

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), Alun Alesbury, John Cross, Debbie Curnow-Ford, Janet Duncton, John Hyland, Gary Marsh, Andrew Shaxson and Daniel Stewart-Roberts.

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)), Stella New (Development Management Lead), Chris Patterson (Communities Lead), Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer), Richard Fryer (Senior Governance Officer) and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

1. The Chair welcomed John Cross, Stephen McAuliffe and Daniel Stewart-Roberts as new Members of the Planning Committee, The Chair thanked the previous Members who had left the Committee, Therese Evans, Ian Phillips, Isabel Thurston and Richard Waring.
2. 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

3. There were apologies for absence from Stephen McAuliffe and Robert Mocatta.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

4. The following declaration was made:
 - Daniel Stewart-Roberts declared a Public Service interest in Agenda Item 6 as a Lewes Councillor.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 8 JUNE 2023

5. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 June 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

6. There were none.

ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS

7. There were none.

ITEM 6: SDNP/22/05983/FUL – CASTELMER FRUIT FARM, KINGSTON

8. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-01) and the update sheet.
9. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
 - David Hoare, speaking on behalf of Kingston Parish Council.
 - Tony Wheeler, speaking as a local resident.
 - Bob Evans, speaking as a local resident.
10. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
 - Rob Burnham, speaking as the applicant.
 - Peter Rainier, speaking as the agent.

11. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-01), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Clarification was requested on the number of parking spaces. There were fewer than 2 parking spaces per house. A car would seem necessary for regular transportation to the location.
 - Tandem parking should be resisted as stated by East Sussex Highways in Paragraph 4.6 of the report.
 - The Section 106 agreement should include maintenance of the offsite compensatory orchard habitat.
 - Was there sufficient sewerage capacity for foul drainage?
 - Would there be tree protection as a pre-construction condition?
 - The requirement of Condition 12 for replacement planting in the first 5 years was insufficient in length and all planting should be native species.
 - The site was currently run down.
 - The Orchard was already private and not open to the public so there would be no loss of amenity.
 - The flats reflected existing village buildings, however units 9 and 10 were incongruous.
 - The roofs seemed to slope south to north, where would the solar panels sit?
 - Would there be battery storage for the solar panels?
 - The application demonstrated good use of a brown field site.
 - Was there documentation on sewage release from the local pumping station which serviced the local community? Were there any statistics showing the unlawful discharge for sewage?
 - Where would the electric vehicle charging points be positioned?
 - Would there be any conditions to ensure that the rain gardens would be maintained to assist with surface drainage?
 - Was there a condition to improve the access and blind corner?
 - The Chair asked if members could be reminded of the building materials that would be used.
 - The way the architects had utilised and built into the slope was appreciated.
 - The design and amount of development was acceptable given the village setting, however the drawings could be better.
 - Some members felt the application was unsatisfactory due to lack of clarity regarding materials and amount of tandem parking provided.
12. Members were advised:
- Paragraph 3.6 of the report stated there were 16 car parking spaces for residents plus an extra 2 for visitors.
 - Tandem parking was not contrary to policy and the East Sussex Highway Authority had not objected on that basis.
 - The landscaping condition was standard however could be amended to extend the replacement planting period to 10 years.
 - Southern Water (SW) are the statutory provider for foul drainage and have confirmed there is capacity in the local sewerage system and no upgrade would be required.

