

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 13 April 2023 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects & Performance Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Naomi Langford (Major Projects Officer), Richard Fryer (Senior Governance Officer), and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

110. 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. The Chair thanked Therese Evans and Isabel Thurston for their service to the Planning Committee as this was their last Planning Committee.

### **ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

111. There were apologies for absence from Robert Mocatta and Andrew Shaxson.

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

112. The following declarations were made:

- A public service interest from Debbie Curnow-Ford on Agenda Item 6 as a Hampshire County Councillor.
- A public service interest from Therese Evans on Agenda Item 6 as she had served on the AONB with Sir James Scott, speaker against the application.

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

113. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 March 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

114. None.

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

115. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/22/05643/FUL – BULMER HOUSE, PETERSFIELD**

116. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-29) and the update sheet.

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

- Sir James Scott speaking in a personal capacity.
- Sarah Brooks speaking in a personal capacity.

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

- Cllr Paul Milner speaking on behalf of Petersfield Town Council.
- Mark Slater speaking as the agent.
- Cllr Liz Fairhurst speaking on behalf of Hampshire County Council.

119. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-29), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- The design presented had shown improvement from the previous application.
  - How would parking be calculated and what provision for deliveries would be made for the onsite restaurant?
  - There were no objections from the Highways Authority regarding any traffic consequences from the proposed development however a higher volume of traffic could have an impact on local residents.
  - The design included rain gardens and energy saving which were pleasing. The development would deliver a significant benefit to the town given the need for this type of housing.
  - There was concern on the potential for the development overlooking onto neighbours' properties.
  - The previous application had been refused and that decision was being appealed. Would the previous application be withdrawn?
  - Would there be development rights to prevent the development becoming larger?
  - Would swift boxes be included in the proposal as swifts are in decline?
  - The scheme would be judged on its own merits and not on the previous scheme. Architecture broke up the bulk of the building scale. The improvements of open space were valuable. The court yards on the northern side could be shady but still useable along with appropriate planting. Management of the landscape would need to be part of the building maintenance.
  - There was an impact on neighbouring properties however the distances were acceptable, and the orientation of neighbouring properties was substantial to the advantages of the site. The impact was not so significant as to justify a reason for refusal on amenity grounds.
  - Boundary trees would offer a degree of screening.
  - The application was for 100% affordable housing which for which there is a high need.
  - The solar panels seemed to be obscured by tree foliage for part of the year, would this not affect their effectiveness?
  - Would have liked to of seen a style that was more representative of Petersfield, but as this is not a conservation area and picked up characteristic forms, such as gables, it was acceptable.
  - The site was allocated for specialist housing and there was a great need for housing provision for the elderly in the area.
120. Members were advised:
- Parking provision was informed by the Parking Supplementary Planning Document which had a parking calculator. However, the SPD offered flexibility in how the standards are applied and the site is in a sustainable location. Pick up and drop off points on the site and facilities for refuse had been taken into account with the design.
  - The recommendation included a travel plan, which would be monitored. There was an awareness there would be staff and visitors coming and going that the travel plan would need to reflect and manage.
  - The elevation at the southern end of the building would face towards Cliff Cottage, it was important to note that there were acceptable distances to the guidance of the SPD, and there was intervening vegetation which would help mitigate overlooking. The

proposed roof terrace would be set back from the south elevation and be further away from Cliff Cottage. the main wing of the building.

- The previous application was the subject of an appeal. The applicant had indicated that the new application was their preferred design and it was for them to decide whether to withdraw the appeal.
- The proposals would not benefit from permitted development rights to enlarge the building.
- The Ecological Enhancement Plan could include swift boxes.
- Solar Panels could be orientated to face southwest to improve their effectiveness, but new solar panels are efficient and do not necessarily need direct sunlight. Their contribution, however efficient, would be beneficial in meeting the energy needs of the building.

**121. RESOLVED:**

- I. That planning permission be granted subject to:
  - i) The completion of a legal agreement to secure the following, the final form of which is to be delegated to the Director of Planning:
    - An extra care housing scheme with a 100% affordable housing tenure.
    - A Travel Plan with associated financial contributions.
  - ii) The completion of a satisfactory preliminary feasible surface water drainage strategy supported with further infiltration testing and subsequent ground water assessment, the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, as necessary.
  - iii) The conditions as set out in paragraph 9.2 of report PC22/23-29.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if:
  - a) the S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 13 April 2023 Planning Committee meeting.
  - b) The surface water drainage strategy has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be feasible.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/22/01858/FUL – FORMER RECREATION GROUND AND ALLOTMENT GARDENS, EASEBOURNE**

122. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-30) and the update sheet.
123. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
  - Henry Beltran speaking on behalf of the Residents Action Group and in a personal capacity.
124. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
  - Jacob Goodenough speaking as the agent.
  - Alistair Harris speaking as the applicant.
125. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-30), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
  - It was good to see 50% affordable housing had been included and support from the housing authority.
  - Understand affordable housing was grouped together for ease of management.
  - The mid-range of 18 homes under a policy for 16-20 dwellings was acceptable.

