

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 13 October 2022 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Alun Alesbury, Janet Duncton, Therese Evans, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Ian Phillips, Vanessa Rowlands (agenda items 7 & 8 only), Andrew Shaxson, Isabel Thurston, and Richard Waring.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Amy Tyler-Jones (Senior Planning Policy Officer), and Richard Sandiford (Head of Governance).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

19. Alun Alesbury, who was Chairing the meeting, 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**

20. Apologies were received from Heather Baker and Debbie Curnow-Ford.

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

21. The following declarations of interest were made:
- A public service interest from Janet Duncton on Agenda Item 6 as a Chichester District Councillor.
  - A public service interest from Robert Mocatta on Agenda Item 7 as a Hampshire County and East Hampshire District Councillor.
  - A public service interest from Richard Waring on Agenda Item 8 as Lewes Town Councillor.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 8 SEPTEMBER 2022**

22. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 September 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

23. Members were updated on application SDNP/21/06431/FUL, ReCharge One by the A3 at Buriton. This application had gone to appeal.

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

24. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/22/02466/FUL – THE GRANGE DEVELOPMENT SITE, MIDHURST**

25. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report and the update sheet.
26. The following speaker addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Anna Ciesielska representing Monpelier Estates as the applicant.
27. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-08), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Could the vehicular access to the site be clarified?
  - What was of particular concern for Peachy House?

- Could the actual redline be clarified?
- It was acknowledged that there were fundamental issues with the scheme and Members were not in favour of a deferment, as had been requested by the applicant.
- There were a number of design issues, including the size and bulk being inappropriate for the site, the poor awareness of how spaces around the building might be used, and the building's poor relationship to its surroundings. The building would likely have a negative impact on the conservation area.
- There was concern for the living conditions of residents in rooms facing out of the northwest elevation.
- The applicant's position on viability and their insistence on this size of care home was noted. However, what the applicant wanted to build did not fit on this site.
- It would have been good to see innovations in water technology. The approach to water neutrality was very disappointing.
- It seemed the applicant had not understood the messages from officers either in the previous applications or during pre-app for this application that an application of this scale and design would not work. A new scheme was needed.
- There was also concern about insufficient car parking being in the control of the applicant.

28. Members were advised:

- On points raised by the public speaker, officers commented:
  - That it was possible to assess the scheme from the outside of the site as Members could get a good appreciation of the site from public vantage points.
  - Officers had been in contact with the applicant in August to outline concern and it quickly became apparent that there were fundamental issues with the scheme that were very unlikely to be overcome. As the issues were similar to those raised in pre-app and in previous withdrawn applications the applicant was advised that the application would be coming before Members with a recommendation to refuse permission.
- The main access was off Bepton Rd and would use the existing car park access. The car park would be reconfigured with an additional access through the car park to create a through route. There was parking provision for larger vehicles along with a service access into the building. The Highways Authority had not objected.
- The principle outlook of Peachy house was of particular concern.
- The definitive redline for the application encompassed the access and the first row of parking in what is currently the leisure centre car park.

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

30. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 9.1 of report PC22/23-08 as amended in the Update Sheet.

31. Vanessa Rowlands joined the meeting.

#### **ITEM 7: HAMPSHIRE WASTE AND MINERALS PLAN: PARTIAL UPDATE DRAFT PLAN**

32. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

33. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-09) and commented as follows:

- There was some concern about the impact of inflation on the costings.

- Did policy 24 take into account paragraph 176 of the NPPF, which protected National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs)?
- Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Plants, as in policy 28, were likely to be in rural areas. Many of these plants were relatively small. Would these be permitted in the SDNP? The NPA needed to be quite clear on the line between major and minor development for future applications.
- While designated landscapes were mentioned in policy 4, the same concern did not seem to be had about their setting or the indirect impact of some of the potential developments. Also, there seemed to be no reference to the section 62 duty. This should be included. Potentially also references about adverse impacts on the purposes of the SDNP.

34. Members were advised:

- Policy 24 was in line with paragraph 176 of the NPPF. Although the moratorium on fracking had been lifted recently and this was a very fast moving environment, but nothing had been said on the impact of this on National Parks or AONBs.
- Officers will need to consider the matter of AD Plants. Any applicants would need to consider policy 28 alongside policy 4, the protection of the designated landscapes. If an AD application was considered to be major development then the presumption would be that it would be located outside the SDNP. If minor development though it would not necessarily follow that must be outside the SDNP.
- The setting of the SDNP was included in the second paragraph of policy 4. Officers would review the document for reference to Section 62 duty. If there was no reference, there needed to be and it would be included.
- It should be noted that, in general, national policy should not be repeated in local policy documents.

35. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved:

1. Receive and consider the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan: Partial Update Draft Plan; and
2. Recommend the National Park Authority to:
  - i. approve the Hampshire Minerals & Waste Plan: Partial Update Draft Plan as set out in Appendix I of this report for Regulation 18 Public Consultation subject to any comments made by the Planning Committee and the National Park Authority being addressed; and
  - ii. agree to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Directors of Planning at Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council and the New Forest National Park Authority to agree minor amendments to the Draft Plan prior to Regulation 18 consultation.

#### **ITEM 8: LEWES BROOKS ROAD PLANNING BRIEF**

36. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

37. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-10) and commented as follows:

- Is it correct that, as the Authority did not own any of the properties in this area, unless properties came up for redevelopment there was not much that could be done to push change or improve the impact of the buildings on the climate?
- Part of being the local planning authority was trying to guide the future of development and this document was outlining how the Authority would like this area to develop. It should also help to embed this area into the community.

- Had an article 4 direction been put on this site? Otherwise permitted development could undo all the good work trying to be done in this area.
- Were the dashed blue lines on some of the maps hidden or visible infrastructure?
- It was possibly unique for an urban design brief to be produced in a national park. Officers were to be congratulated. This will influence development over the next 20/30 years in a beneficial way.
- Could there be some misinterpretations, for example, around public realm as the document doesn't explain that access and parking should be considered public realm? An explicit reference would be good. Might there also be encouragement of street trees and a useful appendix which suggested the kind of trees, vegetation or soft or hard landscaping elements that might be suitable. Although it was noted this could make the document too complex and could be linked to the Design SPD.
- Would any current pre-apps need to take this document into consideration?
- On pages 342 and 344 the view should not be set out that it was only suitable for contemporary design, but rather that it could be good quality contemporary or traditional design.

38. Members were advised:

- Any changes would only happen through redevelopment. The overall approach in this document would guide any redevelopment.
- An article 4 direction was in place across all employment sites in the towns of the SDNP.
- The dashed blue lines were a mix of historic ditches and underground pipework. It was proposed to bring them back to the surface.
- The aim of this document was to make it clear, accessible and easily read by persons who wanted to develop in this area. A read across to the Design SPD, where matters such as public realm and tree are covered in detail, would be most appropriate.
- This brief would gather weight as time went on, but was not part of the development plan. It would have weight after consultation, but not as much as a full SPD or development plan.

39. **RESOLVED:** The Committee resolved to:

1. Approve this draft Planning Brief for consultation, subject to any comments of the Planning Committee being addressed (the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee).
2. Agree to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, to consider the results of the consultation, make any minor changes and then approve the Planning Brief for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. If major changes are required as a result of consultation, a further report will be presented to Planning Committee.

40. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.30pm.

**CHAIR**

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