- Tree protection was secured by conditions 5 and 26.
 - The solar panels would be angled southwards, allowing them to catch the solar rays.
 - At the discharge of conditions stage all planting in the public domain would be required to be native.
 - There was no evidence of unlawful discharge of sewage from the local pumping station.
 - The electric vehicle charging points would be integrated with planting to screen them.
 - The proposed pumping station could control foul water flow to 0.08 litres per second.
 - Surface water from units 8, 9 and 10 would be directed into the swale, with the remainder of the units being provided with attenuation tanks.
 - The Highway Authority had raised no concerns regarding the access or blind corner, and deemed the width of the entrance to be acceptable.
 - Paragraph 3.4 of the committee report set out the materials. Condition 15 would secure details of the materials and how they would be used to integrate the development within the landscape.
 - A condition requesting sample panels of materials could be added.
13. It was proposed and seconded but not resolved that planning permission be refused on the basis of design and insufficient parking, with the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning.
14. **RESOLVED:**
1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report PC23/24-01 and the update sheet with the following additional amendments
 - a. amendment to condition 12 to change five years to ten years and include reference to native species.
 - b. additional/amended condition, the form of words delegated to the Director of Planning, with regard to the need to provide sample panels.and a legal agreement, the final form of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
 - i) Four affordable homes of the following mix and tenure:
 - 2No 1-bedroom flats and 1No 2-bedroom maisonette (affordable rental)
 - 1No 2-bedroom maisonette (shared ownership); and
 - ii) The provision and management of a 0.05ha area of offsite compensatory orchard habitat; and;
 - iii) Replacement planting of trees within the adjacent Local Wildlife 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 Planning Committee meeting of 13 July 2023.
15. John Cross briefly left the meeting at 11:17.

ITEM 7: SDNP/23/00746/REM – BUCKMORE FARM, PETERSFIELD

16. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-02) and the update sheet.
17. The following speaker addressed the committee against the application:
- Councillor Jamie Matthews, speaking on behalf of Petersfield Town Council
18. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:

- Aiden Murray, speaking as the agent.
19. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-02), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Would Beckham Lane be closed off completely? The plan showed bollards would allow pedestrians and cyclists, signs would be needed to prevent motorbikes access.
 - Would the proposals would incorporate grey water recycling?
 - Would there be a management company employed to maintain the surface water drainage within the site? Could a condition be added to cover this?
 - The site plan showed an area of open space to the north, when would this be delivered?
 - Could the western site boundary alongside the A3 dual carriage be improved to deliver further landscape benefits? If existing vegetation is lost the buildings could appear more exposed given their proximity to the western boundary.
 - The buildings are large and how would they be screened?
 - Why is the retention of the sycamore tree an issue?
 - Would like to see the landscape condition increase the requirement for the maintenance of the planting from 5 years to 10 years.
 - Could solar panels be maximised on all buildings?
 - Would the buildings meet BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) Excellent?
 - The report showed no objection in principle from the Town Council but there were some objections by the public speaker Councillor Matthews. Did the report accurately capture the comments of the Town Council as a statutory consultee?
 - Could the wording native species rather than predominantly native species be included in the landscape condition?
 - Would the setting of the adjacent listed buildings to the south be compromised in the winter months due to leaf fall?
 - There was only one entrance point for emergency vehicles, was this a concern?
 - Would access still be retained for existing dwellings and commercial premises to the south?
 - Was there any consideration for the parking spaces to be permeable?
 - What would the traffic volume be once the housing was completed?
 - Would the footpath need to be moved as a public right of way?
20. Members were advised:
- Beckham Lane would not be used for construction traffic and would be restricted to vehicles via bollards. Officers would speak to Hampshire County Council to look at preventing motorbike access. The intention was that Winchester Road be the principal access road to the site.
 - The tree belt alongside the A3 was outside of the application site and likely the responsibility of National Highways, who would determine replacement trees in the future under their published guidance.
 - The wasn't further scope for planting along the western site boundary given the position of building A, however, buildings had maintained an agreed height of no more than 10m from the design principles agreed at the outline stage. Building A would also help to screen noise within the rest of the site.

