

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

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

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

Officers: Mike Hughes (Director of Planning (Interim)), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Philippa Smyth (Principal Development Management Officer), Lewis Ford (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Claire Tester (Planning Policy Manager), Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead), 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**

241. There were apologies for absence from Janet Duncton, John Hyland, Stephen McAuliffe and Robert Mocatta.

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

242. The following declarations was made:

- Debbie Curnow-Ford declared a public service interest in items 6, 7 and 8 as a Hampshire County Councillor (HCC).
- Andrew Shaxson declared a personal interest in item 6 as he was acquainted with Tricia Newby who was one of the public speakers, speaking against the application.
- Gary Marsh declared a professional interest in item 6 as he was acquainted with the developer in a professional capacity.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 APRIL 2024**

243. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 April 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

244. The consultation for the Local Plan review had been discussed and approved at the planning committee meeting in March 2024. Due to the calling of the General Election, the start of the consultation had been delayed and would now run for ten weeks, rather than eight, to account for the summer holiday period. The consultation period would run from 8 July 2024 until 16 September 2024.

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

245. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/23/03638/FUL - LAND WEST OF THE CAUSEWAY, PETERSFIELD**

246. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-34) the update sheet and provided a verbal update on cycle and parking provision.

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

- Tricia Newby – Speaking as a local resident.
- Kim Chapman – speaking as a local resident.

- Cllr John Hutchinson – Speaking as an East Hampshire District Councillor.
248. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Lisa Parchment – speaking on behalf of Thakeham Homes Ltd.
  - Tristan Robinson - speaking on behalf of Thakeham Homes Ltd.
249. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-34), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Three highways planning options had been submitted to Hampshire County Council Highways (HCCH). Was the option chosen the best all round option, given residents' opposition? Had the applicant worked with HCCH?
  - The Highways report seemed to be lightly addressed in the main report. Despite the concern expressed by some of the public speakers but it would be difficult to refuse the application given the statutory consultee did not object. Would have liked to know why HCCH chose this particular option.
  - Surprised that traffic calming was proposed as the road did not seem to require it.
  - An excellent site, and the design was very good.
  - Would have concern that if the traffic calming measures needed removal that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money would be required to fund the changes.
  - Could this be dealt with through the Section 278 agreement with HCCH?
  - Would encourage the planning team to respond to HCCH regarding the proposed traffic calming measures.
250. Members were advised:
- Out of the three highways options submitted to HCCH, option C was the preferred option and the applicant had worked with HCCH.
  - There was a five-page document in the highway's response to the application. It was a statutory response, and option C was HCCH's preferred option. Officers would not recommend refusal on highways grounds.
  - It was not unusual for a development of this size to involve alterations to the highways infrastructure.
  - The professional advice from HCCH was that the application was acceptable, and that advice should be given significant weight. Officers were of the opinion that there was a workable solution.
  - Highways works would be largely outside the development red line, can be done without requiring planning permission and would be subject to a Section 278 agreement.
  - HCCH would not allow the work to proceed if they did not think they would be safe.
  - The Chief Planning Officer and Chairman would send a letter to HCCH outlining Members' concerns and request a response. However, the appropriate traffic calming was ultimately for HCCH to determine rather than SDNPA.
251. **RESOLVED:**
- I. That planning permission be granted subject to:
    - (i) A letter being sent to the Highways Authority concerning the proposed highway works, elucidating the concerns of the Planning Committee and the local community. The contents of the letter to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee
    - (ii) the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of report reference PC23/24-34;
    - (iii) the oral update provided by the case officer around a prior to occupation condition requiring the submission of a cycle parking or storage scheme for each dwelling;

- (iv) the completion of a section 106 agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
- 27 affordable homes
  - Off-site Biodiversity Net Gain
  - Highways and Rights of Way Contributions
  - Travel Plan and Monitoring fees
  - Open Space and Management company for public open space, SuDS etc.
  - The requirement to enter into a S278 agreement to secure highways works.
  - The diversion of the definitive line of FP42.
  - The diversion and/or works on FP41b at its junction with the access road.
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 13 June Planning Committee Meeting.
252. Committee adjourned for a comfort break at 10.54am

