

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

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

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

Officers: Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Claire Tester (Planning Policy Manager), Vicki Colwell (Principal Planning Officer), Stella New (Development Management Lead), Lewis Ford (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Richard Fryer (Senior Governance Officer) and Jane Roberts (Governance Officer).

### **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**

97. There were apologies for absence from Debbie Curnow-Ford and William Meyer.

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

98. The following declarations was made:

- Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 6 as an East Hampshire District Councillor and Hampshire County Councillor, and was acquainted with the public speakers Cllr Louise Bevan and Cllr John Lees. He also declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 10 as a Hampshire County Councillor.
- John Cross declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as a Chichester District Councillor.
- Janet Duncton declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as a West Sussex County Councillor.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13 JULY 2023**

99. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 October 2023 were agreed, subject to the following changes, as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

- Paragraph 80, last bullet point, changed from 'we' to 'were'.
- Alun Aylesbury to be add to the Present list.

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

100. SDNPA/22/03525/FUL – Gravel Pit, Clapham (December 2022 Committee) had gone to appeal and the appeal had been dismissed.

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

101. There were none.

102. Antonia Cox joined the meeting at 10:04am

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/22/04472/FUL – HARRIER WAY, PETERSFIELD**

103. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-14) and the update sheet.

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

- Cllr Louise Bevan, speaking as a District Councillor.
  - Cllr John Lees, speaking as a Petersfield Town Councillor.
  - Kate Smith, speaking in a personal capacity.
105. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Gian Bendinelli, speaking as the agent.
  - Simon Broomfield, speaking for McCarthy & Stone.
106. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-14), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- What was the distance from the western side of the apartment block to the third public speakers house?
  - Was it proposed there would be tree planting between Harrier Way and apartment block?
  - Could the footpath around the site be paved rather than gravelled, and a condition be added so that it was suitable for wheelchair and mobility scooter use?
  - What was the proposed material for the access road through the site?
  - Surfaces needed to be permeable for water drainage. How much of the road and pavements were permeable?
  - Could there be a design solution for the balcony on the apartment that was on the northwestern corner? Could this balcony be moved to face Serpents Trail rather than Harrier Way to enhance the privacy of the property opposite?
  - There seemed to be no pavement on the internal circuit road, was it a multi-use road?
  - Were further road safety measures required to compensate for increased traffic flow and the visual acuity of residents?
  - Was there much provision for cycle storage on the development?
  - Paragraphs 7.16 to 7.22 did not show how acceptable the parking was. Would there be sufficient parking on site without it spilling out onto Harrier Way or the Serpents Trail? The Serpents Trail may be used as a cycle way in the foreseeable future, had that been taken into account?
  - Supported additional cycle storage and would like that to include storage for ebikes.
  - Could the landscaping plan be amended to request additional screen planting to mitigate loss of privacy?
  - The scheme had a good layout and access and was an allocated site. Materials used should be suitable and in a light palette.
  - The site had existing permission for development, and this application provided increased accommodation on a smaller footprint.
  - It was good to see a new footpath on Harrier Way. This scheme was an improvement on the previous scheme.
  - Would there be a raised footpath on exit points to slow down traffic, with haptic surfaces to designate priority?
  - Had the Landscape Officer received the further information requested on the Tree Protection Order (TPO) trees or would it require a condition?
  - There seemed to be four visitor parking spaces for 97 apartments, was this proportionate?

- HCC was currently performing a consultation on the Durford Road area to change the priority of traffic to Harrier Way.
- Page 25 paragraph 7.31. The culvert under the parking area was of concern as they can become blocked. Had there been discussions on shortening the length of the culvert?

