

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 8 June 2023 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), Janet Duncton, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Ian Phillips, and Andrew Shaxson.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead (West)), Nicola Martin (Senior Development Management Officer), Chris Patterson (Communities Lead), Kelly Porter (Major Project Lead), Richard Fryer (Senior Governance Officer) and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

110. 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. The Chair thanked Ian Phillips for his service as a Member of the Planning Committee.

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

111. There were apologies for absence from John Hyland, Alun Alesbury and Debbie Curnow-Ford.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

112. The following declaration was made:

- Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 6 as East Hampshire District Councillor and Hampshire County Counsellor and knew speakers John Lees and Michael de Courcey.
- Janet Duncton declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 8 as a West Sussex County Councillor. West Sussex had already considered and voted on the item and she would not take part in the decision on this item..

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 APRIL 2023

113. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 April 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

114. Application SDNP/21/04144/FUL, Broad View Farm, Blacknest Road, Alton. There had been an appeal, and it had been dismissed along with the application for costs.

115. Application SDNP/22/02466/FUL, The Grange Development Site, Bepton Road, Midhurst. An appeal had been applied for and would be considered by written representation.

116. Application SDNP/22/03525/FUL, Gravel Pit, Long Furlong, Clapham. An appeal had been applied for.

ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS

117. There were none.

ITEM 6: SDNP/22/04504/FUL – LAVANT STREET, PETERSFIELD

118. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-34) and the update sheet.

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

- Councillor John Lees, speaking on behalf of Petersfield Town Council.
 - Michael de Courcy, speaking as the agent.
 - Matt Swanton, speaking as the architect.
120. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-34), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Congratulations were offered to the Officer and Design Team on an excellent application.
 - Who would maintain the pedestrian footpath?
 - How would people sitting outside the café on the podium be obscured from seeing into the apartments?
 - Would the access to the garages via Charles Street be changed?
 - How much of the affordable housing contribution would be turned into affordable housing?
 - East Hampshire District Council had been awarded a £65k fund from South West Rail for a feasibility study for the look and feel of the front of Petersfield Railway Station. Hampshire Highways had committed to being involved in that project going forward. How could the station forecourt area be developed with the applicant for the overall look and feel for Petersfield? Could this be put this into a condition?
 - The design showed a great improvement on the current building at the location.
 - Impressed by the quality of the scheme and pleased that local architecture had been included in the design.
 - How the hard and soft landscape were implemented would be critical, along with the materials used. The green roof would require attention to detail along with the hard surfaces.
 - There was greenery on the plan to the side of the railway station carpark and the entrance to the site, was this the boundary? The strip of land should be treated in the funding of the development, so as to be integrated and co-ordinated in the design.
 - There would need to be a robust management scheme.
 - Another access was shown on the PowerPoint presentation via Lavant Street, was that correct?
 - Would the solar PV tiles only be used on the north west facing building?
 - Paragraph 7.28 noted there was insufficient parking on the site if the parking SPD were to be rigidly applied, but that on street parking would be available. Parking permits were rare could this be clarified.
121. Members were advised:
- The Podium would be used by the café with offices and flats having access. The landscape scheme, through landscape condition 5, would be used to ensure privacy.
 - There were existing access rights to the garages via Charles Street, but minimising use could be encouraged through design and landscaping
 - Within the design hard and soft landscaping would be encouraged.
 - There were no exact figures available at Committee regarding the SDNPA's affordable housing provision but was in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, with examples such as the Wickham Development, and in Midhurst with the Affordable Land Trust.
 - The street frontage third party land could not be conditioned, however the visualisation had been mindful in the design.

- The greenery on the plan to the side of the railway station car park and the entrance to the site was within Network Rail ownership, the developer would like to work with Network Rail to have this maintained.
- The PowerPoint presentation had used an earlier plan that showed access near to Petersfield Housing Association on Lavant Street, but this had subsequently been updated as this access had been replaced with an extra flat.
- Solar PV panels were also planned for the main building and the south west facing building. In conjunction with the fabric and renewables it had been equated by the design officer to between 58-68% reduction in CO2 emissions, far exceeding the Sustainable Construction SPD requirement.
- Not every flat had a parking space but the two-bedroom flats and commercial spaces would have allocated parking spaces. This was a sustainable location, adjacent to public transport and shops.

122. **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:
 - 5 on-site affordable units plus a £105,966 in lieu financial contribution.
 - ii) The completion of a satisfactory preliminary feasible surface water drainage strategy, 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 PC22/23-34 and the Update Sheet.
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 8th June 2023 Planning Committee meeting.
 - b) Within 6 months of the 8th June 2023 Planning Committee meeting the preliminary feasibility surface water drainage strategy has not been acceptable.

