

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker, Debbie Curnow-Ford, Janet Duncton, Therese Evans, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Ian Phillips, Vanessa Rowlands (agenda items 7 & 8 only), Andrew Shaxson, and Richard Waring.

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

OPENING REMARKS

41. 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. That 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

42. Apologies were received from Isabel Thurston.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

43. Gary Marsh declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 6 as, in his role as a Mid-Sussex District Councillor, he was acquainted with the two public speakers who were speaking against the application.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 OCTOBER 2022

44. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 October 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

45. Members were updated that the decision on the application at Reservoir Lane, Petersfield which was considered by Members in January 2022 had been issued.

ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS

46. There were none.

ITEM 6: SDNP/22/04317/FUL – SMALL ACRE, FULKING

47. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-11) and the update sheet.

48. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:

- Cllr Alison Bennett as Mid Sussex District Councillor for Hurstpierpoint and Downs.
- Cllr Colin Trumble as Mid Sussex District Councillor for Hurstpierpoint and Downs.

49. 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:

- The reasons for refusal reflected well the harm to the existing landscape character. It was arguable how effective any mitigation could be.
- The neutral stance of the Landscape Officer still identified how the application would result in landscape harm.
- Were the current Leylandii trees that were acting as screening within the site boundary?

- The site did stand out and was visible. This application represented development creep and suburbanisation of the countryside.
- The site was also not a sustainable site for development.
- At what stage would enforcement action be undertaken if this application was refused?
- It was noted that one of the public speakers highlighted that the number of objections made understated the scale of opposition due to fear of reprisal. Was there anything this Authority could do to ensure that, if this was considered by the Planning Inspectorate, the true reflection of local feeling was made clear?

50. Members were advised:

- It was important that specialist officers were able to make their comments as felt appropriate. It was then the role of the case officer to balance these as part of their recommendation and Members' to balance them in their decision.
- Dependent on the decision at this meeting officers would move to serve an enforcement notice, which the applicant would have the right to appeal.
- Officers did not have information to hand as to whether the Leylandii were located within the application site.
- It was important for local people to express their views which could be done via their elected representatives.

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

52. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC22/23-11 as corrected in the Update Sheet.

53. Vanessa Rowlands joined the meeting.

ITEM 7: ADOPTION OF CLAPHAM PARISH DESIGN STATEMENT AS A SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

54. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

55. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-12) and commented as follows:

- The Parish Design Statement was welcomed by Members and the people of this small community were commended on their production of it.
- If there was a conflict between a local design statement and the SDNPA's Design SPD, which would take precedence?
- It was felt that section 3.2.1, point 1a, could have included a similar reference to traditional design as was set out in point 1b.
- The flexible approach in the parish was admirable.

56. Members were advised:

- Officers worked hard to ensure conflict between the Design SPD and Village Design Statements was avoided. However, should a conflict arise, it would be for the case officer to balance the various considerations.

57. **RESOLVED:** The Committee approved the adoption of Clapham Parish Design Statement as a Supplementary Planning Document.

ITEM 8: MAKING OF THE LYMINSTER AND CROSSBUSH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

58. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

59. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-13) and congratulated Lyminster and Crossbush on its completion.

60. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:
1. Noted the outcome of the Lyminster & Crossbush Neighbourhood Development Plan Referendum.
 2. Agreed to make the Lyminster & Crossbush Neighbourhood Development Plan part of the Development Plan for that part of the Parish within the South Downs National Park.
61. The Chair closed the meeting at 11.01am.

CHAIR

Signed: _____

