

## **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: \_\_\_\_\_



## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 8 December 2022 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects & Performance Manager), Vicki Colwell (Principle Planning Officer), Stella New (Development Management Lead), Nicola Martin (Senior Development Management Officer), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), Richard Sandiford (Head of Governance), and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

62. 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**

63. There were none.

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

64. The following declarations were made;
- Richard Waring declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 as a member of Cycle Lewes and as a member of the Seven Sisters Country Park advisory board.
  - Isabel Thurston declared a pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 7 as a Director of South Downs Commercial Operations Limited and would withdraw from the meeting for the item. Also a public service interest in Agenda Item 10 as an Arun District Councillor.
  - Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Items 10 and 11 as an East Hampshire District Councillor.
  - Therese Evens declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 13 as a Winchester City Councillor and Chair of Winchester City Council's Planning Committee.

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

65. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 10 November 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

66. SDNP/20/04118/FUL Queens Hotel, Selbourne. This Committee refused permission, however, the decision had been overturned on appeal.

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

67. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/21/00290/FUL – MATTERLEY FARM, OVINGTON**

68. The Chair advised that the application had been withdrawn.
69. Isabel Thurston withdrew from the meeting.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/21/02342/FUL – EXCEAT BRIDGE, EXCEAT**

70. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-15) and the update sheet.
71. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
- Vic lent, South Downs Network.
  - Richard Churchman, representing himself as a local resident.
72. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Karl Taylor, East Sussex County Council.
  - Dale Poore, East Sussex County Council.
73. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-15), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- What would be happening to the existing bridge? Was it safe for use?
  - What was riprap construction?
  - The design showed provision for pedestrians and cyclists and was sympathetic to their requirements.
  - There was about how the design of the bridge would fit into the landscape. How was this bridge different to what the design would have been if not in a protected landscape and not in the South Downs National Park? The bridge was very angular, probably delivering the lowest cost on construction.
  - If the existing bridge was repaired, how long would a road closure last?
  - Had studies been carried out on the potential increase of traffic in the local area?
  - Why did the new bridge need to be so high?
  - It was good to see that the National Coast Path had been taken into consideration so there would be a continuous path on the south side.
  - The existing bridge needed replacing. The style was similar to the existing bridge and was acceptable.
    - There were environmental benefits to less stop start traffic. For traffic calming, could double white lines be added to prevent overtaking within the 30 mile per hour stretch?
  - A functional bridge was needed over a small river to get the traffic through as fast as possible. There seemed to have been no consultation with cycling and pedestrian organisations. The last analysis of the local traffic was carried out in 2019 and the number of vehicles had significantly increased since then.
  - Given there was currently no street lighting, would the low level lighting affect the dark night skies?
74. Members were advised:
- The existing bridge would be removed. The soffit and abutments were in need of serious repair.
  - Riprap was the lining on the bank, stopping the banks washing away.
  - Four design options had been considered and flooding did have a bearing on the design. Discussions had been lengthy in obtaining the best design.
  - If repairs to the existing bridge were to take place, this would need to go back to East Sussex County Council to be considered further.

- Studies had been undertaken to review the potential increase in traffic.
- The new bridge needed to be high in construction as the area was prone to flooding. If it was lower there was a risk of flood damage to the bridge structure.
- Potential double white lines within the 30mph stretch were not for discussion as part of this application. However, a traffic management strategy was required as part of the application.
- The traffic count that was done in 2019, and had been taken into account. The new bridge would have a minimal impact on traffic but would result in a limited increase in the overall movement of traffic in the local area.
- New lighting was a safety feature for pedestrian. The two current lighting pillars would be replaced by three, and further lighting would be below the top of the bridge facing down.

