, but to compensate for not reaching 19% they were proposing a 25% reduction via renewable technologies. They would still be achieving the 39%, but in a different way.
- Highways Authorities had not raised any issues on tandem parking and there were no objections at this stage of the application. Tandem parking had been used elsewhere in other schemes and this was an issue that was considered in the Design Guide SPD.
- The layout highlighted that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) would run throughout the site to manage surface water at source or water would be channelled to the new SuDS basin on site. Drainage engineers and other consultees had agreed with this approach.
- The site was elevated above the Petersfield Road, however the dwellings were set back a noticeable distance from the road in addition to the open space and planting filtered and soften views from higher land and surrounding rights of way.
- Affordable housing was reported to Members in the annual monitoring report each December.
- SD71 required a transition in density from Petersfield Road through the site. To achieve this larger properties were sited on the south eastern side of the scheme, with the smaller properties placed nearer to the Petersfield road.
- Existing Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) would be retained along with trees of significant quality and character on the site. New tree planting was proposed in the public open spaces and along the Bakers Field boundary.
- The site was not significantly contaminated.
- There was a difference in levels between the rear of Bakers Field properties and the proposed levels for the new development. This was addressed by the layout of the dwellings and good size gardens with planting along the boundaries.

- Officers acknowledged the concern expressed about the Viability Appraisal being readily accessible such as appending it to the committee report, and this would be considered in future applications.
  - In a previous application there seemed to be a local divide on the need for a shop. The provision of a shop was not an explicit requirement of SD71, rather the policy supported a shop if one was included within proposals.
  - The management and landscape plans would be implemented later in the process.
  - The car parking allocation included garages.
  - Bus stops were immediately outside the site, which supported transportation links.
12. **RESOLVED:** That the application be refused as set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC21/22-56.
13. Barbara Holyome joined the meeting.

#### **ITEM 7: ADOPTION OF THE DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

14. The Officer reminded Members of the report.
15. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC21/22-57) and commented as follows:
- What training would be provided for non-professional users?
  - How would Town and Parish Councils be included in the training?
  - Once the document was approved would it be shared with relevant District and County Councils?
  - Some informative comments were made by consultees on matters such as how this contributed to the Authority's climate change and sustainability objectives. These could be considered as part of the Local Plan Review.
  - This Design Guide document was worthy of note and contained many important messages. It would be worth the Authority publicising this as it could give rise to better design in permitted development.
  - Officers were congratulated on their work on this document.
  - Would this SPD override a Village Design Statement (VDS)? Parish Councils needed to understand how to manage a VDS and a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) alongside this Design Guide SPD.
16. Members were advised:
- A training plan was being created in a variety of formats which included:
    - Sessions for Members, parish and district councillors, and host authorities.
    - All planning staff to include Officers from host authorities.
    - Including in our Agent's forums.
  - Discussions were taking place for training to take place through Parish webinars currently scheduled for September/October.
  - Training would include agents and District and County councils impacted by the Design Guide.
  - In the absence of a VDS this Design Guide could be used. If resources were available and the parishes wanted to continue with a VDS this would be encouraged and it was acknowledged that a VDS would go into a finer level of local detail. However, the Design Guide SPD was the framework going forward.

17. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved to:
  1. Note the content of the Consultation Statement (Appendix 1 of report PC21/22-57);  
and
  2. Adopt the revised Design Guide SPD (Appendix 2 of report PC21/22-57).
18. The Chair closed the meeting at 11:50.

**CHAIR**

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

