

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 14 September 2023 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), Alun Alesbury, Janet Duncton, John Hyland, Stephen McAuliffe, Robert Mocatta 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)), Stella New (Development Management Lead), Richard Fryer (Senior Governance Officer) and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

OPENING REMARKS

33. 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

34. There were apologies for absence from John Cross, Debbie Curnow-Ford, Gary Marsh, William Meyer and Daniel Stewart-Roberts.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

35. The following declaration was made:

- Alun Alesbury declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6, as the applicants Mr & Mrs Le May were known to his brother-in-law. He had no direct connection with the applicants and would participate in the agenda item.

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

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

ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

37. SDNP/23/00746/REM, Buckmore Farm, Petersfield (July 2023 Committee) had now been approved.
38. SDNP/21/02342/FUL, Exceat Bridge, Exceat (December 2022 Committee) had now been approved.
39. SDNP/22/03525/FUL, Gravel Pit, Clapham (December 2022 Committee) had gone to appeal, the hearing would be heard on the 26 September 2023.
40. SDNP/22/02466/FUL, The Grange Development Site, Bepton Road, Midhurst (October 2022 Committee) had gone to appeal and would be considered by written representation.
41. SDNP/22/02247/FUL, Blind Veterans UK, Brighton (December 2022 Committee) had now been approved. Following negotiations the affordable housing contribution had been increased from a cap of £1m to £3.5m which included an up-front sum and claw back mechanism.

ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS

42. Amendment 247 to the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill was defeated in the House of Lords on 13 September 2023. This amendment proposed to remove nitrate neutrality as a consideration for the planning system.

ITEM 6: SDNP/23/01969/FUL – NEWLYNS FARM, UPHAM

43. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-05) and the update sheet.
44. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
 - Councillor Gwyn Halsall, speaking on behalf of Upham Parish Council.
 - Freya Green, speaking as a member of the public.
 - Richard Green, speaking as a member of the public.
 - Jerry Pett, speaking as an SDNPA Member.
45. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
 - Sarah Le May, speaking as the applicant.
 - Mark Passmore, speaking on behalf of the Countryside Stewardship Scheme.
 - Genevieve Jacobs, speaking as the agent.
46. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-06), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
 - The Chair reminded Members that they should consider the scheme before them, not possible future developments.
 - The National Park has many agricultural buildings in a similar condition.
 - Local residents concerned about a future residential use of the buildings. Would the use of the site and the impact of the development be monitored?
 - Concern over the viability of the scheme with regard to cost-income analysis.
 - If the current permitted use of pig farming was resumed, what would be the impact on nitrate neutrality?
 - The development not breaking the tree line when viewed from the Monarch's Way was an important attribute, as was the opening of the views from within the conservation area towards the countryside.
 - The materials proposed suited the character of the area. The scale of the proposed development matched the existing buildings. The proposal enhanced the local conservation area of Upham.
 - The current buildings were non-descript and the proposed scheme, if well implemented, would fit well within its setting in the South Downs National Park (SDNP).
 - It was good to hear from the representative from the Countryside Stewardship Scheme, who historically have not attended committee meetings.
 - SDNPA consultees (design, landscape, conservation) supported the scheme.
 - In accordance with SDI5, these proposals would enhance the local conservation area in Upham.
 - Mention was made of the proposed padel court use.
 - The Chair commented that the development would be an improvement on the current site and would fit well within the conservation area. The use of materials are appropriate to the setting.
47. Members were advised:
 - Conditions 3 and 5 controlled the use of the site. Any unlawful use in the future would be a breach of those conditions and any immunity of this would be 10 years. Future monitoring would be done on a periodic basis in regard to the ongoing enforcement duties of the Authority.

- There was currently extant permission for the barns to be used as a pig farm. As per Natural England guidance the base line nitrate assessment for the site would not be assessed as a working pig farm as it had not been used for that purpose for the last few years. It may be that off-site credits would need to be purchased if on site mitigation could not be secured in order for the scheme to be 'nitrate neutral.