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

76. **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of this report and in the update sheet, the completion of a Legal Agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning and the updated sheet, to secure:
  - i. Land to be secured as compensatory replacement for the SSSI (in perpetuity) and details of habitat type to be created;
  - ii. Land secured to provide biodiversity net gain (for a minimum of 30 years) and details of habitat type to be created;
  - iii. Commuted sum to be paid to SDNPA to cover monitoring of land for biodiversity net gain;
  - iv. Landscape strategy, method statement, timeframe, maintenance, management and monitoring for the SSSI compensatory land and land secured for biodiversity net gain;
  - v. Details of traffic management strategy, including gateway features and how the need for any potential future traffic management measures will be considered
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the Legal Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within six months of the 8 December 2022 Planning Committee meeting.

77. Comfort break was taken at 11.06am.

78. Isabel Thurston returned to the meeting.

**ITEM 8 & 9: SDNP/22/02247/FUL & SDNPA/02248/LIS- BLIND VETERANS UK, BRIGHTON**

79. The Officer presented the applications and reminded Members of the reports (Report PC22/23-16 & Report PC22/23-17) and the update sheet.

80. The following speaker addressed the committee against the applications:

- Bridget Fishleigh, Brighton & Hove City Councillor.

81. The following speaker addressed the committee in support the applications:

- Guy Dixon, as agent on behalf of the applicant.

82. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-16), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- Given the developer would make a contribution of up to £1 million for affordable housing, were there any developments that will benefit in the local area?

- It was disappointing there was no onsite affordable housing. Why was the affordable housing claw back mechanism capped at £500k? Also, given this would be a commuted sum, how effective was the Authority at distributing these funds?
- The profit level and proposed £1 million marketing cost seemed high.
- Was this development considered policy compliant?
- This was a good use of the site, particularly given it was a listed building.
- Good use of an iconic building.
- Although buildings of this nature could be challenging to redevelop, the building seemed to be in good order. It was felt there was scope to find additional funds for affordable housing.
- It was good to see one bedroom flats and accessible housing. The energy efficiency improvements were welcomed. Although there were some traffic concerns, this was outweighed by the benefits of this development.
- What materials would be used for the doors and windows?
- Could there be a second homes policy?
- The building needed a new use as it no longer worked for the current occupants.
- There was some concern about the extent of the contribution towards affordable housing and felt that the cap on the claw back mechanism should be removed.

83.

Members were advised:

- The £1 million contribution would go into a central funding pot. Its spend on developments in the local area would be dependant on suitable developments coming forward.
- Viability assessment had been done by Bruton Knowles on the developers contribution to affordable housing, there was some disagreement on the saleable square footage of the sales and Bruton Knowles also felt the sale price had been underestimated. The £500k, with an additional up to £500k through the claw back mechanism was a negotiated position following advice from Bruton Knowles and was a significant improvement on the applicant's initial position of zero affordable housing.
- The profit level and marketing costs, although at the higher end of what is considered acceptable, did fall within the accepted limits.
- The Authority carried, as did all Planning Authorities, a significant amount of funds received in commuted sums. However, this Authority was very efficient at distributing these funds, for example, through Community Land Trusts. In the development of heritage assets, it was considered normal to accept commuted sums rather than onsite provision of affordable housing.
- On balance, having considered all policies together, officers believed this was a policy compliant scheme.
- Aluminium and glass are often used for doors and windows due to the location next to the sea. There would be no policy to stop people buying second homes.

84.

It was proposed and seconded to vote on an amended recommendation to delegate the grant of planning permission to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, to enable further discussions and negotiations to take place with the applicant on the matter of affordable housing with the aim of removing the cap on the affordable housing sum.

85.

**RESOLVED: SDNPA/22/02247/FUL**

1. Delegate the grant of planning permission to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, the grant being subject to the following;

- (i) The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC22/23-16 as amended in the Update Sheet.
- (ii) The completion of a legal agreement to secure:
  - An affordable housing contribution of £500K.
  - A review mechanism to secure an additional affordable housing contribution to reflect the concerns of the Planning Committee.
  - A £5,534 travel plan monitoring fee.
- 2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the legal agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 8 December 2022.