107. Members were advised:

- The distance from the western side of the apartment block to the third public speakers' property was approximately 20 metres which was considered a suitable distance.
- It was proposed there would be planting between the Harrier Way and the apartment block, to include trees and hedgerows.
- The footpath materials used around the site were resin-bound or self-binding gravel, not loose gravel, the materials condition could be amended to reflect the need for surface materials to be user-appropriate, but typically this material was acceptable for wheelchair and mobility scooter use.
- Condition 13 could be amended to include hard landscaping to ensure paths were suitable for wheelchair use, the final wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning.
- The proposed material for the access road through the site was tar and chip, which was suitable for the use of wheelchairs and walking.
- There was a robust water drainage system which took into account the non-permeable tar and chip roads, resinbound gravel and self-binding gravel paths.
- It would not be possible to move the balcony of the apartment on the northwestern corner to face the Serpents Trail rather than Harrier Way due to the elevation and the pitch.
- There was no pavement on the internal circuit road, it would be a multi-use road that would have walker and mobility scooter priority and would likely be of low vehicle use.
- Hampshire County Council (HCC) Local Highway Authority would have taken on board scheme in its context and had raised no objection. There was also a sizeable Section 106 contribution to enhance pedestrian and cycling provision.
- There was limited provision for cycle storage currently proposed on the development. There had been no objection from the Local Highway Authority but a condition could be added to enable consideration of increased provision on the site.
- HCC Highway Authority and Officers were satisfied there was sufficient parking. The four visitor spaces were for the bungalows. The parking in front of the apartments was for the apartment residents and their visitors.
- The site would have onsite management and staffing that would oversee parking. Operational management was part of the condition and was required in the Section 106 agreement. Members needed to deal with the scheme before them. There would be no access from the site onto the Serpents Trail, so no potential conflict with users.
- The landscaping plan could be looked at to add additional screen planting to mitigate potential loss of privacy, but landscaping must not conflict with visibility splays and access. Different types of tree species could be considered.
- Exit point and raised curbs for the footpaths was part of the highways plan and had been considered acceptable.
- Further information had been received on the TPO'd trees, and the requirement for more information had been conditioned.
- This was the shortest length of culvert that could be delivered in respect of the site layout (without changing the scheme that had been reached). They would be maintained

by the onsite management company and Officers were confident sufficient measures were in place.

108. It was proposed, seconded and resolved to add a condition, the final form of wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, requiring a scheme to be submitted by the developer to consider cycle storage within the development. That scheme to be considered by Officers and if acceptable to be implemented in accordance with what is approved.

109. **RESOLVED:**

1. That the application be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.3 of the report, the update sheet, an amended condition 13 on hard landscaping the form of wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning, the additional condition for cycle storage as referenced in minute 108 and subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, with obligations relating to:
  - Securing the C2 use through the details of the care package requirements, qualifying occupier/residents and domiciliary care providers;
  - Securing the £125,000 Highways Contributions for improved pedestrian access to Petersfield Town Centre;
  - Securing the formal approval fee (£1,500) and monitoring fee (£15,000) of the Travel Plan and financial surety;
  - Securing the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain offsite as well as the associated monitoring fee; and
  - Highway access works
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the S106 Agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 09 November Planning Committee Meeting.

110. The committee adjourned for a comfort break at 11:17.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/21/03905/FUL – SQUARE FIELD, PETWORTH**

111. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-15) and the update sheet.

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

- Sara Sweeney, speaking as the applicant.

113. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-15), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- It was good to see the development provided 50% affordable housing.
- Hoped the materials used in the construction were suitable for the area.
- Good design for the site. The local lead flood authority had provided a late objection, were Officers satisfied?
- Page 56 condition 18, point 2. The driveways for plots 18 and 19 go over swales. Would the owners of those properties be responsible for keeping it clear or would there be a management company maintaining the swale?
- There was concern the property owners at Littlecote would not have a turning point, how would they turn around?
- Would there be bee bricks in the gable ends of the new dwellings? Will the ecology report also include bats and swifts?

- A good and welcomed development on an allocated site that was landscape led. The consideration of materials at detailed matters stage should ensure these fit in with the local character.
- With regard to water neutrality, the wording of paragraph 7.35 could suggest that the borehole was a temporary scheme. Could this be an issue going forward if the borehole stopped operation?.
- The construction management plan, ecological mitigation plan, arboricultural management plan, and tree protection plan seemed to be missing from the application. There seemed some contradictions within the ecological documentation that had been supplied; the reptile relocation site was also earmarked for wildflower planting.
- How would large construction vehicles access the site if cars were parked on the access road on the northern boundary which was less than 3 metres wide.
- Pleased to see the informative on bird nesting.
- Commended the identification of an innovative solution to resolve the water neutrality problem.