- Concern about overuse of red brick had been raised but felt it fitted in well with existing properties.
- Could there be an overspill into the school car parking despite no concern from the Highways being raised?
- The materials used shown on the design drawing showed sandstone above and the red brick below on the walls and felt red brick would be more appropriate.
- Congratulated officers on being able to secure adaptable and accessible properties.
- Were there passive house standard properties on all 3 schemes taken to Planning Committee in Easebourne?
- The rear area of the properties design appeared to have a flat roof area; would people be able to extend in the future?
- Easebourne Parish Council's objection was a concern.
- We should aim for new development to fit the local area in design terms. Recognise design is subjective, size of properties was acceptable and the site is outside of the Conservation Area.
- Securing quality details throughout was important.
- Pleased the trees were to be retained around the site, would like to see strong conditions to ensure they remain

126. Members were advised:

- The treatment of the watercolour design drawing suggested a lighter red brick than the formal elevation drawings. Buildings would be predominantly red brick and clay tiles in accordance with the dominant materials locally. The sandstone on historic boundaries was picked up in the proposed stone southern boundary walling. Samples of materials would be checked on site by condition.
- Should all 3 schemes in Easebourne taken to this Planning Committee be approved then all the passive houses would be built on the Cowdray Works Yard development as affordable rented homes. If not then 10% would be provided on each site that was approved and secured by Section 106.
- The flat roofs on the properties would be green roofs.

127. **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission was granted subject to:
  - (i) the conditions set out in Section 9 of report PC22/23-30;
  - (ii) the completion of a Legal Agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
    - a. Nine affordable homes (on site);
    - b. Water neutrality offsetting within the Cowdray Estate (off-site);
    - c. 2 Passive house certified homes to be delivered either on the Cowdray Works Yard (SD66 and SDNP/21/04040/FUL) or on site; and
    - d. Estate management plan to cover management and maintenance of communal elements (on site).
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 13 April Planning Committee meeting.

128. The committee adjourned for a comfort break at 11.32am.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/21/04041/FUL – EASEBOURNE PRIMARY SCHOOL, EASEBOURNE,  
ITEM 9: SDNP/21/04042/LIS – EASEBOURNE PRIMARY SCHOOL, EASEBOURNE**

129. The Officer presented the applications and reminded Members of the reports (Report PC22/23-31) and (Report PC22/23-32) with the update sheets.
130. The following speakers addressed the committee against the applications:
- James Green speaking in a personal capacity.
  - Rosemary Downing speaking on behalf of the Residents Action Group and in a personal capacity.
  - Nicole Reid speaking on behalf of the Residents Action Group and in a personal capacity.
131. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the applications:
- Jacob Goodenough speaking as the agent.
  - Alistair Harris speaking as the applicant.
132. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-31), and (Report PC22/23-32) the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- The site was allocated in the Local Plan. It was allocated on its merits at the time.
  - Pleased to see the plan restored the existing historic building whilst the development maintained the rural views. The new builds were fitting to the site.
  - The view corridor across the site linked with the landscape, and the layout of the housing fitted in well with regard to local patterns.
  - Could the water system use open channels rather than a piped system?
  - Concern was expressed with the outstanding items to be addressed by conditions. Levels were critical. Would flood control and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)), would this be covered by condition? New hard surfacing would need to be permeable.
  - The design was good, soft and hard landscape would need to be completed to a high standard.
  - Boundary walling was important, clarification sought on which trees were to be retained
  - Could there be clarification on the management of the green field and swale, which would need to be implemented first.
  - The site had been sympathetically designed.
  - Biodiversity Net Gain was good along with the new footpath access to Glaziers Lane and bat mitigation.
  - Would the water conservation limit be applied to this site?
  - The detail on the design on the larger houses looked slightly unsympathetic.
  - Restoration of the listed building including features such as the bell were supported
133. Members were advised:
- The implementation of the agricultural swales and silt management systems would be secured by condition and implemented at an early stage to ensure continuous provision on the site.
  - The final drainage design was subject to condition, with opportunities there to use more open features. Any surplus water would be piped under the road into the river, whereas it currently discharges onto the road. This would result in a reduction in both flood risk and sediment impacts on the highway.

- There was a maximum mains water use limit of 100 litres per person per day on all properties. The overall water use would be offset by boreholes within the Cowdray Estate to secure water neutrality.

