

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 14 November 2024 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

Officers: Mike Hughes (Director of Planning (Interim)), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Robert Campbell (Senior Planning Enforcement Officer), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead (West)), Katharine Stuart (Planning Policy Lead), Claire Tester (Planning Policy Manager), Amy Tyler-Jones (Planning Policy 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**

85. Apologies for absence were received from Daniel Stewart-Roberts.

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

86. The following declarations was made:

- John Hyland declared a public service interest in Agenda Items 7 as was acquainted to the public speaker.
- Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item and 9 as an East Hampshire District Councillor, Hampshire County Councillor, a resident of the village, and he was also acquainted with all the public speakers.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 OCTOBER 2024**

87. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 10 October 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

88. The following updates were given by the Development Manager:

- SDNP/24/00588/CND – Land north of A3 Junction, Petersfield, had now been approved.
- SDNP/2104092/OUT - Petersfield Golf Club, Petersfield. The decision had been appealed by the applicant.
- SDNP/20/04118/FUL – The Queens Hotel, Selborne, the inquiry had not yet been completed.
- SDNP/20/03365/FUL - Meadow Farm, Bordon the applicant had complied with the enforcement team and the site was currently being used as a base by SSE.

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

89. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: SUMMER ENGAGEMENT AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTS**

90. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC24/25-13) and the update sheet.

91. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-13) and commented as follows:
- In relation to the last Local Plan (LP) early engagement, were there any glaring gaps from the responses received?
  - It was a comprehensive document.
  - Members had previously gone through the detail at a Member workshop.
  - Would have liked to have seen a higher number of responses given the number of people living within the South Downs National Park (SDNP), with 120,000 residents with only 700 responses.
  - Needed to engage more with the District Councils. It appeared the National Park was working separately to District Council Planning Authorities, but it was not.
  - Were communities that live around the boundaries of the SDNP actively contacted? Should the Local Plan engage with people outside the park?
  - Some Local Authorities were concerned the SDNPA was not doing enough in regard to housing numbers.
  - Had Parish Councils responded?
  - There was concern over the timeline and impact on the economy between now and until June 2027. What was the status of the plan between now and adoption? Could the Planning Committee take account of emerging policy in decisions before adoption?
  - The LP was an extremely complex subject, how far outside the park would the Authority consider going for consultations?
  - The proportion of the Parishes that had responded to the consultation was quite low, although it was to be expected that the number of responses would be higher once sites had been detailed.
  - People only tended to object in serious numbers if something terrible was going to be proposed. The response numbers suggest that the SDNPA was not doing things seriously wrong and nothing untoward is being proposed.
  - Could more detail be provided on Regulation 18 and its stage in the process?
  - Had the reasons for unhappiness detailed in the report at p25 been considered?
  - There did not seem to be enough on climate change and net zero emissions.
  - Respondents had mentioned that there were not enough homes for local people and the report did not mention starter homes.
  - Publishing pre-app details was an issue that parish councils often raised. Would like to see all relevant details included on the system, not just responses as it could be hard to understand the responses without the original plans. Could the earlier documents be watermarked as pre-application?
  - The public should be looking at the live application, not outdated plans that were no longer valid.
  - Members should judge the application before them and not what was irrelevant on a previous application.
  - It was important for potential applicants to be guided through the pre-application process to help deliver better applications. Whilst sharing them might be well intentioned, there were many practical difficulties.
92. Members were advised:
- The last LP early engagement received 400 comments, this time 700 comments were received.

- Throughout the summer the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) went to events within the SDNP and around the edge of the park. Also received online comments, with 40% of those being from people who had visited the park but lived outside of the SDNP.
- There were more residents to reach, and Officers could explore working through Local Authorities. The responses were to procedural documents with no policies or sites. A larger response was expected to the Regulation 18 consultation.
- Many Parish Councils had responded on behalf of their Parishioners.
- There was considerable work involved in progressing an LP. The examination would take at least 6 months, and the timetable could not be shortened. Between now and June 2027 would have to look at the individual planning applications and their context on their own merits.
- The closer the LP was to adoption, the more it could be referred to it. Once it had been through Regulation 18, and if people were comfortable with the policies, then more weight could gradually be given to the policies before adoption.
- Regulation 18 was the first statutory consultation under the existing planning system. It required enough content that people could engage with it. This would be followed by the Regulation 19 consultation.
- Regarding reasons for unhappiness, people were asked about the vision up until 2050, 85% that responded were happy with this and the reasons why some weren't are set out in the summary report.
- Feedback on the vision would be considered through the review of the Partnership Management Plan.
- All pre application details used to be online and this proved unworkable. If a parish council requested specific pre-application plans, they could be provided. Uploading all pre-applications plans would incur an administrative burden, led to the potential for public confusion and could lead to reticence from potential applicants to engage with the pre-application process. The Authority would continue to publish the SDNPA pre-application response (not the pre-application drawings) where a relevant planning application was then submitted and in this respect the Authority went further than most LPAs.

**93. RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

1. Noted the outcomes of the summer engagement (Appendix 1);
2. Approved the revised Project Initiation Document for the South Downs Local Plan Review (Appendix 2);
3. Approved the revised Local Development Scheme (Appendix 3) and
4. Approved the revised Statement of Community Involvement (Appendix 4) subject to the amendment set out in the update sheet;
5. Delegated to the Director of Planning any minor and presentational changes to the documents approved in recommendations 2-4.

