

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE 11 MARCH 2021

Held: online via Zoom videoconferencing, at 10am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Janet Duncton, Thérèse Evans, Barbara Holyome, Diana van der Klugt, Gary Marsh, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson and Richard Waring.

Also attended by: Russell Oppenheimer.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Becky Moutrey (Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer) and Sara Osman (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead (West)), Sabrina Robinson (Monitoring and Compliance Officer – Minerals and Waste), Kirsten Williamson (Planning Policy Lead), Chris Paterson (Communities Lead).

OPENING REMARKS

295. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that:
- Due to the Coronavirus pandemic full meetings were not able to be held at the Memorial Hall until further notice, hence the meeting of the South Downs National Park Authority was held using the Zoom Cloud Meetings software.
 - The meeting was being webcast by the Authority and would be available for subsequent on-line viewing. Anyone entering the meeting was considered to have given consent to be filmed or recorded, and for the possible use of images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.
296. The Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.
297. The Chair reminded those present that:
- SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthers the National Park Purposes and Duty. 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

298. There were no apologies.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

299. The Chair disclosed a general, non-prejudicial interest on behalf of some of the Members present, as one of the speakers for item 8, Mr Kemp-Gee, was a founder Member of the Authority and was known to some of the Members present
300. Robert Mocatta disclosed a non-prejudicial public service interest in items 7 and 8 as a District Councillor for East Hampshire District Council (EHDC). Also, one of the speakers for item 8, Councillor Mark Kemp-Gee, was known to him as a fellow EHDC councillor.
301. Janet Duncton disclosed a non-prejudicial public service interest in item 9 as a West Sussex County Councillor.
302. Andrew Shaxson disclosed a non-prejudicial public service interest in item 9 as a parish councillor for Harting Parish Council.
303. Therese Evans disclosed a non-prejudicial public service interest in item 10 as a Winchester City Councillor. The speaker for this item, Councillor Chris Corcoran, was also known to her.
304. Barbara Holyome disclosed a non-prejudicial public service interest in item 10 as the speaker for this item, Councillor Chris Corcoran, was known to her.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2021

305. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 February 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendment:
- The date listed at the top of the minutes was incorrect and should say '11 February 2021' (and not '21 January 2021'). The minutes were confirmed to be the correct record of the 11 February 2021 meeting.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

306. A member asked for an update on application SDNP/20/01535/FUL – Butser Hill Lime Works, the decision for which had been delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. The Director of Planning confirmed that discussions had taken place and the decision would be issued imminently, and a copy of the decision would be circulated to members of the planning committee.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

307. The appeal for SDNP/19/01876/FUL - Soldiers Field House had been allowed.
308. The appeal for SDNP/19/04720/FUL - Land rear 34 Lavant Street had been dismissed.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

309. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/18/06111/FUL – Liss Forest Nursery, Greatham

310. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the update sheet.
311. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Cllr Mark Rodbert spoke against the application representing Greatham Parish Council;
 - Elly Butler spoke against the application representing herself;
 - Anna Dale-Harris spoke against the application representing herself;
 - Aaron Wright spoke in support of the application as the agent representing the applicant.
312. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-35), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- The application proposed combination boilers to be installed in dwellings. Was Greatham on mains gas?
 - Was the hedge that formed a boundary between the site and the Petersfield Road in the ownership of the applicant?
 - Was the proposed housing mix appropriate and could there be fewer larger dwellings to allow for more 2-3-bed properties?
 - What would be the implications if members deferred the decision to enable the applicants to deal with any issues raised?
 - What was local response to the loss of a shop in this application, were a shop had been proposed as a community asset in the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) allocation? Was there scope to provide a shop and café and/or farm shop, especially as this site was adjacent to the village primary school and opposite the village hall?
 - Did the scheme provide sufficient open space?
313. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Greatham village did have mains gas, however the sustainability of installing gas reliant boilers had been questioned by the parish council.
 - The hedge was in the ownership of the applicant however the grass bank between the hedge and the road was not in the applicant's ownership.