- The Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) scheme would likely be managed by a management company, and future tenants of the buildings were currently unknown but the planning conditions would need to be accorded with.
- The principles of the design framework secured in the Outline Planning Permission included the area of open space to the north of the site and that this would be delivered with the housing element of the overall development..
- The management of the site would be subject to a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan which was conditioned.
- The design principle sought to maintain vegetation with boundary vegetation retained along with the majority of the hedgerow running north-south through the site. The Sycamore tree was a category A tree which meant it was a good quality tree with longevity however it had constrained an otherwise acceptable layout of the development. Importantly, a compensatory heavy specimen oak tree would be planted as a replacement tree which was a higher quality species. The overall benefits of the scheme outweighed the loss of this tree.
- BREEAM Excellent had been targeted in the design and was subject to conditions. The provision of solar panels and air source heat pumps, in conjunction with the fabric of the buildings, accord with policy SD48 and Sustainable Construction SPD requirements. There was scope for further provision of solar panels on roofs, but this would be subject to the requirements of future tenants.
- The report included both the official response from Petersfield Town Council as a statutory consultee, and the comments of Ward Councillor Matthews as an individual.
- The landscaping would involve around 95% native species, however non-native ornamental plants could still provide some biodiversity net gain.
- The setting of the listed buildings would not be harmed due to the distances between them and the proposals, as well as how the proposals had been designed including new planting. There had been no objections from the Conservation Officer.
- It was not unusual for an industrial estate to have a single entrance point and the access had been approved via the outline application and the phase I reserved matters application. The Highways Authority had not raised an objection.
- The parking areas would be permeable block paving to assist with on-site drainage.
- The volume of traffic for the overall development of Buckmore Farm including the dwellings was not a material consideration in the current application. However, at the outline stage the overall traffic flows for the new main access were modelled and anticipated additional traffic was not raised as a highway safety issue by the Highways Authority.
- The public right of way has already been officially diverted and has been constructed by the applicant.

21. **RESOLVED:**

That approval of all Reserve Matters relating to Phase II works of SDNP/18/06292OUT be granted, subject to the conditions as set out in paragraph 9.2 of report PC23/24-02, the update sheet and the additional amendment to condition 4 to change five years to ten years

22. Vanessa Rowlands joined the meeting at 12.12.

ITEM 8: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING UPDATE

23. The Chairman noted that Chris Paterson would be leaving the Authority and thanked him for his work.
24. The Officer reminded Members of the report and noted a verbal correction. The Authority had adopted 42 Neighbourhood Plans (NP), not 41.

25. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-03) and commented as follows:
- Were Bramshott and Liphook included in the Neighbourhood Plan numbers?
 - There was not always local enthusiasm for the NPs. Would they be encouraged to revisit them at the Regulation 19 consultation stage?
 - What was the legal status of Parish Priority Statements?
 - If local communities wished to input into the Local Plan review process by completing a Parish Position Statement what was the deadline for returning them?
26. Members were advised:
- Bramshott and Liphook were included in the NP numbers but East Hampshire District Council, rather than the SDNPA, was the lead authority.
 - The Regulation 19 stage was some way distant for the SDNPA. At the workshop it was agreed that the Authority would encourage Parish Priority Statements. Should a town or parish propose a NP, the SDNPA would support them but would advise that they might better achieve their aims through a Parish Priority Statement.
 - Details had been circulated to Members regarding Parish Priority Statements. The Statements would not form part of the development plan and would not be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) but would inform the development of the local plan review. They don't have a formal legal status but would be material consideration.
 - Parishes had been contacted again outlining the timescale for input with the deadline being October 2023 which could be extended to December 2023 if needed.
27. **RESOLVED:**
- The Committee noted the progress to date on the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans across the National Park

ITEM 9: EQUESTRIAN TECHNICAL ADVICE NOTICE

28. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-04) and the update sheet.
29. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-04) the updates and commented as follows:
- Would manèges be counted as other physical changes for the purposes of Permitted Development?
 - Could the Technical Advice Note (TAN) be used as a tool to prevent incremental development? Does it hold any weight in terms of planning enforcement?
 - Were there any plans to introduce TANs for other small holdings?
 - It was a useful document, but there were still grey areas in terms of the legislation and changes of use. Could it be redrafted to make definitions tighter?
 - Were parishes on the border of the South Downs National Park consulted?
30. Members were advised:
- Manèges would be counted as other physical changes.
 - The TAN could not be used to determine what was development or not, that was set down by parliament and case law. The TAN would be helpful where it had been determined that there had been a material change in use or physical development requiring planning permission.
 - There was no intention to introduce TAN's for other types of site.

Agenda Item 3

- There was a risk in attempting to clarify matters too tightly as the document could be held to be restrictive and unfair, as was determined in the case of the pig arcs in Annington. The TAN was not intended to be exhaustive, and cases would need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
- All parishes were consulted, including those partially within the National Park.

31. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

1. Approved the Equestrian Development Technical Advice Note set out in Appendix I for publication subject to any changes proposed by the Committee.
2. Delegated authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to make any minor changes to the Equestrian Development Technical Advice Note

32. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.40pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____