**ITEM 7: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: REGULATION 18 PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

94. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC24/25-14) and the update sheet and provided a verbal update on an incorrect placement of p406 that would be corrected in the final report.
95. The following speaker addressed the committee against the report:
  - Cllr Danny Lee, Councillor for Central Meon Valley, representing himself and the Central Meon Valley residents.

96. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-14) the updates and commented as follows:
- Could District and County Councillors be contacted to engage in the Local Plan review via their Member services?
  - Could the code SD have a key letter attached so it so it would be easier for the public to understand? For example, SDH would be Housing, SDC would be Countryside.
  - The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) should be congratulated on sending the site information to local representatives. Members of SDNPA should help with the distribution of consultations to their Local Councils and Parishes, as they had their own full list of contacts.
  - Could Officers ensure that when the Regulation 18 document goes out to the public, people were aware that this was their opportunity to comment on the future plan as Regulation 19 was focused on legal matters.
  - Could there be a definition of the term 'regenerative' in the policy document?
  - Regarding gypsy and travellers on p210, nothing was mentioned about Chichester, could that be included?
  - Needed to include a definition of heritage asset and their setting, there was no list of heritage assets, would that be included?
  - There seemed to be a discrepancy in the water use. Page 261 listed 85 litres, and page 268 listed 90 litres. Should these figures be the same?
  - Regarding the reference to renewable energy projects on page 271. Was there a need to state that other sites could be put forward?
  - Could there be clarification on blue space mentioned on page 326, to be within 15 minutes of green and blue space.
  - Burial grounds and cemeteries were included presumably because they were not to be used in the same way as other areas of open space. Was that correct?
  - Chichester District Council had recently employed a liaison officer for the gypsy and traveller community, had other District Councils done the same?
  - SD21, public art needing to reflect and respect context. Could a nuance be included in the sub clause to say that this wouldn't always be appropriate?
  - Core policies and the new eco system services SD2 and SD25 gave the impression that sites dependant on private car use would become more difficult to fit within the policies. Was this the intention?
  - Could goods from Kent be included in goods to be sold from vineyards as they were a neighbouring county?
  - Would we get the housing stock needed for the delivery of housing? Housing developers should be asked to comment on the delivery of housing since the last adopted plan in 2019, to ask about constraints and hurdles to overcome.
  - SD28 needed to be looked at, as to what it would do to accelerate affordable housing.
  - Community Land Trusts could be used to provide social housing, however there seemed to be a lack of them with the South Downs National Park (SDNP).
  - Planning Permission had been given, but there seemed to be a lack of housing built. Page 217 of the Community Involvement Plan mentioned who was to be involved, a strategy was needed, and that sector needed a prescription to deliver the housing. Would like to see engagement with the development sector expanded upon.
  - Community Land Trusts were engaged with delivering housing but were limited in what they could provide.

- The document conformed well with the workshop sessions that Members had attended. Would strongly support the wording of regenerative and its clarification. Pleased to see regenerative tourism. The key purpose of the National Park was to preserve the landscape.
- Welcomed the outline of the policy around County Hall, Lewes.
- Could housing numbers be included within the consultation and should it be published without them? Was the Authority ready to consult on Regulation 18 given the many uncertainties?
- What was the downside of not committing to the current timetable?
- Did not want to produce a situation where there were issues on sites with the housing numbers, and potentially would need to find other sites to make up the total number of houses delivered on unsuitable sites.
- Could the public be asked qualitatively on housing needs, e.g. a need for downsizing, an invitation on the qualitative type of housing rather than just quantity.
- East Hampshire housing need should be discussed.
- Would public footpaths be linked to the footpath network? Currently says on a site-by-site basis.
- What development proposals of SD20 would be taken into the consultation?
- Would all supplementary documents, including Technical Advice Notes (TAN's) be included in the LP review?

97. Members were advised:

- District and County Councillors could be added to the consultation database.
- There were some difficulties in navigating the document due to its size and the amount of information included. The navigation of the document would be looked into as part of the presentation and an index added to the policies section.
- It would be made clear that Regulation 18 would be the main opportunity to comment.
- Further information would be added to the Community Involvement Plan to say how the development sector would be engaged.
- Heritage assets were defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and this would be added into the preamble for SD12.
- The definition of 'regenerative' would be looked at but could be summarised as making things better rather than just keeping the status quo and doing no harm.
- The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) for East Hampshire was finalised and was published on the East Hampshire website. A joint GTAA document was being finalised that would cover the whole of the SDNP including Chichester.
- There was no discrepancy in the water usage numbers. The need for water neutrality in the Sussex North zone meant that 85 litres per person, per day was the correct limit for this area. For the rest of the SDNP the proposed Sustainable construction policy requires a limit of 90 litres.
- Renewable energy projects worked around the same principle as other allocations, those listed were the initial and would be included in Regulation 18. Other sites would be likely to be submitted in response to that consultation. Criteria three of that policy covered any community led proposals and would be assessed under those criteria.
- The wording of the preamble to SD46 would be changed to green and/or blue space as it was more difficult to ensure that everywhere was close to blue space.