- Paragraph 8.18 of the officer's report detailed the reasons behind the proposed housing mix. It was the view of officers that, on balance, the mix was considered acceptable as, whilst a notable percentage of larger dwellings was proposed, this would help to deliver affordable housing. Policy SD71 of the SDLP also required that any development proposal should provide clear transition in form and layout with a reduced build intensity from Petersfield Road east towards the open countryside and the housing mix allowed for this, with the larger units along the Petersfield Road edge of the scheme.
 - This site was allocated for residential development of 35-40 dwellings in the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP). Members could be minded to defer the decision if, after the debate, they felt that the application could meet the SDLP policies with amendments.
 - The provision of a shop had been mentioned in many representations with mixed feelings amongst the local community on whether it should be included or not. It was not a prerequisite to meet policy, and whilst a shop was in the original proposed, following discussions it was decided that it was best to put forward a wholly residential scheme. However, there was nothing to preclude a shop or even café being proposed in a development scheme for this site and if it came forward as part of the scheme it would be supported.
 - The open space had been maximised given the number of dwellings, which was in the middle of the 35-40 dwellings allocated) and it was useable space.
314. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The committee agreed that the scheme was too suburban, was not landscape led and that it did not provide a sense of placemaking within the village.
 - Developer had not sufficiently addressed local community's views.
 - There could be an opportunity for this site, located next to the school and opposite the village hall, to create a centre for the village and the scheme was inward looking in its design.
 - The design and layout was considered uniform and did not respect the local traditions and individuality of design of existing dwellings, and as such did not add anything to the village.
 - This development did not provide a sustainable heating source for dwellings (i.e a transition away from gas central heating). Sustainable construction for any new development should provide for an alternative heat source and not provide heating reliant on gas, which the Government had committed to phasing out.
 - Members considered that the affordable housing policy could be met with a different housing mix, or that some of the CIL liability could be offset, as outlined in paragraph 8.38 of the officer's report, which could make a difference to the viability of the development and enable it to meet the policy for affordable housing.
 - Members were concerned that the viability had not been sufficiently progressed to determine an achievable level of affordable housing.
 - The scheme was not sufficiently close to a satisfactory design to consider deferring it.
315. It was proposed to vote on the officer's recommendation.
316. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons as set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the officer's report.

ITEM 8: SDNP/20/03365/FUL - Meadow Farm

317. The Case Officer presented the application, referred to the update sheet.
318. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Cllr Mark Kemp-Gee spoke against the application as Hampshire County Councillor for the Alton Rural Division

- Cllr Terry Blake spoke against the application representing Worldham Parish Council
 - Roy Polley spoke against the application representing himself
 - Bruce Weller spoke in support of the application as the agent representing the applicant.
319. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-36), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- How would conditions 4 & 5 be monitored?
 - Clarification was sought on the timescale for the application. The report stated that the applicant proposed any further soil importation would be completed in time for the Autumn 2021 crop planting however, the conditions stipulated that importation of inert soil and the earthworks associated with the land raising should be completed within 18 months of first commencement of the development.
 - How many enforcement cases had there been on this site?
 - Clarification of the need for the temporary car parking area.
 - How would this application enhance the natural beauty of the National Park?
 - Was there evidence of flooding in fields surrounding this site?
320. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The site would be on a monitoring list and would have monthly visits from SDNPA officers, who would check waste transfer notes to ensure that the correct tonnage of soil was imported to the site. This would be undertaken in consultation with the Environment Agency.
 - If the application was approved and the applicants could start importing soil in spring 2021, the proposal could be finished by autumn 2021. However, the 18-month timeframe was conditioned to allow for the correct amount of soil to be found if it took time to get soil from various sources, and to allow for details to be provided at the discharge of conditions stage, where ecological monitoring of the site needed to be approved by SDNPA officer and the Environment Agency.
 - There had been 8 enforcement cases in connection with the adjacent land which is subject to a Certificate of Lawful Use (Existing), dating back to 2015. Of these, one was permitted development, six the site operator cleared/rectified the breach, one was closed and the remaining one was the subject of this application.
 - Condition 20 required the removal of the temporary car parking area, hardstanding and site office from the site within 3 months after the completion of the final profiling of the imported material. However, during the process of bringing soil on site it was considered typical for a development of this size to provide welfare space for staff and to keep documents. The car parking provision was for on-site workers and to enable SDNPA and EA officers to monitor the site.
 - Whilst this was not considered a landscape led scheme, the conditions would ensure that it would be a well-run agricultural site that would enhance natural beauty by providing wildlife habitats and wetland areas around the ponds.
 - The site was not within a flood risk zone and adjoining fields did not flood, however they were in better quality than this site.
321. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- The Committee strongly agreed that importing soil to the site from outside the National Park was unacceptable, would cause harm to the landscape, and was not in line with duty and purposes of a National Park.
 - Members raised concern that the applicants had created a problem on the site by importing waste material, and that they should be responsible for restoring the site to conditions favourable for growing crops.

