

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

Present: Heather Baker (Chair), Antonia Cox, Alun Alesbury, John Cross, 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)), Sarah Round (Principal Planning Officer), Amy Tyler-Jones (Planning Policy Lead), Lynsey Robinson (Ecology Planning Lead), Katharine Stuart (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

174. There were apologies for absence from Debbie Curnow-Ford and Daniel Stewart-Roberts.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

175. The following declarations were made:

- Andrew Shaxson declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as a Member of Harting Parish Council.
- Robert Mocatta declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 as he was acquainted with one of the public speakers, Lionel Fanshaw.
- Stephen McAuliffe declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 as was acquainted with the developer Langmead Estates.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15 FEBRUARY 2024

176. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 February 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

177. SDNP/20/04118/FUL The Queens Hotel, High Street, Selborne. The committee's decision to refuse had been appealed. The appeal decision was to allow the appeal, but that decision had been judicially reviewed by one of the objectors and the appeal decision had been quashed. The inspectorate were now reconsidering the appeal. The original appeal had been dealt with under written representation, and the reconsidered appeal would likely be dealt with in the same way.

ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS

178. There were none.

ITEM 6: SDNP/23/01466/FUL – TWYFORD SCHOOL

179. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-24) and the update sheet. The Officer highlighted a error on the report under paragraph 7.2: "(all of which are category C or below)" which should have read "(are category B to C, C in the case of the pine and B in the case of the rowan)".

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

- Paragraph five, point two noted an objection to queuing on Bourne Lane, but the applicant had done all they could to address this, so no objection to the application.
- This was a sensible proposal to rationalise the parking.
- Where was the discharge point for the water in the sub surface attenuation under the tennis courts and it's storage tank?
- Would the ground water assessment include a ground water impact assessment?
- Disappointed at the use of tarmac, but runoffs created by hardstanding could be controlled through conditions.
- Would like to see the tree planting to consist only of indigenous trees.

181. Members were advised:

- There was a condition that, prior to commencement, all details of drainage be submitted. Hampshire County Council drainage officers were happy with that condition.
- The applicant would be asked if the ground water assessment would include a ground water impact assessment.
- The proposed conditions would control details of landscaping.

182. **RESOLVED:** Planning permission be granted subject to the conditions at paragraph 8.2 of the report and the Update Sheet.

ITEM 7: SDNP/23/02243/FUL - LAND EAST OF SOUTH BANK, SOUTH HARTING

183. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-25) and the update sheet.

184. The following speaker addressed the committee against the application:

- Cllr Sheila Bramley, speaking on behalf of Harting Parish Council.

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

- Elizabeth Lawrence, speaking as the Planning Agent.
- Lionel Fanshaw, speaking as the Landscape Designer.
- Dan Lytton, speaking as the Drainage Engineer.

186. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-25), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- How far did the gardens extend to the rear of the site?
- Would the ridges of the houses be seen over the top of the hill to the north and if so, by how much?
- The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) recognised the need to have new housing on green field sites, and this site was an allocated site in the Local Plan. It was a sloping site, but that did not mean it was inappropriate to develop. The proposals had been designed in a way to provide views and gaps through the site and was an acceptable layout. The overall design fitted well with the village and would provide an attractive street scene.
- Suitable drainage systems (SuDS) were a good use of the land on the eastern side of the site and was a beneficial aspect of the development.
- Viewing the planning history, and noting the previous refusals it was encouraging to see how officers had worked with the applicant and refined previous applications to deliver this proposal.

- Concern over the long-term maintenance of the SuDS and how that would be financed. Robust scrutiny was required to ensure it achieved its purpose and that the costs did not fall on the community.
- The applicant would be the owner of the affordable home, would it be rented in perpetuity?
- Would the property for rental, which would remain owned by the developer, have disabled access?
- Was a very small, allocated site and the site had been enlarged to incorporate the SuDS and was now 150% larger than the original site allocated in SD87.
- If the SuDS were located on the original site it would likely only be large enough for one to two dwellings. With the SuDS located off the original site it gave the right balance to the development.
- Harting Parish Council had an active climate action network and wanted swift boxes incorporated into the building, but there was no mention of that in the condition. Could this be added?
- How could the Authority control people adding porches and conservatories which would negatively impact the work done to deliver the current elevations?
- What was the height of the solar photovoltaics (PV) panels?
- Where would the heat source pumps be located?
- Flooding would be alleviated by the swales on the side of the road.
- There was concern over the SuDS system and water quality of water entering the adjacent watercourse; river pollution which could open up two new pollution pathways. The SuDS system itself could capture hydrocarbons and pollution, inwards and outwards with no secondary tertiary flow. It would bypass the flood system to the river, contradicting policies SD2 and SD17. Would there be long term funded management of the SuDs?
- The SuDS scheme would be located in an area deemed to have medium/high sensitivity as outlined in the Authority's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
- Whether the ecology pond would deliver ecological enhancements in regard to habitat and species.
- The eastern site boundary would be significantly extended to accommodate the SuDS.
- The application was submitted before February 12 2024 so not subject to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) legislation.
- Should the drainage line on the plan outlined in the brown area extend to the edge of the site?
- There was disabled access to only three of the five dwellings, was that compliant with policy?
- It was good to see small developments in smaller villages to keep them thriving.
- The development was a high density, which can't get away from the given size of the site and allocation.