- A separate engagement process would need to be done with the gypsy and traveller community. Unfortunately, not enough sites had come forward. A meeting had been scheduled between the new Chichester Liaison officer and the SDNPA.
- The clause referred to in SD21 was in the adopted policy rather than a proposed amendment. It was not possible for policies to cover all eventualities. If material considerations indicated otherwise, then an exception to the policy could be made.
- SDNPA Policies including SD2, SD25 and national policies were steering towards the need for less travel and the use of private car. It was about giving people more power to make choices to benefit the climate.
- Regarding goods to be sold from vineyards, with Kent close to eastern end of the SDNP Officers did not object to its inclusion as the policy was seeking to reduce food miles.
- The development community were geared up to respond and they were on the SDNPA database and would engage. There would need to be a viability report to underpin the whole plan. The SDNPA fought hard for affordable housing and had a good track record of success on brown and green field sites.
- The legislation was not specific as to what a Regulation 18 consultation had to include. There was no requirement that housing numbers be included at this stage. It was very difficult to say what the housing need was, due to national changes, and what the supply would be, as the numbers would inevitably change. The Authority included the policies, with the sites and would require feedback from this. Developers and adjacent Local Planning authorities would feedback on numbers anyway.
- Would advise leaving SD26 as it stands but the accompanying documentation could provide some context (including draft housing numbers) and we could ask some qualitative questions about types of housing needed.
- SD20, criterion 2 has been amended to include require development proposals to connect and contribute to the rights of way network.
- All supplementary planning documents would remain unchanged provided that the LP review was progressed (as is planned) under the existing planning system. Technical Advice Notes had no formal weight but would be retained. Officers would consider a new Technical Advice Note on regenerative design. Parish Priority Statements were not a formal part of the planning process but part of the evidence base for the Local Plan review.

**98. RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

1. Agree the Community Involvement Plan for the Regulation 18 consultation (Appendix 1) subject to the considerations and comments of the Committee being addressed.

Recommend to NPA :

2. That, subject to any comments of the Planning Committee being considered, the National Park Authority approves the Regulation 18 consultation for the South Downs Local Plan Review (Appendix 2).
3. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee and the Chair of the Authority, to make any minor and presentational changes required to the Regulation 18 consultation document.

99. The meeting adjourned for a short comfort break.

**ITEM 8: ENFORCEMENT UPDATE**

100. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC24/25-15).

101. The following speaker addressed the committee against the report:

- Cllr Danny Lee, Councillor for Central Meon Valley, representing himself and the Central Meon Valley residents.
102. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-15) the updates and commented as follows:
- Host authorities deal with the majority of enforcement for SDNPA, and this was not the direct day to day responsibility of the in-house SDNPA team.
  - The report notes 242 enforcement cases received and 149 closed, which seemed quite a number outstanding. Did the SDNPA team have problems with the number of cases being closed?
  - The trajectory of cases was going down, was that correct?
  - It seemed 85% of District Council case work was related to post-planning consent issues around breach of conditions. Why did it seem the in-house SDNPA was so successful, or were there a lack of breach of condition notices?
103. Members were advised:
- Winchester City Council was the host authority who dealt with the enforcement work in the speaker's area. The link officer liaised with host authorities and would speak to Winchester regarding the matters raised.
  - The enforcement process can take some time, with various external consultees and statutory bodies consulted.
  - Some cases took years to resolve due to their complexities, and these were kept open, which could show apparent discrepancies in the figures. The SDNPA did not artificially close cases and anything at appeal was kept open. The SDNPA currently had 45-50 SDNPA cases open, Winchester did have a higher number, and the Authority would liaise with Winchester City Council.
  - The Link officer supported the host authorities and was dealing with the Soberton site.
  - There were more cases than cleared during Covid-19 pandemic. However, the lower number of cases, did not necessarily show better compliance.
  - Good compliance from the start meant fewer breaches of condition and in general no breach of condition has had a cause to create a beach of condition notice. There were other ways to deal with breach of conditions than a notice.
104. **RESOLVED:**
- The Committee noted the update on enforcement action.

**ITEM 9: SDNP/23/05251/FUL- WESTBURY HOUSE NURSING HOME, EAST MEON**

105. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC24/25-16) and the update sheet.
106. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Jonathan Moritz – as a local resident.
  - David Butcher- representing West Meon Flood Group.
  - Scot Masker – as the Agent.
107. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-16), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Interesting site to visit, could see a lot of benefits from the development of the site, and the Officers had completed a lot of work to secure enhancements and get the plans right. The new drive was the same length from the road as the historic access.

- The building had much embedded carbon and hoped that materials would be reused to be cost effective.
- Condition 5 appears to limit construction to take place until the house was demolished.
- The gates at Coombe Lane would need to be in keeping with the local rural character area and concerned what could be allowed within permitted development.
- Was the house still liable in principle for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)?
- Was sad to see the building in its current state, and there were lots of buildings of its type throughout the country. The East Meon Flood Group would wish for enhancements to the site.
- A good piece of traditional architecture, and the site needed something appropriate to the landscape and Hampshire. In its context it would work and would not object to the new entrance at the western end of the site.
- Could anything be salvaged from the existing property to the new building? Could the portico on the old house be used on the stable block?
- Could there be a condition be set to ensure something from the old house was included in the new build?
- Fantastic historic site, and good to see Condition 14 on heritage and work on the River Meon. Grateful for the work with the applicants over the years and congratulated the Officers for their work.
- Condition 5 should show quantum levels.

108. Members were advised:

- The house was still liable for CIL.
- There had been dialogue with the applicants on salvaging from the existing house for the new property. The portico cap stones and tops were being considered to be re-used and were looking to be salvaged. Would survey the materials and salvage what they can, including using materials in the features of the site.
- Condition 13, criterion d, detailed the scope and salvage of existing materials.
- In terms of levels, there were photographs on the levels, and fairly accurate information on the cut and fill. Condition 5 would narrow those down and work on the detail.
- The new access was intended to have a rural character and appearance. Also, approval of these details was subject to a condition and an informative would be included on the decision to set out the parameters/principles of what officers would like to see.