- There was a consensus that there were too many unanswered issues and inconsistencies in this application for the committee to grant permission. It was not clear what the applicants intended to do with the site in the long term.
322. Officers noted concerns from Members that enforcement action should be undertaken at this site.
323. It was proposed and seconded that the application should be refused, on the grounds that the importation of a significant amount of material, would result in an adverse impact on the landscape character of the area, altering the levels at odds with the character of the original field and that of the surrounding area and adding in unwarranted temporary structures, routes and associated paraphernalia, as well as the disruption and disturbance caused by the importation to the site of a substantial quantity of extraneous material. The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
324. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reason set out in 323 above and that the final form of the reason for refusal be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
325. Ian Philips joined the meeting.

ITEM 9: Adoption of the West Sussex Soft Sand Single Issue Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan

326. The Planning Policy Lead presented the report.
327. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-37) and made the following comments:
- It was noted that any inconsequential changes should be suggested to officers in time for them to be included in the report to the next full authority NPA meeting.
 - Members queried why the table detailing the assessment for each site allocation (on page 96 of the full papers), indicated that it was uncertain what effect the policy would have on so many of the objectives. Officers clarified that this assessment reflected the sites at this stage of the process, providing a true reflection of the sites are present, and that this would enable a comparison to be made over time.
 - Members complimented officers on a well-written report which made a complicated issue clear to understand.
328. **RESOLVED:** The Committee recommend that the National Park Authority:
- 1) Note the content of the Inspector's Report and his conclusion that the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan provides an appropriate basis for the planning for soft sand within the West Sussex including that area which lies within the National Park, provided that a number of Main Modifications are made to it;
 - 2) Note the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) and the Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan;
 - 3) Delegate to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Authority to make any other inconsequential changes to the text required prior to publication of the updated West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan;
 - 4) Adopt the Soft Sand Review of the Joint Minerals Local Plan as amended by the Inspector's recommended Main Modifications to form revised policies M2 and M11 of the statutory minerals plan for the South Downs National Park within West Sussex, and use these policies as the basis for planning decisions for soft sand minerals development across this area of the National Park along with neighbourhood development plans and the South Downs Local Plan, where relevant; and
 - 5) Publish an updated version of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (2018) and the relevant Policies Map.

ITEM 10: South Downs National Park Authority's (SDNPA) response to the Submission (Regulation 16) Consultation on the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan (TNP)