187. Members were advised:

- The rear gardens did not extend past the northern boundary of the site allocation, which was 28-29m to the rear at the western end of the site as the shortest distance, and the size of the allocation site had been determined during the Local Plan process.
- Only the top portion of the roofs may be visible from the north, but there would be a backdrop of the housing behind Smithfields which was on higher ground.

- The drainage condition had been updated on the update sheet, relating to the maintenance and management of the SuDS. The discharge element could be looked at closely in terms of the long-term management.
- The renting of the affordable home would be secured by Section 106, to ensure its rental to people on the housing register, as there could be difficulty in securing a registered provider given it was just one unit. There was precedent elsewhere in the National Park for this approach.
- Officers would include swift box provision in condition 6.
- Condition 16 limited permitted development rights which would help maintain the elevations.
- The PV panels in the rear gardens would be 0.5m high and behind hedging.
- Condition 9 would cover the sustainable construction and location of the heat pumps.
- There was an updated condition on surface water and drainage. The updated drainage drawings showed new swales along the frontage which would channel water from Elsted Road into the SuDs scheme and discharged into the river to help alleviate flooding. The site was not making pollution run-off materially any worse and no consultee had raised an objection on these grounds. The planting within the SuDS scheme would help with filtration to a degree.
- Water quality, outlined in condition 10, had to be addressed within the existing policy framework. The drainage officer was satisfied with the drainage design overall, subject to condition on more detailed matters.
- The area coloured brown on the drainage plan along the northern site boundary was a new swale to capture water run-off from the field; it followed contours and extended along the rear gardens of the new properties. Drainage officers were satisfied it was in the right location and was the right scale.
- The technical advice was that the drainage was acceptable as stated on the update sheet.
- Level disabled access was afforded to plots 3-5 but plots 1-2 had front steps. There is legislation including Building Regulations for the applicant to work to, but it was believed there was some flexibility regarding sloping sites.
- The property for rental would remain owned by the developer. The type of property, be it disabled or stepped access, would be confirmed in the S106 which would be negotiated.

188. RESOLVED:

1. 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 resolution of the issue of water neutrality.
 - ii) A S106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure:
 - One affordable dwelling.
 - Water neutrality mitigation measures (as necessary).
 - iii) The conditions set out in paragraph 9.2 of the report, the update sheet and amended condition 6 to address swift boxes.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse Planning Permission, with appropriate reasons, if matters relating to water neutrality have not been resolved, or the legal agreement is not completed, or insufficient progress made, within six months of the 14 March 2024 Planning Committee meeting.

189. Committee adjourned for a comfort break at 11.32am.

190. Janet Duncton left the meeting at 11.32am.

ITEM 8: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

191. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-26) and the update sheet.

192. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-26) and the update sheet and commented as follows:

- Was it the responsibility of the SDNPA to produce the design code, with the parish producing a character statement?
- Page 66 of Appendix 1 on economic challenges references 'access to nature'. How was this relevant to economic challenges?
- Project Governance in Appendix 1 on page 75 notes the project team to include 'Member leads' as the Chair of Authority and Chair of Committees. Why weren't all Members invited to participate as was the case when the plan was created?
- Cooperation and Alignment strategy on page 87, appendix 1C, when would the county and district councillors be advised on site allocations? Where in the process would the notification to potential site allocations be disseminated to those councillors, rather than officers.
- Appendix 3, page 155, Minimum Statutory Publicity Requirements. Could the publicity requirements for both 'development affecting the setting of a listed building' and 'development affecting the character or appearance of a conservation area' be advertisement in a local newspaper and both a site notice and neighbour notification?
- The parish priorities statements were all from very small parishes with relatively small populations. The majority of residents in the National Park did not live in those parishes. The larger more densely populated towns would need to be engaged in the process. Consideration should be given to the number of residents engaged, rather than the number of parishes engaged or geographic spread.
- Appendix 1B, South Downs Local Plan Risk Register outlined several high level risks.
- The Neighbourhood Planning Act (2017) restricted the use of pre-commencement conditions on planning permissions, yet the SDNPA often used pre-commencement conditions.
- Should the three County Councils be included in paragraph 1.20 on page 125, as they deal with planning?
- Parish Priorities Statements took a lot of work and parishes may expect reaction and response from the SDNPA.
- Page 95, general consultees, the language used was slightly outdated and could be updated and improved.
- Page 127, Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 2.2, references appendix 2 to appendix 3, not appendix 2 to this report. Need to ensure this is clear in the final document.