ITEM 7: SDNP/22/05605/FUL – LAUNDRY COTTAGE, ROGATE

123. The Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report (Report PC22/23-35), the update sheet and provided an oral update to amend the wording of condition 11.
124. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
- David Champion, speaking on behalf of local residents
125. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Paddy Cox, speaking as the applicant
 - Raymond Bolter, speaking in a personal capacity
 - Alina Warlow, speaking in a personal capacity
126. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC22/23-35) and commented as follows:
- Was an excellent site to visit and Members had visited it a few times.
 - It was understood a permanent licence would be required for funding to be secured to complete construction.
 - The applicant had done what had been asked of them by the Planning Committee every time advice had been given.

- There had been no objections from the professional consultees in their representations.
- The plans worked well with the duties of the South Downs National Park, with the woodland management being of a high standard and heathland restoration in action.
- Health and wellbeing and sustainability had been addressed and it was excellent that the offering was reaching out across generations.
- Conditions were deemed adequate.
- Report page 36, 4.2, bullet point 3 noted historic parkland of local importance. Did it have any relevance to the decision?
- Report page 46, 7.41-7.44 stated fire risk dealt with by condition. Was this sufficient in the face of the risk of forest fires.
- With regard to water neutrality, paragraph 7.32, what is the current water usage to ensure there is no increase in usage.
- Report page 48 condition 10, referenced condition 4(d) should that be 4(IV).
- Water meterage would be based on historic usage.
- The Chair noted that there had been no substantial objections or complaints from the local community about disturbance, light or traffic.

127. Members were advised:

- The wording of condition 11 would be delegated to the Director of Planning to ensure that the various monitoring requirements within the documents listed (in condition) be implemented and the documents updated as necessary
- Paragraphs 7.15 and 7.46 There would be a correction in the first sentence to be replaced with the following: “No substantiated complaints have been made to SDNPA or CDC regarding breaches of conditions. Concern was raised with enforcement officers on two occasions, but upon investigation no breach was found to have occurred.”
- Officers had been given information on water metres and bills for use in determining water neutrality. Water use is split between the individual elements of the site including the dwelling and the timber yard. Analysis of this information would be used to detail what improvements could be put in place at the cottage to accommodate the additional water needs for the site.
- Water neutrality is complex, which is why it is subject to a delegation and would be agreed with Natural England.
- The Fire Authority were happy, subject to conditions.

128. **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission be granted subject to:
 - i) the completion of a satisfactory water neutrality assessment and appropriate mitigation measures the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, as necessary.
 - ii) the conditions as set out in paragraph 9.2 of report PC22/23-35, the amended condition 11, the form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning and minor amendment to condition 10 to reference condition 4(iv).
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if within 6 months of the 8 June 2023 Planning Committee meeting the water neutrality measures have not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be feasible.

129. The committee adjourned for a comfort break at 11:35

ITEM 8: WEST SUSSEX JOINT MINERALS LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

130. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

131. RESOLVED:

The Committee recommended that the National Park Authority:

1. Note the review of the relevance and effectiveness of the Joint Minerals Local Plan.
2. Agree that an update to the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan is not required at this time.
3. Note that a summary of the review process and the decisions will be published on the website hosted by West Sussex County Council and SDNPA website.

ITEM 9: SDNPA'S WRITTEN RESPONSE TO M3 J9 DCO

132. The Officer reminded Members of the report.

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

- The proposed compound location is on Easton Lane, adjacent to a well-used cycle route, and the plan would therefore cause potential conflicts with traffic / users of Easton Lane. The new access routes over the M3 into the National Park should be easier than it is currently.
- The Officer was commended on the analysis and detail that had gone into critiquing the proposals, highlighting the National Policy Statement that National Parks have the highest state of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
- What was the timescale for the decision-making process and hearings?
- It was good to see no overhead lighting on the plans.
- How long would the compound be in existence?
- It was important to get the plans right in the context of the environment, as the air quality was probably very poor in the area.
- Would the spoil go?
- Was there a good reason for the compound to be in that particular place and could it be moved to a better location?
- Page 183 of the report showed two large compounds currently in existence, could they be used rather than creating a new one?
- Impressed by the number of solutions proposed, not just problems raised.

134. Members were advised:

- The Officer walked the site last week to look at the cycle route, details could be found in the report pages 140-141.
- The hearing would take place in July and August 2023, the inspector would have until 16 November 2023 to report back to the Secretary of State. The hearing will take place in Winchester and would also be a hybrid meeting. There would be an ability to watch it back at a later date.
- There was already a Smart Motorways compound at Badgers Farm, but it was not currently being used.
- The amount of spoil they would have at the end would be used to re-profile the land to the east of the junction, within the National Park.
- The new compound would be in use for approximately 5 years. It would be the first thing to be provided and the last thing to be taken away.

135. RESOLVED:

The Committee:

1. Considered and provided comments on the proposed Written Representation, set out in Appendix 1, to be taken into account by the Chief Executive when submitting the Authority's Written Representation to the Planning Inspectorate (acting on the Authority's behalf in accordance with Standing Order 18.3), adding clarification about concerns of cyclists / walkers using Easton Lane and the proposed location of the Construction Compound; and
2. Noted the contents of the Local Impact Report to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as set out in Appendix 2.

136. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.02pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____