329. The Communities Lead presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
330. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Cllr Chris Corcoran commented on the item, representing Twyford Parish Council.
331. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-38), the public speaker comments and the update sheet, and requested clarification as follows:
- Members asked for clarification on a point raised by the speaker, that many of the comments made by officers at the pre-submission stage were repeated again at the submission stage, and a query had also been raised on why there was a need for further evidence to be provided.
 - The Twyford Conservation Area map on page 148 of the full meeting papers (page 20 of the TNP) shows that part of the allocated site is in the Conservation Area. However, on page 208 of the full papers, the comment on policy DB1 states that 'Part of the boundary of the site is in close proximity to the Conservation Area'.
 - Could the SDNPA response ensure that Policy HN6 in the Twyford Neighbourhood plan maintains the flexibility of policies SD30 and SD31, which applies a limitation of *approximately 30%* for extensions and replacement dwellings?
332. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Officers had reviewed the comments made both at pre-submission and submission stages and felt there were still some areas that need addressing, so those comments had been repeated at submission stage in order to gain clarification on these matters. Following submission of the SDNPA response to the Examiner, there were processes in place for further evidence to be prepared and submitted in order to support policies within the neighbourhood plan. There would also be opportunities for discussions to take place between the SDNPA, the Examiner and the parish council.
 - Officers agreed to correct the comment on policy DB1 to ensure it was clear that part of the site fell within the Conservation Area.
 - Officers agreed to review the wording of the response to ensure that the wording from policy HN6 included a reference to the term *approximately* as per policy SD0 and SD31: "For extensions and replacement dwellings, policies SD 30 and SD 31 will apply with *approximately 30%* limitations in each and every case".
333. The Committee discussed and debated the report, making the following comments
- Members commended Twyford Parish Council and others involved in putting together the Neighbourhood Plan.
334. **RESOLVED:** The Committee agreed the Table of Comments as set out in Appendix 2 of the officer's report and Update Sheet, which will form the South Downs National Park Authority representation on the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) Submission consultation, subject to minor amendments reflecting the member discussion at the 11 March 2021 planning committee meeting.
335. Janet Duncton left the meeting.

ITEM 11: SDNPA response to the National Planning Policy Framework changes and the National Model Design Code consultation proposals

336. The Planning Policy Manager presented the report.
337. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-39) and made the following comments:
- The committee fully supported the response.

- It was agreed to state in the letter that the duty of a National Park Authority was subordinate to its purposes.

338. **RESOLVED:** The committee:

- 1) Approved the SDNPA response to the National Planning Policy Framework and National Model Design Code consultation proposals set out in Appendix I of the officer's report.
- 2) Delegated authority to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to make any minor changes to the response.

339. The Chair closed the meeting at 13:20.

CHAIR

Signed: _____

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at 10.00am on 15 April 2021 using Zoom videoconferencing.

Present:

Alun Alesbury (Chair), Heather Baker, Thérèse Evans, Barbara Holyome, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson and Richard Waring.

Officers:

Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Becky Moutrey (Solicitor), Richard Sandiford (Senior Governance Officer) and Sara Osman (Governance Officer).

Also attended by:

Rafael Grosso Macpherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Heather Lealan (Development Management Lead (Minerals and Waste)), Kevin Wright (Planning Policy Officer) Amy Tyler-Jones (Senior Planning Policy Officer), and Mark Alden (Enterprise Development Lead).

OPENING REMARKS

340. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that:
- Due to the Coronavirus pandemic full meetings were not able to be held at the Memorial Hall until further notice, hence the meeting of the South Downs National Park Authority was held using the Zoom Cloud Meetings software.
 - The meeting was being webcast by the Authority and would be available for subsequent on-line viewing. Anyone entering the meeting was considered to have given consent to be filmed or recorded, and for the possible use of images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.
341. The Senior Governance Officer confirmed the Members of the Planning Committee who were present and that the meeting was quorate.
342. The Chair reminded those present that:
- SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthers the National Park Purposes and Duty. 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

343. Apologies were received from Janet Duncton, Gary Marsh and Diana van der Klugt.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

344. Robert Mocatta declared a non-prejudicial, public service interest in item 7 as a Hampshire County Councillor and as a District Councillor for East Hampshire District Council. The public speaker, Steven Ridgeon, was known to him.
345. Richard Waring declared a public service interest in items 8, 9 & 10 as a Lewes Town Councillor, and as a member of Cycle Lewes. Public speaker Vic lent was known to him, and although the speaker Ben Taylor was not known to him, other members of the Taylor family were known to him.
346. Andrew Shaxson declared a public service interest in item 12 as a member of Elsted and Treyford Parish Council, which had commented on the Parking SPD, as noted in Appendix 1.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 MARCH 2021

347. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 March 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

348. There were none.

ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

349. The Development Manager updated the committee on the following items:

- Decisions had been issued for SDNP/20/01535/FUL – Butser Hill Lime Works, which came before the committee in February 2021, and SDNP/19/03366/OUT - Plumpton College, which came to committee in August 2020.
- The appeal for SDNP/18/05444/FUL - Garden Street Auction Rooms had been allowed.

ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS

350. There were none.

ITEM 7: SDNP/19/06024/FUL - Land adjacent to Coppice Cottages

351. The Case Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report content.

352. The following public speaker addressed the Committee:

- Steven Ridgeon spoke against the application representing East Meon Parish Council

353. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-40) and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- Why were 12 houses accepted when 11 dwellings were proposed in the local Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)?
- Was the drainage issue a planning matter, and therefore the responsibility of the developers?
- Was the proposed development landscape led? Had the need to follow the layout put forward in the local NDP restricted the ability to put forward a landscape led plan, which might have been able to address the drainage issues on this site?
- The site included land that extended over the settlement boundary and beyond the allocation site set out in the local NDP. How far did it extend over the settlement site and was the additional land in same ownership as the land inside the site boundary?

354. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The initial proposal was for 11 units but this was increased to 12, which was considered broadly in line with what the policy required for this location. The extra unit would help to deliver 50% affordable housing, and this was considered acceptable as long as other policies of the development plan were met.
- Surface water drainage is a planning matter. The site already suffered from flooding issues caused by surface water run-off from the hill, through the site and onto Coombe Road. Policy SD49 and the neighbourhood plan policies both stipulated that surface water should not be increased from any development on the site. This proposal did not demonstrate that it met the policies, and in the officers opinion the increase in impervious surfaces on the site was likely to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
- The NDP clearly defined that site as appropriate for development and had proposed a similar layout to that of the application scheme. Officers had to take a balanced view and weigh up any benefits and disbenefits of a proposal against the aspirations set out in the NDP. Officers believed that whilst some elements of this application were not landscape led, a scheme could be put forward that would meet both the aspirations of the NDP and a landscape led approach.
- The application site encroached beyond the settlement site by 6.5m. Both the land inside the main settlement site and the encroachment beyond this were in the same ownership. The extension of land allowed for a green buffer, which would reduce visual impact from nearby views, and this was requested in the allocation policy.

355. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- It was clear from the officer's report that drainage issues had not been addressed, and that there was insufficient evidence to show that this scheme would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
 - Members expressed some concern that an application had come forward where Highways had objected on grounds of an inadequate means of access.
 - Members acknowledged the community consultation that had taken place. However, it was felt that this should have brought the reasons given for refusal to the applicant's attention, and yet these reasons were still not addressed.
 - The scheme was not considered to be landscape led.
 - Members agreed with the officer's reasons for refusal as set out in the report.
356. It was proposed to vote on the officer's recommendation.
357. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons as set out in Paragraph 10.1 of the officer's report.

ITEMS 8 & 9: SDNP/20/05439/FUL; SDNP/20/05442/FUL - Iford Farm

358. The Chair informed the meeting that agenda items 8 and 9 were being considered together due to the close proximity of the locations on the Iford Estate. Public speakers would have up to 6 minutes to make their representations to the meeting.
359. The Case Officer presented the applications, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
360. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Victor lent spoke against the application representing himself;
 - Anthony Paul Allen spoke against the application representing himself
 - Ben Taylor spoke in support of the application representing The Iford Estate
 - John Robinson spoke in support of the application representing The Iford Estate
 - May Robinson spoke in support of the application representing The Iford Estate
361. The Committee considered the reports by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-41 & Report PC20/21-42), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Paragraph 8.41 in report PC20/21-4 (SDNP/20/05439/FUL) stated that a S106 agreement would facilitate the construction of a significant length of the Egrets Way shared path across land owned by the Iford Estate, but that it would be accompanied by a License Agreement of 25 years. Was 25 years sufficient to secure the future of the Egrets Way, and could this not be in perpetuity?
 - How would HGVs be routed to the application sites from the C7?
 - Were there highway safety concerns regarding the new farm access onto the C7 for SDNP/20/05439/FUL?
 - Would the use classes listed in the conditions for the control of commercial units have to remain as stated in the conditions or could use class be changed at any point? Was permission being given to specific existing businesses or for class use?
 - Could conditions be included in this application to improve safety for road users, specifically cyclists, along the C7?
362. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The applicants have agreed to provide a dedicated access link for the Egrets Way in perpetuity, which would bind the land into the future. This would be secured through a