**ITEM 7: SDNP/21/04092/OUT – Petersfield Golf Club**

253. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-35) and the update sheet.
254. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Paul Vangrove – speaking on behalf of Petersfield Golf Club.
255. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-35), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Did the Shipwrights Way run parallel to the A3?
  - There was no pre-existing development on the site and there were clear views from the site to the Hangers, with a distant view of Butser Hill. There was clear landscape harm from this proposal.
  - Concern over opening up ribbon development along either side of the A3 corridor.
  - Were the buildings designed to be temporary or permanent? How easily could the landscape be restored at any point in the future if the development ceased?
  - The application would run counter to SD23 (b) and (g) in particular. It was in the wrong location.
  - There was concern with the overuse of Farnham Lane to access the development.
  - This was a noisy site. Would the vegetation lessen the impact the road traffic noise from the A3? Was there adequate screening for not only the sound but also air quality?
  - Building higher up the site, the lodges would be visible in wintertime and visible from the Shipwrights Way.
  - Did the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) want to encourage visitors to the SDNP and create employment. The objections to the proposal seemed contrary to the SDNPA's ambitions in this area.
  - The proximity of the Shipwrights way did not affect the site access; people would likely primarily travel to the site by car.
  - Conflict with SD23 would justify a reason of refusal.
  - The buildings would need to be sympathetic to the site.
  - Was the site stranded agricultural land that could not be used for those purposes?
256. Members were advised:
- The Shipwrights Way ran parallel to the A3 and past the site.

- The proposed buildings would likely be on permanent pad foundations and plumbed into the foul drainage system. Drainage details were covered under condition 25.
- There had been no objection to noise impact upon future residents from the Environment Health Officers. Higher up the site, road noise was less which had partly informed the layout. Muted cladding of lodges, green roofs, and the landscape scheme could help to mitigate for lodges higher upon the site. The vegetation may help to lessen road noise to a degree but this could not be quantified.
- If intending to refuse the application on landscape grounds and location of development, then key policies would include SD4 (landscape character) and SD23 (sustainable tourism), more specifically SD23(b)(g) regarding development making a positive contribution to landscape/natural beauty and the over reliance on private cars.
- A travel plan would be required to see how car journeys could be reduced, and this was in the recommendation.
- There were positive biodiversity and landscape enhancements from the development that should be considered against any impacts.
- The site was owned by Petersfield Golf Club. It had previously been rented to a farmer for grazing.
- Many of the Park's tourist offerings required access by car.
- A generalised concern about precedent of development along the A3 corridor should not be a reason for refusal. This application and any other must be considered on their own merits.
- The landscape impact was a matter of judgement for the Committee.

257. **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be refused for the reason of landscape impact, including with specific reference to policies SD4 and SD23 I (c) and I(g) of the South Downs Local Plan with the final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/23/01722/FUL - UPLAND PARK, DROXFORD**

258. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-36) and the update sheet.
259. The following speakers addressed the committee against the application:
- Cllr Danny Lee – speaking as a Winchester City Councillor and local resident.
  - Adam Faulkner – speaking as a local resident.
  - Janet Melson – speaking on behalf of Droxford Parish Council.
260. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- David Barker – speaking on behalf of the applicant.
  - Mr Morton Schmidt-Hansen – speaking on behalf of the landowner.
261. The following speaker addressed the committee as a Member of the SDNPA.
- Jerry Pett – speaking as a Member of the SDNPA
262. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-36), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Condition 8 on waste management was key to resolving the Committee's previously raised concerns.
  - Had the new design fully met the landscape concerns expressed at the previous meeting in April?

- With the drainage system so close to the river Meon, did the proposal give the highest level of protection? No UV protection had been proposed. The low laying location of the pumping station retained a flood risk.
- Most of the concerns had been addressed. Could the outflow be sent into the main river, rather than the millstream? Moving the discharge pipe could resolve that.
- The conifers shielded the footpath and there was concern that removing them all at once would impact the landscape for several years. The site was stark and planting would take time.
- The treatment plant was designed for 50 users, was this capacity sufficient? Insurance was needed ensure that the river Meon was protected as much as possible. Condition 25 needed to be sufficient to what the permission would grant.
- Droxford Parish Council would like a footpath but that would be outside the red line boundary and not in the applicants gift.
- Liked the strong protection provided by conditions 21 and 22.
- This was a reuse of a pre-existing tourist site which was needed in the SDNP. This was also an improvement on the extant permission.
- It was not sufficient to say all statutory consultees were satisfied as some may be using out of date information. Was it possible to impose a condition which went beyond the requirements of the statutory consultees?