**86. RESOLVED: SDNPA/22/02248/LIS**

That listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 10.1.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/22/03525/FUL – GRAVEL PIT, CLAPHAM**

- 87. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-18), the update sheet and gave an additional verbal update that West Sussex County Council Highways and National Highways had removed their objections, subject to conditions, therefore reason for refusal number 6 was removed.
- 88. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
  - Sarah Linfield, Clapham Parish Council.
- 89. The following speakers addressed the committee in support the application:
  - Susan Leeson, as agent on behalf of the applicant.
- 90. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-18), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
  - Could the application be considered for non-determination?
  - How long ago was the site a gravel pit?
  - It was felt that the site was inappropriate for the development.
  - The site was necessary as a landscape buffer to the village of Clapham and needed to be protected.
  - Moving the business and house from a proposed housing development site outside of the SDNP to this site within the SDNP, which was a protected landscape, was not acceptable.
  - The proposed house design was not characteristic of the local area.
  - A deferral of the application was not considered appropriate given the fundamental principle of this development was inappropriate to the setting.
- 91. Members were advised:
  - The application could be considered for non-determination.
  - A number of decades ago the site was part of the old route of the A27, but the officer was unable to confirm exactly when the site was a gravel pit.
- 92. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
- 93. **RESOLVED:**

That the application be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 9 of report PC22/23-18 subject to the amendments shown on the Update Sheet and the verbal update at the meeting to remove of reason for refusal 6.

**ITEM 11: SDNP/22/03416/FUL – LONGMORE ENTERPRISE PARK, LISS**

94. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-19) and the update sheet.
95. The following speakers addressed the committee in support the application:
- Tim Rainbird, as agent on behalf of the applicant.
96. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-19), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Were the roofs of the buildings highlighted in green on the plan those proposed to have green roofs?
  - The site was already a brownfield site with large buildings, the proposed application was better than what was there already.
  - Was there scope within this application for the applicant to add further solar panels on the roofs?
  - There was no specific mention of bird or bat boxes. Was this covered in the conditions?
  - Rainwater harvesting would need to be used.
  - The application ticked many sustainability boxes following negotiations with officers. It was acceptable but could have been better, perhaps with with more attention to solar power to feed the wider area. Timber cladding on the larger building may have been good also. The standard set by this application should be minimum standard for future similar.
  - Had there been an update on trip generation on roads, taking into account the operation of the business?
  - There would be 470 new jobs created, where there were currently are none, which was excellent for the local area and employment.
  - There was good cycling and road infrastructure nearby.
97. Members were advised:
- All the roofs of the building highlighted in green were green roofs.
  - The solar panels proposed would generated 10% more energy than the buildings required and no restrictions had been applied for adding more solar panels in the future.
  - The bird and bat boxes were part of condition 17.
  - Rainwater harvesting was conditioned through drainage and landscaping.
  - National Highways and County Highways had reviewed their modelling on road use and trip generation and they were satisfied.
98. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
99. **RESOLVED:**
- That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to:
- 1) The completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:
    - Travel Plan for the operational management of the site and approval monitoring fees.
    - Provision of new pedestrian links and bus stop on Longmoor Road.

- Provision of a financial bond to the Highways Authority in respect of ensuring the measures within the Travel Plan are met.
- 2) No objections being received from Natural England and National Highways which cannot be overcome without significant changes to the proposals.
  - 3) 3) The conditions as set out in paragraph 9.2 of this report.
  - 4) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the S106 Agreement is not completed or satisfactory progress is not being made within 6 months of the 8th December 2022 Planning Committee meeting.

I00. A Comfort break was taken at 12.10 hrs,

I01. Vanessa Rowlands joined the meeting at 1.16pm.

## **ITEM 12: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

I02. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

I03. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-20).