SI06 agreement. The 25 year licence agreement relates to management of the land by the SDNPA.

- A Traffic Management Plan would be required and which should provide an agreed routing plan. This could then be monitored by officers.
- The highways consultee had submitted detailed considerations regarding visibility splays along the C7 and safety of the proposed new farm access, and they were satisfied with visibility at the proposed junction. There was a requirement for cutting back hedging to improve visibility.
- Conditions 9 & 10 dealt with the issues of use class of the commercial units. Condition 9 approved a B8 use for the currently redundant A2 unit, as this unit was closest to existing residential properties and is a more appropriate use adjacent to residential properties than a more active B1 use. Condition 10 required that commercial units were used only as their current use class and for no other purpose. The conditions were not specific to named businesses as this would be considered overly restrictive and difficult to meet planning condition tests of reasonableness.
- It was beyond the remit of this planning application to condition improvements to the highway. However, the SDNPA was working separately with ESCC on traffic management for the area with a model emerging from the County to look at traffic generation and flow.

363. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:

- The Committee thanked the applicants for their community consultation.. It was also noted that the applicants had submitted these applications together, and had undertaken an audit of their buildings, which the Committee had asked for when the previous application was before them.
- It was noted that there was a lot of public concern about safety for users of the C7, but recognised that it was not a planning matter for consideration as part of this application.
- The new access would have a positive impact on traffic through Iford village.
- The proposals for item 9, SDNP/20/05442/FUL, were considered reasonable and sensible proposals.
- Members acknowledged that as Iford was a large estate, any changes could have more of an impact than smaller farms. However, it was recognised that farms needed to change to keep up with modern farming practices and should be supported.

364. It was proposed to vote on the officer's recommendation for item 8, SDNP/20/05439/FUL.

365. **SDNP/20/05439/FUL - RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the completion of a legal agreement to permit the development of the Egrets Way on Iford Estate land
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 made within 6 months of the Planning Committee meeting of 15 April 2021.

366. It was proposed to vote on the officer's recommendation for item 9 SDNP/20/05442/FUL.

367. **SDNP/20/05442/FUL - RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report.

ITEM 10: SDNP/20/05441/FUL - Swanborough Farm

368. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.

369. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Victor lent spoke against the application representing himself

- Ben Taylor spoke in support of the application representing The Iford Estate
 - Wendy Robinson spoke in support of the application representing The Iford Estate
370. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-43), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Could the curtilage of Swanborough Manor, which was a Grade I listed building, be protected by conditions of this application?
 - Was there a traffic management condition regarding use of Swanborough Drove and access new road?
 - Were there any bridleways around the site, and how would horse riders access them from the site?
371. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Swanborough Manor was outside of the remit of this application.
 - There had been some concerns from residents that the application might create a circular route from Swanborough Drove, through the site to the access road to the north of the site. However, the applicant had proposed to install bollards to prevent access to the site from Swanborough Drove. The site plan was well laid out and parking provision was adequate on the site, so it was anticipated that users would enter and leave from the access road to the north.
 - There were bridleways around the site and there was direct access from the yard across land owned by the Estate onto the bridleway network.
372. There were no comments from the Committee.
373. It was proposed to vote on the officer's recommendation
374. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report.