193. Members were advised:

- It was the responsibility of the SDNPA to produce the design code, parish design statements would be material considerations.
- The reference to 'access to nature' would be removed from this section as the comments related to the period of Covid, and could be moved to more appropriate sections.
- All Members would be updated at each step, and all Members would have the opportunity to input to the Local Plan Review, principally through a series of all Member workshops. .

- Officers would consider how best to keep ward councillors informed. SDNPA Members could feed back to their local authority colleagues once site allocations were in the public domain.
 - Page 155 listed the minimum statutory requirement and page 137 listed the SDNPAs proposed undertaking. Beyond legislative requirements officers recommended some flexibility and officer discretion in publicity to avoid unnecessary complaints.
 - It was noted that several of the larger more populated areas did not submit parish priorities statements but did have a made neighbourhood plan and/or parish design statement. All such community-led plans would be used to inform the Local Plan Review where relevant.
 - The risks identified were current and would be revised as circumstances changed. Mitigations were in place where appropriate but were sometimes limited in their capacity to reduce impact.
 - Paragraph 1.20 related to agreements with host authorities to determine planning applications that would normally be within the remit of the NPA and so did not need to include the three County Councils which retain powers to determine their own planning applications.
 - Pre-commencement conditions could be used, but written consent to their use was required.
 - Parishes would be written to following this meeting to confirm what the committee had resolved in respect of Parish Priorities Statements and relevant Parishes would be notified prior to publishing of the Land Availability Assessment.
194. It was agreed that the recommendation be amended to include ‘subject to a delegation to the Director of Planning to make those amendments as raised by the Committee’.
195. **RESOLVED:** The Committee, subject to a delegation to the Director of Planning to make those amendments as raised by the Committee:
1. Approved the Project Initiation Document for the South Downs Local Plan Review in Appendix 1 for consultation in Summer 2024;
 2. Approved the revised Local Development Scheme in Appendix 2 for consultation in Summer 2024;
 3. Approved the revised Statement of Community Involvement in Appendix 3 for consultation in Summer 2024;
 4. Agreed the scope of the community engagement planned for Summer 2024 and the Community Involvement Plan in Appendix 4 setting out how this would be carried out.
 5. Noted the submission of Parish Priorities Statements from the parishes listed in Appendix 5, and agreed that the Authority would have regard to their contents in preparing the Local Plan Review.

ITEM 9: ROTTINGDEAN NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

196. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-27).
197. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-27) and commented as follows:
198. **RESOLVED:**
The Committee:
1. Noted the outcome of the Rottingdean Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Referendum; and

2. Agreed to make the Rottingdean Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) part of the Development Plan for that part of the Parish within the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

ITEM 10: BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN TECHNICAL ADVICE NOTE

199. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-28).
200. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-28) and commented as follows:
 - Congratulated and thanked officers for an excellent piece of work. The Technical Advice Note was extremely precise.
 - Could the SDNPA select which Technical Advice Notes (TAN) would be a material consideration?
 - The map in appendix 2 included sites outside the National Park. BNG should be offset within the park as opposed to outside it.
 - Not all potential BNG sites were included on the map in Appendix 2, why was that?
 - With reference to the proposed BNG metric (para 2.30), would a condition assessment need to be submitted with the application?
201. Members were advised:
 - Material consideration was anything that had relevance to the determination of an application and therefore any TAN was capable of being a material consideration if it was relevant to the proposal.
 - The map showed locations deemed to have high strategic significance, with sites offsetting BNG in those areas receiving the highest strategic significance multiplier score available within the Statutory BNG Metric.
 - Design of the map would be looked at, to ensure it showed only significant sites within the park and to avoid giving the implication that the SDNPA would look to designate BNG sites outside the National Park boundary.
 - The Defra Statutory BNG Metric for calculating BNG includes a spatial risk multiplier, incentivising BNG solutions to be as near to the development site as possible and within the National Park.
 - There were many sites which had BNG potential but were either not designated sites or in biodiversity opportunity areas and so were not identified on this map which only identified high level strategic opportunities.
 - The condition assessment was a statutory part of the metric for the submission process. The TAN would be amended to make clear that condition assessments should be submitted.
 - The document would evolve over time but this was at the cutting edge of planning practice at present.
202. It was agreed to amend the recommendation to include ‘subject to a delegation to the Director of Planning to make those amendments as raised by the Committee to the map’ at the end of recommendation 2.
203. **RESOLVED:**
The Committee:
 1. Approved the Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Advice Note set out in Appendix I for publication subject to any changes proposed by the Committee;
 2. Approved the map in Appendix 2 for publication for use in the interim definition of ‘High’ Strategic Significance for the purposes of Biodiversity Net Gain in the South Downs