I04. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

1. Noted the current uncertainty in planning and the Authority's resourcing for the Area Action Plan and Local Plan Review
2. Recommended to the Full Authority the integration of the Area Action Plan into the Local Plan Review
3. Recommended to the Full Authority the approval of the Local Development Scheme (eighth revision) for the South Downs National Park set out in Appendix I of this report.

## **ITEM 13: APPEALS UPDATE**

I05. The Officer reminded Members of the report

I06. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-21) and commented as follows:

- Could further information be given on the The Queens Pub, Selbourne decision?
- What were the costs awarded for the Queens Pub, Selbourne?
- Could planning reserves be used more wisely in across the Authority?

I07. Members were advised:

- The Queens Pub, Selbourne decision showed the importance of not looking at individual elements of policy or developments, but rather as a whole.
- The Queens Pub, Selbourne costs awarded were of £6,000.
- The upcoming Member Budget workshops would cover reserves as part of Member's consideration; reserves for planning had already be reduced in previous years.

I08. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions.

I09. The Chair closed the meeting at 1:29pm.

**CHAIR**

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

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 9 February 2023 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker (Chair), Debbie Curnow-Ford, Janet Duncton, John Hyland, Robert Mocatta, Ian Phillips, Andrew Shaxson, Isabel Thurston, and Richard Waring.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects & Performance Manager), Naomi Langford (Major Projects Officer), Chris Patterson (Communities Lead), Katharine Stuart (Planning Policy Lead), Amy Tyler Jones (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Richard Fryer (Senior Governance Officer), and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

110. The Chair welcomed John Hyland as a new Member of the Planning Committee. The Chair then 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**

111. There were apologies for absence from Therese Evans and Gary Marsh.

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

112. The following declaration was made:

- Richard Waring declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 8, Brooks Road Planning Brief, as he was a Lewes Town Councillor.

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

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

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

114. There were none.

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

115. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/21/05619/FUL – HILLSIDE NURSERY, BURY**

116. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-22) and the update sheet.

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

- Robert Murtagh representing himself as a local resident.
- Charlie Hughes, representing himself as a local resident.

118. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:

- Cllr Graham Morrison speaking on behalf of Bury Parish Council.
- Paul Fender speaking on behalf of MJH Executive Homes.

119. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-22), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- Commercial units and housing were situated in close proximity. Would there be restrictions on the time usage of the commercial units to protect amenities?

- Garage roofing with green roofing, would it be a good site for PV solar panels? What would be best for ongoing sustainability?
- Unrestricted commercial use could have a negative impact on the SDNP. Daytime hours only working for the commercial units would seem sensible to help control impacts including vehicle movements.
- There were many positives including sustainability, water neutrality and sustainable construction.
- The long barn roof was continuous. Was there a reason for metal over wood cladding? The barn was closer to the road than the existing glasshouses.
- Drainage, (3.4) mentions discharge at lower volume. In terms of flooding, it would not be controlled. Was Condition 7 tough enough in uncontrolled conditions e.g. heavy rain and to avoid mixing foul and rainwater?
- Was electricity a planning issue? Would there be enough power onsite with the increased demand?
- Was the application considered without parking on the road in front of the development?
- Does the hedge between the farm next door and the site go all the way around the perimeter?
- This was an acceptable design, if not in a traditional design.
- The site plan incorporated a lot of hard surfaces. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be incorporated including filtration. Should be dealt with under Condition 7.
- There was a high dependency on off-site landscape. Would like to have seen more onsite soft landscaping, such as tree planting and hedges, rather than relying on third party provision., This included trees to the front of the site on highways land that appeared to be in poor condition, but the screening benefitted the development.
- Possibly two separate commercial units would have been better than one on the frontage, given the substantial change in levels. Detailing will be important.
- Concern over the design of the residential properties, could they have been designed to look more like local existing area properties.
- The site was dilapidated, dangerous and in need of re-development.

120.