48. RESOLVED:

1. That planning permission be granted subject to:

- i) Resolution of the issue of nitrates from foul water, the consideration of which is delegated to the Director of Planning.
- ii) The conditions at paragraph 9.2 of this report and the update sheet.

2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse Planning Permission, with appropriate reasons, if within 6 months of the 14 September 2023 Planning Committee meeting the impact from nitrates has not been satisfactorily addressed.

ITEM 7: SDNP/23/02048/FUL – COUNTY STABLES, LEWES

49. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-06) and the update sheet.

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

- Suzanne Asher, speaking on behalf of Residents of the Old Racecourse.
- Jane Gordy, speaking in a personal capacity as a resident.

51. The following speaker addressed the committee in support of the application:

- James Oliver, speaking as the applicant.

52. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-06), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- The National Park's status with regard to the Section 52 agreement, which had been set up by Lewes District Council (LDC) was queried. Did LDC have any comment, or retain any further interest?
- The application provided small scale tourist accommodation, which was greatly needed within the SDNP, and there would be no harm to the surrounding countryside.
- The tourism accommodation was intended to serve walkers. Would this be suitable for prolonged stays, and did the lack of parking effect the viability of the scheme?
- Noted the provision of a bicycle store, allowing people to access the site via bicycle.
- The issue of infrastructure cost sharing was not a material planning consideration as it was a civil matter.
- Was there any concern that not enforcing the Section 52 agreement would create a precedent for any future Section 106 agreements?

53. Members were advised:

- The Section 52 agreement was made between LDC as the Local Planning Authority and the Landowner. The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) was the successor Local Planning Authority, and as such LDC held no further interest albeit they had been consulted.
- Section 106 agreements can be varied by the Local Planning Authority, however the legislation that pertains to Section 52 agreements only provide for their discharge where there is agreement by all relevant parties, including successors in title. These are a particular set of circumstances specific to this location and therefore do not transpose across to other agreements.

54. RESOLVED:

- I. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to:
 - i) Appropriate notice being given to the landowner(s) of the private access road and consideration of any issues that are raised as a result of the notification process;
 - ii) The conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the update sheet; and
 - iii) A legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to agree that the application land will not be used for any development which is contrary to the existing section 52 agreement, other than that development proposed through this application. It is also proposed that the Authority will agree not to enforce the requirement in the section 52 agreement associated with a single equestrian use in respect of the development permitted.
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 14 September 2023.

55. The Committee adjourned for a short break at 11:38

56. Vanessa Rowlands joined the meeting at 11.43am

ITEM 8: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS

57. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-07).

58. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-07) and commented as follows:

- Disappointing results at first glance for the last six months but the details reveal some benefits were achieved from the appeals.
- A six-month period in isolation is too short a period to identify trends in appeal decisions. Harting Parish recently had an appeal allowed which took six months for a hearing decision to be published. Was the overworking of PINS an issue?
- The Buriton Interchange decision appeared to suggest that the special qualities of the National Park were not the same throughout the SDNP. The Authority has always argued that the characteristics applied to every part of the National Park. Did the inspectors wording open the way for future applications to argue in this way?.
- Was there any written advice from the KC on requesting a Judicial Review (JR) over the Buriton decision?
- Disappointing to see that time had run out for three appeals.
- The Buriton development did not have the outcome the Authority had desired as the inspector took the decision that the net-zero element trumped everything else. With an understanding of this, could the Authority have negotiated a better development?

59. Members were advised:

- The special qualities were picked up with the Kings Counsel who represented the Authority in the appeal. The KC argued that the Inspectors comments on the special qualities did not justify a Judicial Review.
- The KC's advice was verbal, not written.
- If the emerging appeal trend continued it would need to be addressed, and the host Authorities had been alerted to this. Appeals were time and resource intensive.
- If an extension of time was required and it could be negotiated it would be, but it was not always possible.

- Each case must be viewed on its own merits, and in the Buriton case the inspector took the view that the net zero benefits outweighed the landscape impact but in other circumstances that may not apply. The highways and Biodiversity Net Gain objections were satisfactorily resolved through the appeal process via the submission of extra information from the appellant.