109. **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 9.2 of the report and the addition of an informative detailing the parameters for the design and appearance of the new Coombe Lane entrance.

110. The Chair closed the meeting at 13.36pm

## **CHAIR**

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



## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 12 December 2024 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), Tim Burr, Antonia Cox, Alun Alesbury, John Cross, Debbie Curnow-Ford Janet Duncton, John Hyland, Gary Marsh, Stephen McAuliffe, Robert Mocatta, and Andrew Shaxson.

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

111. There were apologies for absence from Daniel Stewart-Roberts.

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

112. The following declarations was made:

- Debbie Curnow-Ford declared a public service interest in Agenda Items 8 as a Bramshott and Liphook Parish 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 14 NOVEMBER 2024**

113. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 November 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

114. The following updates were given by the Development Manager:

- SDNP/23/02187/FUL & SDNP/23/02188/FUL – St Cuthmans, Stedham, approved at Planning Committee September 2024, and a decision was issued on 19 November 2024.
- SDNP/23/05251/FUL - Westbury House Nursing Home, East Meon, approved at Planning Committee November 2024, and a decision has been issued.

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

115. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/24/02686/FUL - HOCKLEY GOLF CLUB, TWYFORD**

116. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC24/25-17) and the update sheet.

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

- Cllr Chris Corcoran representing Twyford Parish Council.
- Cllr Wayne Lawton representing Twyford Parish Council.
- Cllr Susan Cook representing Winchester City Council as a Ward Councillor.

118. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Paul Wynn representing Hockley Golf Club.
  - Jason Holmes representing Hockley Golf Club.
  - Stuart Austin representing IRUK Waste Planning & Consultancy Ltd.
119. In response to speaker comments, Officers made the following comments:
- As the Environment Agency maintain their objection to the proposal the second reason for refusal was considered legitimate and justified.
  - The landscape officer considered there to be fundamental issues with the application which could not be resolved with an onsite meeting or further engagement. An assessment of the proposals could be made through the supporting information submitted. The Landscape Officer had previously visited the site.
120. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-17), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- The Officer was thanked for a clear presentation and Hockley Golf Club was thanked for allowing Members to view the site in detail.
  - There was support for the recommendation for refusal, as the application compromised the first purpose of a National Park. Even if the second reason for refusal could be satisfied, this fundamental reason for refusal would remain.
  - Importing 130,000 cubic metres of material onto a chalk downland, which was clearly visible, was unacceptable. The applicants were proposing to create an engineered landform, importing inert sub soil which would fundamentally alter the landscape.
  - The application stated the grassland would be retained and re-laid but Members queried how realistic and possible this would be.? The topsoil could go back on, but the herbage was likely to be damaged whilst stockpiled. The area above the proposed pond was a good example of downland grassland.
  - Was it demonstrated that the catchment area would drain into the new pond?
  - Commended the golf club for wanting to increase their water reserves and resilience so they did not need to abstract water, thus less pressure on the River Itchen. Had they looked at an alternative way of doing this that did not involve importing 130,000 cubic metres of soil? Could a similar feature be created without the need to import so much soil? Had consideration been given into improving the existing lagoon, and installing the irrigation system?
  - How fundamental would the change to the landscape be, as a golf club had existed there for over 110 years? Was there any reason why the imported material could not be controlled – i.e. import chalk onto chalk, with a materials and waste plan? Could there be a condition to import only chalk? Would such a condition be enforceable?
  - What would be the impact of the proposal on the river Itchen? Could an impact assessment be undertaken to ascertain any impacts?
  - The Highways Authority had no objection. The project could result in mud on the highway, could this be managed via condition?
  - The committee had approved other various applications where there was some landscape impact, with proposals that involved drainage plans, soft landscaping and planting. Whilst the context was different as those applications had delivered housing, was there a fundamental difference for this application?
  - Was the current golf range classed as amenity grassland or species rich chalk grassland?
  - The application would result in increased biodiversity and ground water supplies.
  - How would the pond retain water?

- The application could account for significant water saving, which was a matter to take into consideration particularly if the management of imported inert materials could be resolved satisfactorily.

121. Members were advised:

- No alternatives to bringing in 130,000 cubic metres of material had been discussed with the applicant. The application was assessed on its own merits with a recommendation before Members.
- It was believed that the landform of the driving range area had been unaltered over the years, and it positively contributed to the chalk downland character. The proposal would change the landform and character, to the detriment of Purpose 1.
- A materials waste plan would be part of a management regime (CL:AIRE), The Environment Agency also regulate this regime. Planning conditions could also be imposed.
- The impact on the River Itchen would need to be a much broader assessment and any assessment would be on land outside of the Applicant's control.
- To prevent mud on the highway, a wheel washing facility was already proposed at the access point and could be conditioned.
- The application differed from other applications and needed to be assessed on its individual merits. In this instance, there would be fundamental impact upon the prevailing open chalk downland landscape character. The landscape scheme and biodiversity enhancements would not mitigate and outweigh this harm.
- The Submission proposed enhancement of the grassland on site.
- The pond would need to be lined to retain water, given it would be situated on chalk.
- Would need to consider whether planning conditions to limit the scope of what material could be imported would be reasonable, in the context of the tests for conditions.
- The maintenance of the course required 9,000 cubic metres of water annually, 3,500 cubic metres from the borehole extraction and the remainder from mains water.

122. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

1. That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 9.1 of the report as amended by the update sheet.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/24/03470/REM - LODGE HILL EDUCATION CENTRE, WATERSFIELD**

123. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC24/25-18) and the update sheet.

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

- Peter Cleveland as the Agent.

125. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-18), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- The layout was an improvement on the previously submitted plan, they were happy with the appearance and believed a contemporary approach was suitable for the site.
- Did not personally like the design of the proposed houses and would have preferred the design to reflect Sussex architecture.
- It was an isolated site that was well screened by trees.
- Disliked the upper level, looked boxy and lacked character.
- Liked the upper level and was satisfied with the materials being used.

- Would timer cladding be used, if so, would there be providence of sustainability?
- Was not against the principle of the design but concern over the practical application. Could the overhangs be clarified? Green roofs were inadequate if not properly maintained properly. Were they fit for purpose?
- Supported the contemporary appearance found in a forestry operation. Is the tree officer satisfied with the updated tree protection plan?
- Support the contemporary look, could be a future potential SDNPA design award winner.
- Was the impact on the highways reviewed post development to determine whether Highway Authority predictions were borne out
- Would urge the developer to consider rainwater harvesting conditions to conserve and reuse water

126. Members were advised:

- There would be a condition for materials to be approved before implementation which would outline the providence of sustainability.
- Green roofs were proposed only on the garages, the dwellings had standing seam roofs. Condition 5 would go into the agreed detail on the green roofs.
- The tree officer was happy with the updated tree protection plan and Tree Protection Orders (TPO) would be sought for the buffer zone should permission be granted.
- The access was determined at outline stage and was assessed based on five dwellings. The Highways Authority had looked at that application and were content.
- The development went beyond the sustainability credentials currently required by the Authority. The updated Local Plan Review would increase the environmental requirements from future developments.

127. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

- I. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to grant planning permission subject to:
  - (i) The satisfactory consideration and resolution of technical matters relating to water neutrality following consultation with Natural England;
  - (ii) The conditions and informatives set out in paragraph 9.1 of this report and the update sheet and any amendments or others required to address technical matters relating to water neutrality.

128. Tim Burr Joined the meeting at 11.40am.

## **ITEM 8: MAKING OF THE BRAMSHOTT & LIPHOOK NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

129. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC24/25-19).

130. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-19) and commented as follows:

- A long and complicated process which had taken nine years to complete with changes to the steering group and discussions over site allocations. Well done to Bramshott and Liphook Parish Council on its completion.
- The referendum turnout was disappointing, but the level of support was positive.
- How would NDP Policy BL21 accord with, and support, the new regenerative tourism approach in the Local Plan Review?

- Could further information be provided on NDP Policy BL9 in relation to the Dark Night Skies (DNS) policy, dark sky zones, and buffer zone?

131. Members were advised:

- NDP Policy BL21 accords with Adopted South Downs Local Plan Policy SD23 (Sustainable Tourism). The regenerative tourism approach proposed in the Local Plan Review currently has limited (if any) weight. If the South Downs Local Plan Review is adopted in the future with the new regenerative tourism approach, then this would have more weight than NDP Policy BL21 (but only once adopted).
- NDP Policy BL9 applies to the area outside the SDNP, whilst South Downs Local Plan Policy SD8 applies to all areas inside the SDNP.
- The DNS buffer zone might be a material consideration for areas outside of the SDNP but, for the avoidance of doubt, Policy SD8 does not apply outside the SDNP.

132. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee:

1. Noted the outcome of the Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Referendum; and
2. Agreed to make the Bramshott & Liphook Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) part of the Development Plan for that part of the Parish within the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

133. The Chair closed the meeting at 11.55am

**CHAIR**

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

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 13 February 2025 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Claire Tester (Planning Policy Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead (West)), Sarah Round (Principal Development Management Officer), 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**

134. There were apologies for absence from Debbie Curnow-Ford and Robert Mocatta

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

135. The following declarations was made:

- John Hyland declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6 as he had a relative that lived in Findon.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 DECEMBER 2024**

136. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 December 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

137. The following updates were given by the Development Manager:

- SDNP/24/02686/FUL - Hockley Golf Club, the refusal has been issued.
- SDNP/23/02340/FUL – Land North of Hazely Road Twyford, the planning permission was issued on 10 February.
- SDNP/23/05134/FUL - Ditchling Ruby Club, Ditchling. The decision to refuse planning permission had been appealed by the applicant.
- SDNP/23/04270/OUT - Land adjacent to The Causeway & The Buriton Link Road Underpass, Petersfield. A hearing date of 29 April 2025 has been confirmed.

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

138. There were none.

### **ITEM 6: SDNP/23/04993/FUL - LAND AT ELM RISE, FINDON**

139. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC24/25-22), the update sheet and the amended recommendation.

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

- Cllr Sean Smith, Chairman of Findon Parish Council Planning Committee representing Findon Parish Council.