National Park, subject to a delegation to the Director of Planning to make those amendments as raised by the Committee to the map; and

3. Delegated authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, to make any appropriate amendments to the TAN in response to changes in national guidelines and best practice over the next 12 months.

204. The Chair closed the meeting at 12.51pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held at: 10.00am on 11 April 2024 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

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

Officers: Rebecca Moutrey, (Senior Solicitor), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Claire Tester (Planning Policy Manager), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead (West)), Lewis Ford (Senior Planning Policy Officer), Sarah Round (Principal Planning Officer), Philippa Smyth (Principal Planning 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

205. There were apologies for absence from John Cross.

ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

206. The following declarations were made:

- Alun Alesbury declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 7 as he was acquainted with the author of the counsel's opinion, and a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 9 as he was acquainted with public speaker Minette Palmer who was a previous Member of the Authority.
- Debbie Curnow-Ford declared a public service interest in items 6, 7, 8 and 9 as a Hampshire County Councillor.
- John Hyland declared a public service interest in item 8 as he was a parish councillor for Soberton Parish Council which adjoined the application site.
- Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in item 6 as an East Hampshire District Councillor, and items 7 and 9 as a Hampshire County Councillor. He declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in items 6, 7 and 8 as he was acquainted with the public speakers.
- Andrew Shaxson declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 9, as he was acquainted with the public speaker Minette Palmer who was a previous member of the Authority.

ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14 MARCH 2024

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

ITEM 4: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS

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

- A decision had been issued for SDNP/23/01466/FUL, Twyford School, which came before the committee in March 2024.
- A decision had been issued for SDNP/22/04472/FUL, Land East of Harrier Way, which came before the committee in November 2023.

- Appeal decision APP/Y9507/C/22/3313813, Clappers Lane, Fulking. The appeal against the SDNPA's enforcement notice was dismissed although the period of compliance was extended to 12 months.

209. A Member requested that a copy of the Clappers Lane appeal decision be sent to Mid Sussex District Council for information.

ITEM 5: URGENT ITEMS

210. There were none.

ITEM 6: SDNP/23/04270/OUT – HOTEL, LAND NORTH EAST OF A3 NORTHBOUND INTERCHANGE, PETERSFIELD

211. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-29) and the update sheet.

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

- Cllr Matt Wright, representing Buriton Parish Council.
- Jonathan Jones, representing Buriton Village Design Statement Group.
- Richard Marks, on behalf of local residents.

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

- John Bell, speaking as the applicant.
- Jeremy Gardiner, speaking as the agent.

214. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-29), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:

- Why had no Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) been completed for the site?
- Was a 50% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) relevant to the application?
- The proposal would have an irreversible effect on the area.
- The application would negatively impact the views of the area from Butser Hill.
- There were six objections, two of which from statutory consultees. The site seemed to be in the wrong location. There were alternative sites in the area that were more suitable.
- The application did not conserve or enhance the National Park, contrary to its purpose and the landscape harm was not outweighed by any potential benefits from the scheme.
- SD23 noted that travel to sites by car should be minimised. This application did not achieve that objective.
- The cycle rental facility could only be reached by car, which was a fundamentally unacceptable proposition.
- The information outlining the need for accommodation in the area was more than 10 years old. The press had recently reported there was an excess of rented accommodation available, especially with the rise of Airbnb. The need for this type of accommodation was not as strong as it might be.

215. Members were advised:

- There had been no EIA on the site as it had been determined that one was not required.
- BNG requirements were not a reason for refusal as they could be achieved through a condition.

216. **RESOLVED:** The Committee refused permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 10 of the report.