60. RESOLVED:

The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions.

ITEM 9: ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

61. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-08).
62. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-08) and commented as follows:
- Could the figure of unsolved enforcement cases be published? This could help identify trends and performance.
 - What was the process of oversight of Host Authorities?
 - The Chair of the Authority and Planning Committee thanked the Officers for their work.
63. Members were advised:
- Officers would look at adding the unsolved enforcement cases to the report going forward. There were circa 650 enforcement cases in the SDNP last year. The SDNPA do not always have the initial information on cases if they came via the Host Authorities.
 - The vacant Monitoring and Compliance Officer post had been filled, with the candidate starting in October 2023.
 - There was a quarterly review of Host Authority enforcement cases that were currently on the books and over 6 months old.
 - There was regular communication with the Host Authorities through the Link Officers, providing oversight and advice.
 - The number of enforcement cases outstanding went up in 2020 and has gone down significantly since. The Authority used a proxy figure of the number of cases in and resolved each year, which was reported annually to the SDNPA Policy and Resources Committee. There can sometimes be a wait of over 18 months for a decision from the Planning Inspectorate, and in such circumstances the enforcement case is left open.

64. RESOLVED:

The Committee noted the update on enforcement action.

ITEM 10: ONE APP VALIDATION LIST

65. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-09).
66. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-09) and commented as follows:
- Could Members have clarity on the enforcement regime around Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) with the 30-year commitment. Who would be funding it and how would it be monitored and enforced?
 - Could the full pre-application documentation be included online alongside the planning application? Can it be very difficult to find and often only includes the final advice letter.
 - Should pre-application advice remain as distinct advice and not attached to an application? Applicants may not understand the planning system and may need freedom to explore what is possible.
 - Who benefits from knowing the content of the pre-application?

67. Members were advised:

- The Authority has employed a Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) qualified ecologist to monitor BNG sites. Payment comes from the developer via offset contribution and all local planning authorities have also received some funding from Government. The implementation of the BNG policy was being staged starting in November 2023. The extent of the workload would not be known until the policy was implemented but the Technical Advice Note (TAN) was being drafted and would be kept under review for at least a year after implementation.
- The Planning Director thanked the Validation Team for their efforts in registering applications.
- The Authority aimed to be transparent in the planning process and offered advice without prejudice.
- Pre-applications are confidential until the point an application is received, at which point the advice is made available online alongside the application. Officers would check whether this included the originally submitted plans and forms. This was done in-house, rather than as a requirement by the applicant as part of the Validation List.
- A separate discussion would be had by Members on pre-application advice to discuss if a fully completed pre-application form should be attached to a full planning application, and what benefit, if any, it would serve. There was a balance to be struck between transparency and operational efficiency.

68. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee approved for publication the revised local list of requirements for validating planning applications and related consents for adoption.

69. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.33pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 12 October 2023 at the Council Chamber, County Hall, Lewes

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), John Cross, Janet Duncton, Gary Marsh, Stephen McAuliffe, Robert Mocatta, Andrew Shaxson and Daniel Stewart-Roberts.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), David Boyson (Conservation Officer), Mike Hughes (Major Planning Projects and Performance Manager), Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), Claire Tester (Planning Policy Manager), (Mark Waller-Gutierrez (Specialist Lead), Gill Welsman (Planning Project Management Officer), Richard Sandiford (Head of Governance) and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

Also attend by: Claire Warwick (Assistant Manager, Transport Development Control, East Sussex County Council)

OPENING REMARKS

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

70. There were apologies for absence from Debbie Curnow-Ford, John Hyland, William Meyer and Robert Mocatta.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

71. The following declarations was made:

- Daniel Stewart-Roberts declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 6 as a Lewes District Councillor and would not participate in that item as Lewes District Council had a financial interest as part landowner; also a public service Interest in Agenda Item 7 as Lewes District Councillor, but which would not prevent his participation in the item.
- Gary Marsh declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as he was acquainted with two of the public speakers.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14 SEPTEMBER 2023

72. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 September 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

73. The permissions for SDNP/21/04041/FUL, SDNP/21/04040/FUL and SDNP/22/01858/FUL on a mix of greenfield and brownfield sites, with policy compliant affordable homes, in Easebourne had been issued following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement

74. SDNP/22/02466/FUL, The Grange Development Site, Bpton Road, Midhurst (October 2022 Committee) had gone to appeal, but the appeal had since been withdrawn.

ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS

75. There were none.

ITEM 6: SDNP/23/00526/OUT – NORTH STREET, LEWES

76. The Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-10) and the update sheet, and provided the following verbal update:

- Since the issuing of the update sheet an additional 24 letters of support and 3 letters of objection had been received. Furthermore, amended information on sustainable construction was also received from the applicant yesterday, including a 60 page response to the officer's report. Given the late submission of this response, officers had read it but had not been able to consider it in full. Notwithstanding, the applicant's agent was speaking at the meeting so would have the opportunity to put their points across to the committee. There was no reason why the application should not continue to be considered today and the recommendation remained unchanged.
77. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
- Marion Smith, speaking as a local resident.
 - Suzanne Asher, representing Residents of Corporation Villas and Spring Gardens.
 - John Gower, speaking as a local resident.
 - Peter Earl, representing Friends of Lewes.
78. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Gareth Giles, speaking as the Planning Agent for the applicant.
 - Dougal Fleming, speaking as a local resident.
 - Zoe Nicholson, representing Lewes District Council.
 - Deborah Anne Twitchen, speaking as a local resident.
79. Additional Speaker from Lewes Town Council:
- Cllr Adrian Ross, speaking on behalf of Lewes Town Council.
80. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-05), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Additional information was requested to provide a clearer understanding of the closing of the highways on the site. Vehicle, cycle, and pedestrian public rights of way were all important aspects.
 - Could the new riverside walkway be a public right of way?
 - What were the recreational facilities and would they be open to the public?
 - It was noted there would only be 6.5 metres between the rear boundary of Corporation Villas and parcel 5C. What was the normal acceptable distance?
 - What was the distance between parcel 6F and Corporation Villas?
 - Was the proposed four month deferral enough time to overcome the outstanding issues?
 - Would the reduction in mass or height impact affordable housing and the viability of the scheme?
 - How many units were in parcel 1A?
 - Would there be 10% passive house across the site?
 - Could it be clarified whether there would be substantial harm or less than substantial harm in relation to the conservation area?
 - Was there the potential for complaints by future residents about East Sussex Fire and Rescue in relation to the noise from the fire station?
 - It was unclear how the multiple aspirations for aspects of this site, such as the riverside walkway and the rooftop, could co-exist. Could further detail be provided on how they would work together?

Agenda Item 13

- Would APNR surveillance cameras be used by the management company and would they be signed up to the amended code of practice?
- It was highlighted by Southern Water that the site was crossed by water mains, what was the impact of this?
- An extensive site visit had been undertaken and the site's history and the difficulties it presented to development were acknowledged.
- It was also acknowledged there were many good things proposed in this development, including the co-mobility concept, low traffic streets and car free community, concierge service, and the bridge. However, there remained issues that needed to be addressed, even though two of the issues had been overcome. There were many good ambitions, but further detail was required to ensure this was an exemplar of sustainability and a town centre development.
- There was concern that the development did not knit well with the town and the landscape. There were positive and not so positive views about the general design of the detailed part of the site under consideration, however, it was felt that some of the design, particularly in terms of the details of the rooflines and the use of different elevations, could be improved.
- There was also concern about the loss of longer distance views of the wider landscape and that the new views being created were not of a similar quality.
- Greater care needed to be taken in creating satisfactory relationships between the new buildings and the pre-existing buildings on the site.
- The SDNPA as the Planning Authority had a responsibility in this very important town in the National Park to ensure that this development would actually be delivered to a suitably high quality, regardless of who may build the scheme out. Therefore, given the varied objections from a wide range of stakeholders including statutory consultees, the recommended deferral seemed appropriate with the aim of reaching a satisfactory outcome.
- The design in relation to parcel 5c should be amended to either reduce or pull back the building. It was currently not considered acceptable.
- The issue of the fire station also needed to be addressed, possibly to include a measure of buyer beware.
- The outstanding objection from the Flood Authority due to insufficient information remained a concern.
- To ensure the issues we addressed within the four months would require a combined, concerted effort between all parties.