- Samantha King OBE representing herself as a local resident.
  - Alice Bock representing herself as a local resident.
141. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Mark Symonds representing Flo Consulting.
  - Liam Russell representing LRA Retinue.
  - Simon Bareham representing Lewis and Co Planning.
142. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-22), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- This was an allocated site in the Local Plan with houses expected to be built on the site.
  - Was happy with the layout and the design generally albeit concerns about parking and position and outlook of the flats in relation to neighbouring properties.
  - Concern over parking provision and would like more parking spaces included on site provided this didn't have an adverse impact on landscape and design. Tandem parking spaces could prove difficult to utilise.
  - Liked the use of flint materials but would not like to see the use of flint panels in straight lines.
  - Concern over water runoff and of the potential for overlooking from the flats.
  - Surprised that individual residents were to be responsible for organising the maintenance of the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) given that it was such an engineered scheme. There could be impact downstream if issues were not sorted out and people downstream would be placed at risk from negligence or neglect.
  - The application was premature in relation to drainage and had come before the Committee too early. There was work to be done on the drainage scheme particularly given local concerns. Would prefer to lose a house or two on the plans to rectify the flooding issues.
  - This application would be acceptable as an outline application, however as a full application the scheme was not acceptable due to lack of detail on drainage primarily.
  - The Local Plan for Land at Elm Rise, Findon SD69 (9.90) stated 'A site specific FRA (Flood Risk Assessment) should therefore accompany any planning application for this site and should particularly consider the flood risk to access and egress.'
  - Could further details be provided on the conditions concerning drainage?
  - What were the distances with regards to overlooking on the east of the site, from the flats? Would the change in levels impact the overlooking from the flats? And what were the boundary treatments here?
  - Would the affordable housing be for sale or rent and for what length of tenure?
  - Could the width of the access from Elm Rise be clarified?
  - Was the existing boundary wall in a dip?
  - Had any neighbouring properties been previously flooded?
  - What was meant by a 'shady pergola'?
  - New plans had been recently submitted in the last couple of weeks so was there a need to redesign the drainage scheme to match them?
  - If the application was to be permitted the wording to condition 4 should be amended to include 'in writing'.

- Was the local Highways Authority content regarding access and turning for refuse vehicles?
- The Local Plan for Land at Elm Rise, Findon SD69 (9.89) noted that single-storey housing would be encouraged in the more elevated parts of the allocation site. How was the most elevated part determined?
- Could further detail be provided on the appearance of the properties?
- Findon Parish Council had commented that there was no Construction Engineering Management Plan (CEMP). Was that correct?
- Could the height of the flats be clarified? If the block of flats was higher than the existing neighbouring housing, if you moved things around it would reduce the impact of overbearing.
- What was the width of the swales? If less than 1 metre, and with the lack of a maintenance plan, it could quickly become overgrown.
- It had been clarified that there was a four-metre soakaway on the attenuation tank. Had there been an impact assessment on groundwater as this was within a groundwater source protection zone (SPZ)? With the amount of sedimentation on the site and the pollution risks from driveway run-off and the risk of that going into a drinking water SPZ, then that was a concern.
- The ecology report was out of date and needed updating. It was understood that there was a badger sett on site. It was understood the badger sett was located in the proximity of the SuDs basin and there was a 30-metre exclusion zone around active badger setts which could impact the application significantly, as it was near the proposed site for the attenuation tank.
- How would the attenuation tank be safely maintained given the one-in-three slope as that was beyond the safe working limit of most mowers or strimmers?
- Car parking would need to be addressed should the application be deferred.

143. Members were advised:

- There was a condition relating to foul drainage but no other drainage conditions as the report was requesting delegated authority to officers to finalise the drainage scheme, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority, and apply conditions accordingly.
- The distances with regards to overlooking the east of the site were to One Elms Rise and Plot one 29 metres and 22 metres to the flank. With 29 metres to the property and 22 metres to the garage. One Horseshoe Close was 19 metres to the rear elevation of the flatted block. It would be the garden of One Horseshoe Close that would be overlooked rather than the property itself. The change in levels would make the overlooking potentially feel more overbearing. However, the distances met the Design Guide SPD.
- A section was shown setting out the difference in level between the flatted block and the properties on Horseshoe Close. The existing boundary wall to number 1 Horseshoe Close was a high retaining brick wall which was sunken below the field and members were shown pictures of this.
- Affordable housing would be secured in perpetuity through a Section 106 agreement.. There would be six social rented properties and two intermediate/shared ownership dwellings.
- Couldn't provide a measurement immediately for the width of the access from Elm Rise. However, there wasn't an objection from the Highways Authority or from the Arboricultural Officer, and a detailed arboricultural statement had been provided that the access could be created without damaging the longevity of the adjacent tree. Whilst 14% of its Root Protection Area (RPA) would be affected, there would be a management



strategy in place during construction and materials, the applicant would have an arboriculturist on site and use a geo-cellular technique to protect the roots. There was a condition in place to request that information.