Members were advised:

- No specific timings of usage of the commercial units had been proposed. Class E(g) allowed the usage of commercial units within a residential area and therefore no reason for concern.
- Definition of the type of use Class E(g) was that the commercial units could be used in a residential area, without detriment to its amenity. A condition could be added, but would need to be necessary and enforceable. Mixed use sites are common. Environmental health can take action if usage created a public nuisance regardless of a condition. No evidence to support the need for a condition.
- Prioritising the commercial usage was important and prominence to the road advertised itself. Commercial units were the focus of the mixed-use site. Combination of materials was acceptable, samples and details of materials would be agreed. Continuous roof was considered the best solution. The selection of materials were locally inspired and could be locally sourced. Fewer buildings with meaningful gaps between were important to reflect the local pattern of development. Green roofs would provide many benefits over pitched roofs, including amenity, drainage and ecology, and the lower height would make the site appear less developed.

- While taking a contemporary approach, the proposed designs and forms responded positively to the site's particular characteristics and many local more traditional examples. The final choice of materials is subject to a condition.
- Foul and surface water sewers were separate. The proposal would represent a material reduction in discharge off site due to more sustainable ways of managing surface water on site. The highways authority and lead local flood authority would be consulted when discharging Condition 7.
- Electrical supply was not a Planning matter and subject to other regulations.
- The majority of the car parking would be provided on site in the courtyard, with integrated cycle storage, and nearby bus stops to encourage sustainable travel. No justification to restrict off-site parking. The previous business use had no on-site parking.
- The hedge between Southview Dairy Farm and the site is along the majority of the western boundary. The Management Company would maintain the boundaries and public landscaping of the development, and there would be an internal boundary for each curtilage, which would give a double boundary separation to help protect amenity.
- An informative could be placed with Condition 7 to ensure concerns were met over drainage.
- The application was policy compliant on affordable homes on a small site, which was a key part of the Local Plan.

**121. RESOLVED:**

- 1) That planning permission be granted subject to:
  - (i) the conditions set out in Section 9 of this report;
  - (ii) the completion of a Legal Agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
    - a. Two affordable homes on site;
    - b. Phasing plan for the delivery of the site as a whole to ensure integrated provision of the commercial floor space and affordable homes; and
    - c. Marketing programmer for the commercial element; and
    - d. Estate management plan to cover management and maintenance of communal elements.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the Legal Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 9 February 2023.

122. Vanessa Rowlands joined the meeting at 11.07.

**ITEM 7: EASEBOURNE VDS**

123. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

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

- Members congratulated the volunteers and the Parish Councillors of Easebourne for a sensible and considered document.
- A Village Design Statement (VDS) was a valuable Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) forming a local sense of place and characteristics, and how development will shape their future.
- It was important these documents were taken note of when considering planning applications.

- It was excellent that communities were heard in the compilation of the report.
125. Members were advised:
- VDS's had value when considering planning applications, and were also useful documents in supporting community cohesion.
126. **RESOLVED:**
- The Committee approved the adoption of Easebourne Parish Design Statement as a Supplementary Planning Document.