81. Members were advised:

- There were a number of matters relating to the stopping up of the highway that needed further attention, There was no objection in principle to stopping up the highway, but further details were required in key areas - general public, pedestrian and cycle access, access for fire and rescue, current resident access, and deliveries and access for businesses.
- Through a Section 106 agreement and the Estate Management Plan, pedestrian and cycle access could be secured on the site and the riverside walk, which could also be secured as a right of way.
- The recreational facilities would be key spaces around the Belvedere and Link. The sport and community facilities in the buildings would allow for recreational activities; technical details needed to be addressed to ensure these were protected for public use.
- The distance from the rear boundary of Corporation Villas to parcel 5C was 6.5 meters;. Officers were concerned about this relationship given that Parcel 5C was

proposed to be a 5-storey building in the parameter plans and the Design Code was currently not sufficient to mitigate the harm.

- Parcel 6F had been amended to 3 stories high immediately in front of Corporation Villas and the distance was approximately 8m, which in a town environment was considered an acceptable relationship.
- There needed to be an end point to reconsider the application; four months was considered by officers a reasonable timeframe to overcome the issues.
- There would be an impact on the viability of the site should the height and mass be reduced. Officer's view was that there was room for manoeuvre, however, this needed to be explored further with the applicant, agent, and experts. It was also important to deliver needed affordable housing on this site.
- The number of units in block 1A was 44.
- 10% passive house across the site would be secured through the s106 agreement.
- It would be less than substantial harm to the conservation area.
- There were concerns on overspray and noise from fire station. The design code currently proposed *reasonable endeavours* to explore options to address the issue. This was not considered enough and further discussions would be held on this, but the solution was not likely to take the form of a buffer around the fire station.
- The spaces proposed within the scheme would have to work hard to deliver multiple benefits. The principles were good, but there remained an outstanding objection from the ecologist on deliverability. More work was needed on the design code to address this.
- The matter of surveillance cameras was still to be addressed.
- Further discussions would be had with the applicant and Southern Water, however, it was not considered appropriate for Southern Water to dictate the form of development on an allocated site such as this without very good reason. Their concerns would be sought to be addressed, but it may not be to their full satisfaction.
- The s106 agreement would play a very important role in this development, not only in securing public rights of way and affordable housing, but also the sustainability credentials of this scheme. It was important to ensure that commitments to sustainability were made, rather than the *reasonable endeavours* which were currently proposed by the applicant.
- As an urban site, it was important to focus on the public edges of the development and ensure they spoke to the landscape; the developer could be given some leeway in regards to planting within the development, for example, in courtyard settings.

82. It was proposed and seconded to vote on a revised recommendation. No.1, amended to read "That a decision on this application be deferred to seek to resolve the following issues with the application reported back to Planning Committee within 4 months for a further or final decision" and to delete recommendation no.4.

83. **RESOLVED:**

- I. That a decision on this application be deferred to seek to resolve the following issues with the application reported back to Planning Committee within 4 months for a further or final decision:
 - a) Transport – currently insufficient and inadequate information and justification
 - to demonstrate the scheme will not have a significant impact on highway capacity and highway safety issues (including the new access arrangements on the Phoenix Causeway);