- A shady pergola was a lightweight wooden structure like a canopy. In the summer it would provide shade in high sun but in winter it would not block natural light into the property.
- The full scheme of the application went out in September 2024 and went out to consultation in November 2024. There were minor errors and inconsistencies in the floor plans and elevational drawings and site plan which resulted in the submission of the most recent plans. Otherwise, there were no fundamental changes to the layout, height, mass and bulk or design approach of the development hadn't changed since the re-consultation exercise in December so no further consultation with statutory consultees was required.
- There were no objections from the Highways Authority on the road design and turning head which would be large enough for bin lorries to turn.
- There were various designs, chalet bungalow, two story houses and flats. The chalet bungalow was proposed at the highest area of the site to meet the allocation policy. The landscape officer was comfortable with the scheme but did have concerns with SuDS. The materials were in line with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) Design Guide SPD and would be brick and tile hung for the flatted block, and a mix of brick and flint or brick and tile hung for the remainder of the properties. Some of the properties, such as the semi-detached 09-10 had slate roofs and others tile roofs. All properties were proposed to have timber windows. There were a number of conditions to secure further details such as barge boards, rainwater goods, detailed design of the windows and doors samples of materials would also be conditioned.
- The CEMP was detailed in condition 6.
- The flats were two-story, as with the surrounding housing. The Velux windows in the roof would lead to minimal overlooking.
- There was some disagreement between the Applicant's consultant and the Lead Local Flood Authority on groundwater testing which was an item that needed to be resolved. There have been no objections from the Lead Local Flood Authority in regard to groundwater source protection matters specifically and the consultant was relying upon infiltration methods to resolve.
- The Section 106 agreement would include a management plan to maintain the site, but that has not been conditioned as the SuDS and drainage were outstanding and haven't yet been agreed. We don't yet have the detail of what was going to be managed as we were still working through the technical details of the scheme.
- There was a site walkover in April 2024, which revealed that foxes were currently using the badger sett. Condition 22 required a pre-commencement updated badger survey.
- The distances between the properties were not out of the ordinary and not out of kilter from the Design Guide SPD. The flats would overlook gardens, but that was not unusual. Officers would re-examine the siting of the flat to see if it could be improved.
- The car parking was compliant broadly with the thrust of government advice being Vision-led rather than predict and provide, but policies allowed some flexibility, so Officers would look again at it.

144. **RESOLVED:** That the determination of the planning application be deferred in order for the applicant to have the opportunity to address the Committee's concerns in relation to technical matters of the drainage scheme, its consequent maintenance and management plan and a groundwater impact assessment. Officers would also consider the relationship of the flats with the neighbouring property and parking provision.

145. The meeting adjourned for a short comfort break.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/22/05353/FUL - GRACES FARM, ABBOTTS WORTHY**

**ITEM 8: SDNP/22/05354/LIS - GRACES FARM, ABBOTTS WORTHY**

146. The Officer presented the applications and reminded Members of the reports (Report PC24/25-23) and (Report PC24/25-24) and the update sheet.
147. The following speaker addressed the committee in support of the application:
- Chris Horn of BCM Wilson Hill, the Land Agent representing the applicant.
148. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-23), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Could not find any significant issues with the proposed development. This made the farm sustainable by letting the farmer diversify. It was a fabulous development and would love to see it built.
  - Had concerns in principle with large agricultural buildings being moved to elevated land whilst converting a previous farmstead into non-agricultural use, but the proposals' advantages outweighed the movement of the large agricultural buildings. It was a large site which could accommodate the change.
  - A very good scheme which should not set a precedent for new dwellings outside a settlement boundary when inappropriate or putting large farm buildings on green fields if they could go elsewhere. But this was a unique case, and the farm buildings had to move for good reason.
  - The B3047 road was not suitable for walkers so welcomed the improved Rights of Way allowing walkers to avoid the road.
  - Pleased to see the block wall would be removed and a new one added.
  - Could detail be provided in regard to building 8?
  - Could the rationale behind condition 4 of SDNP/22/05354/LIS be explained? Could there be circumstances where the building could benefit from dampproof treatment? Could this be amended to allowing treatment where appropriate?
  - Was it realistic to make the barn into a residential space, due the size and would they be energy efficient?
  - This scheme was a mix of a conservation approach, such as maintain the roofing materials on the threshing barn, and a pragmatic approach with regard to the stables roof. Would it be better served following just one philosophy or approach to maximising the conservation of the site, rather than a mix of both?
  - Could further detail be provided on the two new permissive routes?
  - Welcomed the addition of condition 25 to SDNP/22/05353/FUL. Concerned with the wording of condition 13 for SDNP/22/05353/FUL. The biodiversity management plan was almost 5 years old and would normally only be valid for between 18 and 24 months. Could condition 13 be amended so that it's a pre-commencement condition, and we would seek a biodiversity action plan and surveys before any development.
149. Members were advised:
- It was initially proposed that building eight would be moved and replaced with a detached dwelling. However, Officers were of the opinion that a detached dwelling on the road was not appropriate, and that part of the application was withdrawn. Building eight was now proposed to be used as farm storage and would no longer be used for livestock. The current cattle would be relocated away from the residential development.
  - Condition 4 of SDNP/22/05354/LIS was a result of a discussion with the conservation officer. It could be amended to include the wording in that condition that says "unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA."

- The barn would achieve a 12% reduction in carbon emissions through external insulation. The applicant had submitted a sustainable design and construction report, and there was a condition which required those standards were achieved.
- The Winchester Heritage Officer has provided support for the scheme. The threshing barn was the more important building in terms of its heritage significance. It was Grade Two listed in its own right, whereas the stables were curtilage listed. Officers were of the opinion that the application had put forward an approach which addressed the respective significance of the listed buildings and maintained this as best they could whilst they changed the use of the buildings.
- There were two new permissive routes, one of which would come off the existing public right of way which would allow the occupants of the old farmyard can go straight out onto a footpath. The other permissive route was down the side of East Lane to Easton. This would allow people to walk along a path all the way down to Easton, and that was requested by Easton Parish Council.
- Condition 13 of SDNP/22/05353/FUL could be amended to require a pre-commencement biodiversity management plan to be submitted for approval.