114. Members were advised:

- Officers were satisfied that the Sustainable Drainage scheme was likely to be achievable given the free draining soil type.
- The management of the sustainable drainage system including the swales was secured by condition 19 and would not be the responsibility of the property owners
- The property owners at Littlecote would have ample turning space in the development.
- There were no specific requirements for swift boxes and bee bricks but they could be included in the ecology condition. The ecologist had requested bat boxes be integrated.
- The borehole was a suitable offsetting solution but the applicant's preference was the strategic scheme being developed by local authorities including Horsham and Crawley. This was currently at an early stage, with delivery scheduled for early to mid-2024. The borehole was a workable alternative should the applicant's preferred scheme be delayed or prove undeliverable.
- Documents such as the Construction Environmental Management Plan would normally be secured by condition, and there was a condition to secure that. There was also a condition requiring an Arboricultural method statement to ensure that trees were protected through construction.
- The ecologist had scrutinised the details provided and requested two conditions. Condition 22 required that works be carried out in accordance with the measures set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment. The ecological enhancement and management strategy should resolve any conflicts identified. Confident that everything can be resolved satisfactorily at the detailed matters stage through these two conditions.
- A Section 278 agreement with the Local Highway Authority would address the timing of the access provision to ensure safe access for construction traffic. The management of construction traffic would be secured by the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

115. **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the update sheet, and a legal agreement, the final form of which is also delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
  - i) 16no affordable homes of the following mix and tenure:
    - 6no. 2 bed and 6no. 3 bed units (affordable rental)

- 2no 2 bed and 2no. 3 bed units (shared ownership); and
  - ii) A Water Neutrality Offsetting Strategy to be submitted and approved (in writing) and implemented in accordance with an agreed timetable prior to commencement of the development;
  - iii) Highway works to complete the access into the 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 with regard to securing water neutrality, within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 9 November 2023

**ITEM 8: SDNP/23/01969/FUL – NEWLANDS FARM, UPHAM**

116. The Chair announced the application had been withdrawn and would not be considered by the committee today.
117. Tim Burr joined the meeting at 12:02pm

**ITEM 9: ROWLANDS CASTLE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

118. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-17) and the update sheet.
119. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-17) and commented as follows:
- Why was the neighbourhood plan completed without allocating any sites?
  - Supported Parish Councils delivering Neighbourhood Plans. This had taken six years to complete. The plan had already been made by East Hampshire District Council which was a more likely area for any development.
  - There was a need to safeguard the area from urban sprawl from Portsmouth and Havant.
  - If no housing sites were designated in a Neighbourhood Plan, would the increased Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) still be received?
  - Congratulations to the Parish for completing the plan.
120. Members were advised:
- There was no requirement to allocate sites when making a neighbourhood plan, it was optional. The parish sought to protect their identity as a separate area. The Neighbourhood Plan focused on design, facilities, local green spaces, settlement gaps, and significant views rather than allocating sites.
  - The neighbourhood portion of CIL increases from 15% to 25% once a Neighbourhood Plan is made regardless of whether it allocates sites for housing.
121. **RESOLVED:**
1. Noted the outcome of the Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Referendum; and
  2. Agreed to make the Rowlands Castle Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) part of the Development Plan for that part of the Parish within the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

**ITEM 10: HAMPSHIRE JOINT MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN 2040 – REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION**

122. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-18) and the update sheet.
123. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-18) the updates and commented as follows:
- Page 142 had a list of sites which included Horndean (X) and Horndean (C), what did that distinction mean?

- There was an emphasis change from ‘support’ to ‘permit’ in regard to Policy 24 (Oil and Gas), why was that?
- Why was the Petersfield waste water treatment works safeguarded when other waste water treatment works in the area were not?

124. Members were advised:

- The site name were to differentiate two different sites within the same area.
- The emphasis change from ‘support’ to ‘permit’ was subtle but reflected a change in attitude over the last 10 years.
- The water waste treatment works would normally be safeguarded to protect their existing use from other potential uses. It is possible that Petersfield was included as more at risk from competing uses being in an urban area but officers would check.

125. **RESOLVED:**

That the Planning Committee recommended the National Park Authority:

1. Approve the consultation draft of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan: Partial Update – Proposed Submission Plan and Policies Map, as set out at Appendix 1 of this report, and its supporting documents, as set out at Appendices 2 and 3, for Regulation 19 consultation commencing in January 2024, subject to any comments made by the Planning Committee being addressed, and subject to any minor changes that arise prior to the start of the Regulation 19 publication being agreed by the Director of Planning in consultation with Hampshire County Council
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority, Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council, and New Forest National Park Authority, to make any minor changes arising from the consultation and then submit the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan: Partial Update to the Secretary of State under regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012 for examination.
3. Note that if major changes are required to the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan: Partial Update a further consultation and decision by the Authority may be required.

126. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.22pm

**CHAIR**

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