**134. ITEM 8 RESOLVED:**

- I. Planning permission was granted subject to:
  - (i) The conditions set out in Section 9 of report PC22/23-31;
  - (ii) The completion of a Legal Agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning to secure:
    - a. Six affordable homes (on site);
    - b. Water neutrality offsetting within the Cowdray Estate (off-site);
    - c. 2 Passive house certified affordable rented homes to be delivered either on the Cowdray Works Yard (SD66 and SDNP/21/04040/FUL)) or on site;
    - d. Estate management plan to cover management and maintenance of communal elements (on site);
    - e. Management of agricultural drainage separately to residential (on site).
    - f. Permissive footpath route to Glaziers Lane
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 13 April Planning Committee meeting.

**135. ITEM 9 RESOLVED:**

That listed building consent was granted subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of report PC22/23-32.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/21/04040/FUL – COWDRAY WORKS YARD, EASEBOURNE**

136. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-33) and the update sheet.
137. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
  - Mark Jerome speaking on behalf of the Residents Action Group and in an individual capacity.
138. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
  - Jacob Goodenough speaking as the agent
  - Alistair Harris speaking as the applicant.
139. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-33), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
  - Was there any risk in dealing with the 3 site applications together should one be started and not completed?
  - The application would deliver a benefit to the area and was good to see a coordinated approach.
  - It would be beneficial for Cowdray Estate to have a Whole Estate Plan.
  - It was a real bonus to see the passive house affordable housing on the site.
  - What flood risk from the stream? What would the stream banks be like? Would there be any danger of properties flooding?

- The new access footpath to the Cowdray Park would be beneficial and did not need to be straight.
- This scheme delivered only 25% affordable housing
- The scheme was not lacklustre and had different sectors and characters that positively reflected the site and surroundings and was different to standard housing.
- The commercial area at the back needs to be dealt with sensitively.
- Concerns were shown on the garden size and location.
- Condition 7 mentions not disturbing the bats, what about other species in decline, such as swifts and hedgehogs.
- This was a special and unusual location.
- Would like to be assured the detailed design of the commercial area would come back to the committee at the appropriate time.
- Would there be trigger points in the Section 106 so that the affordable housing would be built before other housing would be occupied?
- Supported affordable housing funds being used in the same parish
- Congratulations to Officers for achieving five affordable passive houses.
- The walkway should be curved rather than straight to slow down traffic.
- Who would deal with the management and maintenance of the public realm?
- Note objections from specialist on design and landscape impacts.

140. Members were advised:

- It was acceptable that all 3 sites were proposed at the same Planning Committee and this is common practice and legally sound. Each application should be determined on its own merits, but Members could have regard to the wider context.
- The detail of the S106 agreement would mitigate risk of partial implementation and would look to secure the affordable homes at the earliest possible opportunity. Clauses would be looked at closely. Specific schedules would be included to identify to each site, with one set of definitions and overarching provisions to ensure consistency.
- The drainage details including the watercourse would be subject to planning conditions and Ordinary Watercourse Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority. The condition would cover all aspects of drainage on the site and require an allowance of 45% for climate change. The new watercourse would have considerably more capacity than the existing culvert therefore reducing flood risk.
- The 3 sites in total would deliver 20 affordable homes, out of 58 houses.
- Specialist officers (i.e. Design) have a particular specific brief, whereas planners have to balance all considerations. It is reasonable and indeed good practice that a recommendation should be made on all relevant matters, not just one piece of advice
- There was a Grade 2\* Registered Park and Garden to the rear. Officers would, be keen to see the existing northern access used and not a new access point as it could lead to negative impacts on the Park including the loss of trees and effects on public rights of way. It was important that the access in the south east corner was for pedestrians only. Access to the commercial area was a reserved matter and not for consideration on this application.
- The allocation policy envisaged up to 1,500 square metres of commercial space. It was considered that this level was too high for the site, and it was reduced to 1,000sqm

- The management and maintenance of the public realm would be in the Estate Management Plan that was covered by the S106 agreement.

**141. RESOLVED:**

- I. That planning permission was granted subject to:
  - (i) the conditions set out in Section 9 of report PC22/23-33;
  - (ii) the completion of a Legal Agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
    - a. Five affordable rented homes on site;
    - b. Affordable housing review mechanism;
    - c. Water neutrality including on-site reduction and off-site offsetting for the residential development and capped private supply for the commercial development;
    - d. Five passive houses on site (to be the proposed affordable dwellings);
    - e. Pedestrian crossing on Easebourne Lane;
    - f. Publicly accessible pedestrian route through the site to Cowdray Park; and
    - g. 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 13 April Planning Committee meeting.

142. The Chair closed the meeting at 1.00pm

**CHAIR**

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