**150. ITEM 7 RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission was granted subject to:
  - i. A S106 legal agreement, the final form of which was delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee, to secure:
    - the creation and dedication of a Public Right of Way connecting Itchen Valley Footpath 44 with the HCC Itchen Valley Rail Path along the route of the disused railway line adjacent to the north boundary of the development site.
    - the creation and dedication of a Public Right of Way for a route that would run west from Itchen Valley Footpath 29 to the field entrance on the south side of the B3047 opposite the southern access to Itchen Valley Footpath 44.
    - the works to the heritage assets to secure their optimum visible use.
    - to enter into permissive footpath agreements.
  - ii. The other conditions set out in Section 9 of the report, the update sheet and the amendment to Condition 13 agreed at the meeting.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse Planning Permission, with appropriate reasons, if the legal agreement is not completed, or insufficient progress made, within six months of the 13 February 2025 Planning Committee meeting.

**151. ITEM 8 RESOLVED:**

That listed building consent was granted subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of the report and the amendment to Condition 4 agreed at the meeting.

152. Tim Burr joined the meeting

**ITEM 9: PLANNING REFORMS**

153. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC24/25-25).

154. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-25) and commented as follows:

- The planning reforms increased the urgency to resolve the Local Plan. Could the timetable be accelerated?
- With devolution, would the elected Mayors be bound by the duty to cooperate? Was there a risk the elected Mayors may use their call in powers or compulsory purchase orders (CPO)?

- The mayor could allocate the number of houses allocated on National Parks, was that a fear or had it been specifically indicated by the government?
- The finalized Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for South Downs was published in December, but does it cover the whole of the Park or just Adur and Worthing, Brighton and Hove? (Separate report for East Hampshire).
- Didn't Mid Sussex produce a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment with the SDNPA?
- Can Officers confirm that reports come to the Planning Committee at the discretion of the Director of Planning and in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee?
- Could there be a buffer around the National Park for development, as with Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact zones?
- Could confirmation be provided that the Government seems to have ignored the Authority's submission around the affordability accelerator and what that might mean, in practice, for the SDNP in terms of higher housing allocations?
- In regard to delivery bodies and delivery plans Natural England look to have a key scrutiny role. And may even be the delivery body. This may slow decision making and would lose local expertise. Was there a risk the SDNPA could be overlooked, and it could be one of the best delivery bodies.

155. Members were advised:

- The existing timetable looked for submission of the Local Plan by September 2026, with a hard deadline of December 2026 to be considered under the existing plan-making system. Those extra three months may be required to respond to national reforms, especially National Development Management Policies. There was no scope to accelerate the timetable.
- Some of the proposed changes could make the Local Plan easier, with the National Development Management Policies replacing some of our policies. There was a pace in government to streamline the process, the question was how far the streamlining would meet the Authority's purposes.
- By the time the new mayors were elected they would be preparing spatial development strategies under the new planning system, so the Duty to Co-operate would not be relevant but would likely be replaced by something similar. The mayor would still be bound by Section 245 duty to further our purposes. How they would use their powers and resources would, if history was any guide, be down to their individual personalities.
- Spatial Development Strategies would be part of the new mayor's responsibility and would include distribution of housing numbers. It was currently unknown if this would include allocating housing numbers to National Parks.
- The finalised Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment does cover the whole of the SDNP, but Adur and Worthing Councils, and Brighton & Hove Council commissioned the report.
- Mid Sussex did produce a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment with the SDNPA. It was one of several studies that had been updated as part of the overall study.
- It was confirmed that reports come to the Planning Committee at the discretion of the Director of Planning and in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee
- The Authority cannot designate a buffer around the Park, as by its nature that would be outside the National Park and therefore outside its jurisdiction. Also impact of development in the setting of the National Park depends on many factors including functional connectivity and tranquillity and was a nuanced judgement, not a spatial buffer.

- Representations were made by the Authority to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) consultation raising concerns about the affordability accelerator, but the final version had actually increased its influence on the numbers in this area. The Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) provides some clarification on how housing need should be assessed in National Parks and those local authorities that intersect with them. We were discussing this with local authority partners and gathering relevant data. We know that affordability is more of an issue in the SDNP hence our focus on the provision of affordable housing.
- The housing stock in some National Parks could be up to 40% second homes, but that would need to be evidenced to provide an alternative to the standard methodology.
- The Authority was in direct communication with Government about the threats and opportunities around delivery plans and delivery bodies.

156. John Cross left the meeting.

157. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

1. Received and considered the report on Government's Planning Reforms
2. Noted the issues raised and provided a steer on key messages for officer interactions on the future proposals with Ministers and civil servants

#### **ITEM 10: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS FROM 21 SEPTEMBER 2024 – 23 JANUARY 2025**

158. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC24/25-26).

159. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC24/25-26) and commented as follows:

- The Queens Hotel appeal dismissal by the inspector was very thorough.
- Surprised by the reasons of the appeal outcome for Garratts Field, the dog walking paddock. The impact of the fencing on the area would likely have been permitted development if the mention of dogs using the site had been omitted. The reason for refusal was the fencing and hedging.
- There had been a new submission identical to Land at Mill Lane. Would that be called in or would it be dealt with by Winchester City Council?
- Were there any enforcement issues with the Queen's Hotel?

160. Members were advised:

- Garratts Field, was not permitted development on that scheme submitted.
- The new application at Land at Mill Lane would be dealt with by Winchester City Council who have this appeal decision to inform their handling of the case.
- An investigation would need to be carried out to identify any enforcement issues with the Queens Hotel. Some works were internal and would not require permission, other works could be classed as permitted development. Works above the Tap Room have no material change of use.

161. **RESOLVED:**

The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions,

162. The Chair closed the meeting at 1.10pm

**CHAIR**

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