

## **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.
  - 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.
- 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: \_\_\_\_\_

## **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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions via their fabric/construction beyond Building Regulations standards. Additionally, the SDNPA required a further 20% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> 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: \_\_\_\_\_