ITEM 11: Viticulture Technical Advice Note (TAN)

375. The Planning Policy Manager and the Enterprise Development Lead presented the report and referred to the update sheet.
376. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-44) and the update sheet, and requested clarification as follows:
- If someone wanted to set up a vineyard and put up a barn, would that come under prior notification, and therefore would they be required to have regard to the TAN ?
 - What weight would be given to a TAN when considering planning applications?
 - The TAN made no reference to deer fencing, which would be necessary to ensure deer are kept away from vines. Should this be taken into consideration as the impact could be quite considerable?
377. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The TAN would be a material consideration for planning applications, but would not be taken formally into account in Prior Notification. It could be added to the TAN that it would be best practice to consider the TAN when preparing a prior notification application.
 - A TAN was a material consideration for planning applications, however Local Plan policies held the greatest weight, followed by Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). TANs did not go through the same statutory processes as SPDs so had less weight.
 - The eco system services diagram in the TAN took into account that animals can be used in a positive way to manage pests and keep grass down, however deer were not

specifically mentioned. Officers would be preparing environmental measures guidance and deer fencing could be included in that document.

378. The Committee discussed and debated the report, making the following comments
- The report read well and the impact assessment was very interesting.
 - It was agreed to change the wording on page 11 of the Viticulture TAN from “We offer a paid pre-app service” to “we offer a pre-app service for which there is a charge”, in order to clarify that it was a chargeable service.
379. **RESOLVED:** The Committee
1. Approved the draft Viticulture Technical Advice Note set out in Appendix I for publication
 2. Delegated authority to the Director of Planning , in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee , to make any amendments to the Viticulture Technical Advice Note required to address any issues raised by the Committee

ITEM 12: Adoption of the Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

380. The Planning Policy Officer presented the report.
381. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-45) and requested clarification as follows::
- A point was raised regarding para. 3-2 of the Parking SPD (at appendix I of the officers report), which stated that the provision of all necessary vehicular parking should as far as practicable be on-site to avoid additional on street parking, whereas many of the allocation sites in the adopted Local Plan stated that all necessary parking should be onsite to avoid additional on street parking on adjacent roads.
382. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- When allocating sites in the Local Plan, officers were able to undertake a more in-depth analysis of the sites and ensure that car parking could fit on the allocated site. However this SPD applied to all planning applications, not just allocated sites. Whilst the aim was to avoid car parking off sites, the SPD also allowed for flexibility and for officers to take an on-balance view for each site.
383. The Committee discussed and debated the report, making the following comments
- Members agreed it was important to have flexibility for officers to take an on-balance view for each site.
 - Members queried having a policy for all of the Park, and how there would be flexibility to deal with differing issues in towns and villages, as what might work for one site may not necessarily work in other locations. Officers explained that the parking calculator was designed to provide flexibility and account for differences in locations and was a starting point for assessment.
384. **RESOLVED:** The Committee
1. Noted the content of the Consultation Statement (Appendix I of the officer’s report)
 2. Adopted the Guidance on Parking for Residential and Non-Residential Development SPD (Appendix 2 of the officer’s report) including Parking Calculator (Appendix 3 of the officer’s report).

ITEM 13: Rogate & Rake Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Decision Statement

385. The Senior Planning Policy Officer presented the report.
386. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC20/21-46) and made the following comments:
- The Committee congratulated the members of the Rake and Rogate Neighbourhood planning group and acknowledged the work that had gone into developing the NDP.

- Members noted the inspector's decision that not all of the extensive tracts of land allocated in the NDP could be designated as local greenspace. Whilst this was disappointing, it was recognised that the inspector based his judgement on criteria set out in the NPPF.

387. **RESOLVED:** The Committee

1. Noted the Examiner's Report and recommended modifications to make the Rogate and Rake Neighbourhood Development Plan meet the basic conditions as set out at Appendix 2 of the report.
2. Agreed the 'Decision Statement' as set out at Appendix 3 of the report, which sets out the modifications that will be made to the Rogate and Rake Neighbourhood Development Plan in response to the Examiner's recommendations.

388. The Chair closed the meeting at 14:55

CHAIR

Signed: _____