- to demonstrate the scheme will not have a significant impact of parking demand due to the scale and types of uses proposed within the scheme and the loss of public car parking spaces;
 - as to whether the scheme sufficiently mitigates for those impacts including adequate and sufficient walking and cycling provision to and from the site, and
 - the lack of re-provision for the 3 coach parking bays currently provided on site.
- b) Design - including amendments to the Parameter Plans and Design Code and details of Parcel 1 to address inconsistencies / provide further clarification and to address concerns (for example in respect of bulk and scale) related to views, 'edges', heritage assets, amenity impacts, risks of flooding from surface water / ground water and ecological / biodiversity;
- c) Flood Risk – to address concerns related to risk of flooding from surface water, ground water and other sources which are not fluvial and tidal;
- d) Air Quality – currently insufficient and / or inadequate information to enable an appropriate assessment in air quality terms. Any air quality assessment work is also dependent upon the outcomes of the transport / highway assessment work, and
- e) Section 106 Legal Agreement – currently insufficient and / or inadequate information to ensure the proposed mitigation measures and other benefits critical to the scheme are secured through a legally binding agreement.
2. That the Committee confirm that subject to finding a suitable resolution to the issues highlighted in (1) above, that they, in principle, support the 'Stopping Up' of the existing adopted highways under Sections 247 and 248 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
3. That the Committee confirm in reaching their decision that they have taken into account:
- the environmental information as required by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017;
 - all matters referred to in the Director of Planning's report including comments received from statutory consultees and other interested parties, and
 - all other material considerations, and

ITEM 7: LEWES CAAMP

84. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-11).
85. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
- Peter Earl, speaking on behalf of the Friends of Lewes.
 - Dr Suzy Nelson, speaking on behalf of Lewes Climate Hub (with comments more than speaking against).
86. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-11) and commented as follows:
- This was an additional document to the design guide for the whole of the park.
 - Would the Lewes CAAMP go online?
 - The map with the outline of the conservation area showed red lines within the conservation area, what were those red lines?
 - Was there a domestic advice note that would be revised?
 - In relation to the guidance through historic England and other partners, would there be links to take you to their website via the document?

- Could there be a secondary use of the document with information of Lewes and its history? Could its accessibility be available through general interest in Lewes, not just planning?
- Why had the Lewes bus station been excluded?
- Was there a plan to have a TAN for listed buildings?

87. Members were advised:

- The Lewes CAAMP would go online if approved.
- The red lines within the boundary line showed there was hole in the conservation area, and that area was not counted as part of the conservation area.
- The domestic advice note was in a different document.
- There would be live links in the document to take you through to Historic England and other partner websites via the SDNPA website.

The document would be published on the SDNPA website so people without any interest in planning could still view it. The document could also be shared with other districts and bodies.

- The Lewes Bus Station was not a non-designated heritage asset, the CAAMP reflected this.
- There were no immediate plans for a TAN for listed buildings. The Local Plan Review would look at the general approach to climate change and local heritage. There was currently plenty of advice available on the matter.

88. **RESOLVED:**

1. Adopt, subject to any changes proposed by the Committee, the new Lewes Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan, attached as Annex Two to this report, to replace the existing version, for the purposes of Development Management and to inform the other activities of the National Park Authority and its partner organisations.
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to make any minor changes to the Lewes Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

ITEM 8: EAST SUSSEX MINERALS & WASTE PLAN 2030

89. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-12).

90. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-12).

91. **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Committee recommended the National Park Authority to Agree that the Proposed Modifications to the Submission draft of the Joint South Downs National Park Authority, East Sussex County Council and Brighton & Hove City Council Waste and Minerals Local Plan Review Revised Policies document, and its supporting documents, are published for a representation period of eight weeks.

ITEM 9: SDNPA DRAFT RESPONSE TO DLUHC CONSULTATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN-MAKING REFORMS

92. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-13).

93. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-13) and commented as follows:

- In relation to the deadline of Autumn 2024, as our plan would be 5 years old in July could this be added into the comments to make a case for it being included in the proposed protections?

- Q15, do you support the standardisation of evidence topics - would there be scope for standard development lists to be challenged?

94. Members were advised:

- It was unclear why the Autumn 2024 date was set, it may be moved forward or allow exemptions.
- With Q15, there should be a methodology to look at constraints and how to balance them.
- The consultation was about the mechanics of plan-making, not the policies themselves.

95. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

1. Noted the Government consultation on the implementation of plan-making reforms; and
2. Considered and provided comments on the contents of the draft response, set out at Appendix 2, to be approved and submitted by the Chief Executive of the Authority.

96. The Chair closed the meeting at 13.22pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____