**ITEM 8: BROOKS ROAD PLANNING BRIEF**

127. The Officer reminded Members of the report.
128. The following speaker addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Adrian Ross, Lewes Bridge Ward Councillor.
129. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-24) and commented as follows:
- Very exciting development. Would applications come directly to the SDNPA for approval or stay with the local authority?
  - Specifically who would be carrying out feasibility studies? Developer contributions would be coming forward, how would the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 be spent?
  - Would there be an agreed list of CIL and S106 infrastructure projects?
  - It looked innovative, set an example of collaboration, and could be applied in other places.
  - Would opening up the waterways and river access involve a developer's contribution?
  - What would be the next steps should it be approved?
  - With the form and scale in the architectural design, there seemed no guidance to the height of buildings. How could we be confident this would be addressed sufficiently?
  - Mixed ownership of the area, how can we act in land assembly, how will it be delivered?
  - Flooding within zone 1 & 2, would there be a scheme to address this?
  - All future changes in Lewes should be for the better with this brief.
130. Members were advised
- All medium small-scale applications would stay with Lewes and Eastbourne, who currently dealt with these applications on SDNPA's behalf, unless called in.
  - Discussions had taken place with Lewes and Eastbourne Council on local projects where CIL and S106 funds could be spent, but spending involves third parties.
  - The Brief would allow the SDNPA to have better and more significant conversations regarding how CIL and Section S106 funds were spent.
  - Where there were opportunities within the red line of the site, then developers would need to explore how they might better relate to the water network or reveal prior network access rather than provide an offsite contribution.
  - If approved it would be published and would then be a consideration in development control.
  - There was a range in topography of the area, Paragraph 6.27 principle, would set the framework for a landscape led approach. Defining heights difficult, dependent upon the scale and style of the building and surrounding area.

- The document helps ensure coordination on land assembly and sites owned by multiple owners have a degree of coordination. The Brief is already having an effect.
- There had been a lot of river and protection work in Lewes since the 2000 floods as the area is an historic flood plain. Applications would need to satisfy National policy.

131. Isabel Thurston left the meeting at 11.38.

132. Isabel Thurston returned to the meeting at 11.40.

133. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee approved the post consultation Planning Brief for publication, and its use for development management purposes, 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).

134. The Committee adjourned for a comfort break at 11:45.

### **ITEM 9: PLANNING SYSTEM CONSULTATION**

135. The Officer reminded Members of the report and the update sheet.

136. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-25) and commented as follows:

- Should there be positive starting response to a question, if there are significant caveats to the answer?
- Congratulations were given to the Officer for the content of the report. Should the SDNPA only be responding to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) tracked changes, or include parts of the NPPF?
- Would there be coordination with other national parks on the consultation?
- Was renewable energy referring to existing or a new proposal to be agreed in question 41?
- Could the wording to answer 8 be changed, putting National Parks ahead of Green Belt, and replacing 'Green Belt' with 'Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty'?
- With regard to Item 2.20 on page 129, could the SDNPA recommend a formula be drawn up so that Local Authorities could produce local reports from national data?
- Where feasible would we allow upgrades of sustainable energy where appropriate?
- Would on-shore wind generation be looked at, including a wind map?
- Could the recommendation be changed to 'in consultation with the Director of Planning and the Chair of the Planning Committee'?
- Health and safety ownership and responsibility should be agreed.
- Could the implications of the Housing Delivery Test, Item 2.7 on page 127 be clarified?

137. Members were advised:

- There was a need to be direct in response to government consultations, stating your primary ambition rather than caveating everything.
- Future changes to the NPPF could be dealt with once they had been finalised.
- The Document was sent out 22 December 2022 and a response was due by 2 March 2023, resulting in a significant time pressure.
- Talks with other national parks had taken place. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the SDNPA would be signing off the National Parks England Document in his role as the lead Chief Executive for Planning; the SDNPA would have its own response.
- Question 41 referred to a proposed change to existing on renewable energy.

- Appropriate scale of future onshore energy generation, including wind, was likely to be a key part of a future local plan review.
- The changes proposed to the Housing Delivery Test would mean that neighbouring local authorities would no longer need to identify and permit such high levels of development along the borders of the park.

138. As this was a response to a strategic consultation it was agreed to change the wording of the recommendation to add “in consultation with the Chair of the Authority” after ‘The Chief Executive of the Authority’ to comply with Standing Order 18 ‘Urgent Actions’.

139. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

- 1) Noted the Government consultation on the revised NPPF and prospectus of proposed national planning policy reforms; and
- 2) Considered and provided comments on the contents of the draft response, set out at Appendix I, to be approved and submitted by the Chief Executive of the Authority, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority, as part of the Government’s Consultation on changes to national planning policy.

140. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.30pm

## **CHAIR**

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