263. Members were advised:

- The improvements to the design and landscaping were modest but helpful. The reed bed would help with the wastewater management. Caution should be given should the application go to appeal as there was a reasonable proposal for wastewater and there were stringent conditions applied to the application. There was good evidence and rational to the revisions.
- The developer would be supplying the foul drainage system, and it was suitable for the site. Condition 22 would require further detail of the foul drainage system, including how the reed bed would be constructed and the management of the system. The condition does not explicitly say to meet Statutory Consultee requirements but SDNPA requirements.
- The outflow could be extended into the main river rather than the millstream.

264. Recommendation 2 should read 'nitrate neutrality' rather than 'water neutrality'.

265. **RESOLVED:**

1. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to:
  - i) The satisfactory resolution of the issue of nitrate neutrality.
  - ii) A S106 legal agreement, the final form of which was delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
    - Nitrate neutrality mitigation measures (as necessary)
  - iii) The conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of the report and any amendments or other conditions required to address nitrate neutrality, as necessary.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse Planning Permission, with appropriate reasons, if matters relating to water neutrality have not been resolved, or the legal agreement was not completed, or insufficient progress made, within six months of the 13 June 2024 Planning Committee meeting.

266. Committee adjourned for a comfort break at 12.47pm

**ITEM 9: ADOPTION OF THE EAST SUSSEX, SOUTH DOWNS, AND BRIGHTON & HOVE WASTE & MINERALS LOCAL PLAN (WMLP) REVISED POLICIES DOCUMENT (RPD) AND REVISED POLICIES MAP**

267. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-37).
268. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-07) and commented as follows:
- The document was at the final stage of approval, and it should be considered and passed onto the next National Park Authority (NPA) meeting.
269. **RESOLVED:**
- The Planning Committee recommended to the National Park Authority that it:
1. Notes the content of the Inspectors' Report and their conclusion that the East Sussex, South Downs, and Brighton & Hove Waste & Minerals Local Plan (WMLP) Revised Policies Document (RPD) is legally compliant and sound subject to main modifications; and
  2. Notes the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environment Assessment) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment on the main modifications of the East Sussex, South Downs, and Brighton & Hove Waste & Minerals Local Plan (WMLP) Revised Policies Document (RPD); and
  3. Delegates to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Authority, to make any inconsequential changes to the text required prior to the publication of the East Sussex, South Downs, and Brighton & Hove Waste & Minerals Local Plan (WMLP) Revised Policies Document (RPD); and
  4. Adopts and publishes the East Sussex, South Downs, and Brighton & Hove Waste & Minerals Local Plan (WMLP) Revised Policies Document (RPD) and Revised Policies Map, as amended by the Inspectors' main modifications and the authorities' additional and further (non-material) modifications, to form part of the development plan for the South Downs National Park.

**ITEM 10: WEST SUSSEX WASTE LOCAL PLAN (WLP) – A FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT OF RELEVANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS**

270. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-38).
271. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-38) and commented as follows:
- The five-year assessment explains that hazardous and low-level radioactive waste was exported from the plan area. Was there anywhere in the Park that accepted such waste and does the Authority export such waste?
272. Members were advised:
- That the officer was unsure and he would come back separately to the Member directly with an answer.
273. **RESOLVED:**
- The Planning Committee recommended to the National Park Authority that it:
1. Notes the findings and conclusion of the second five-year assessment on the relevance and effectiveness of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (WLP); and
  2. Approves the findings and conclusion of the second five-year assessment on the relevance and effectiveness of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (WLP) in that the WLP is still relevant and effective and a formal review (in whole or in part) is not required.

**ITEM 11: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED FROM 27 JANUARY 2024 – 29 MAY 2024**

274. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-39).
275. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-39) the updates and commented as follows:
- Was there an update on the Judicial Review for the Queens Hotel, Selborne SDNP/20/04118/FUL?
  - Officers were thanked on their successes.
276. Members were advised:
- The Inspectorate contacted the South Downs National Park Authority to ask how it would like the appeal to be dealt with for the application at Queens Hotel, Selborne (SDNP/20/04118/FUL) and it advised it would like it to be via written representation, which was also the view of the applicant. The objectors requested it be dealt with through an inquiry. The inspectorate concluded it would be dealt with through an inquiry. No date had yet been set for the inquiry.
277. **RESOLVED:**  
The Committee noted the outcome of the appeal decisions.
278. The Chair closed the meeting at 13.14pm

**CHAIR**

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