ITEM 7: SDNP/23/03766/FUL - LAND SOUTH OF CHURCH ROAD, STEEP

217. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-30) and the update sheet.
218. The following speaker addressed the committee against the application:
- Alison Driver, representing Steep Parish Council.
 - Lynette Clarke, local resident.
 - Charlotte Duthie, representing Steep Together.
219. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- James Rush, speaking as the landowner.
 - Jacob Goodenough, speaking as the designer.
 - Stephen Sherlock, speaking as the architect.
220. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-30), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- This was an interesting sloping site and the style of properties looked acceptable.
 - The design worked fairly well within the linear character of the Steep settlement. The 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that developments be beautiful places. This had not been achieved by this application.
 - A good design in a constrained site.
 - Having three houses owned in perpetuity by a charity was a novel approach and delivered, in a rural location, a different type of accommodation and the applicants were to be congratulated.
 - It was disappointing that the two landowners could not come to an agreement as then the desired open space could be easily accommodated within the site.
 - Speakers had commented that the land had allotment status and that there was a related charitable trust. Were officers satisfied that development could take place if approved?
 - Was the site within a conservation area?
 - The site being developed was smaller than the allocated site in the Local Plan. Why was that and could that cause future issues?
 - Were the trees between the application site and the village hall car park protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO)?
 - What was the definition of open space and was there any further information on how it would be managed?
 - Was there confirmation that the portion of land described as open space would be dedicated as public open space?
 - What were the details of the proposed parking for the site and would there be any tandem parking?
 - Was there a regular local bus service adjacent to the site?
 - Did the 19% open space figure include the area designated as a biopark?
 - Did the application undermine SD89 if the public open space was not directly accessible from the village hall, given the lack of agreement between the applicant and the village hall landowners to provide direct access?
 - The fenestration of the buildings should be light in nature.

- The site was approximately 16% smaller than the original size. Did the calculations on density comply with the smaller site?
- The charity was set up for local people, would the affordable homes be allocated to people with a local connection?
- Is the correct version of the NPPF the one extant at the time of validation?
- The landscape impact could be offsite as well as on site. The village hall was unlikely to allow overflow parking to use their car park, resulting in excess parking flowing out onto the street. Did the car parking provision meet SD89 and provide all necessary parking on site to avoid additional on-street parking on local roads?

221. Members were advised:

- The legalities of allotment or charitable trust status were outside the remit of the application and was not a material planning consideration for Members.
- The site was not within a conservation area and there were none within the vicinity of the application.
- The proposed site could provide what was required by the site allocation whilst complying with other constraints. The scheme was not reliant on the excluded land, nor would this application prejudice future use of that land.
- The trees on the western boundary demonstrate the independence of the site and were protected by TPO's.
- The allocation policy SD89, stated that a proportion of the site should be provided as public open space, directly accessible from the village hall and car park. The reference to informal fell within the explanatory text, which aids and informs the policy. A draft open space management plan had been submitted which would be secured through a section 106 agreement. The details of the management company would be agreed as part of the section 106 negotiations.
- The section 106 agreement would include all the details required to ensure the land was secured as public open space.
- The parking provision was a mixture of open driveway spaces and car barns which included some tandem parking.
- Officers were unaware of a regular local bus service. The Steep village community website noted there was a return bus trip daily from Steep to Petersfield.
- The 19% open space figure did not include the area designated as biopark.
- The scheme proposed provided access to be available, which satisfied policy SD89. It was beyond the applicants control how such access was delivered on land beyond their control.
- There was not a specific density formula available for the scheme, nine dwellings was within the allocation policy and it was a matter of design as to whether the scheme was acceptable.
- Condition 3 covered the final finish of the buildings.
- The three houses owned by the charity on the development would be allocated to local people.
- The correct version of the NPPF was the one extant at the time when the decision was made.
- The parking calculator indicated 20.89 spaces were required on site and the application proposed 20 spaces. Officers were satisfied the application complied with both the SDNPA Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and policy SD89.

222. **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That planning permission be granted subject to:
- i) A S106 legal agreement, the final form of which was delegated to the Director of Planning to secure:
 - 3 x 2bed Affordable Housing Units
 - Informal public open space management scheme
 - BNG enhancement scheme
 - ii) The conditions set out in paragraph 9 of the report and update sheet.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse Planning Permission, with appropriate reasons, if the legal agreement was not completed, or insufficient progress made, within six months of the 11 April 2024 Planning Committee meeting.

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

223. The Officer presented the application and reminded Members of the report (Report PC23/24-31) and the update sheet and provided a verbal update.
224. The following speaker addressed the committee against the application:
- Adam Faulkner, Droxford Parish Council.
225. The following speakers addressed the committee in support of the application:
- David Barker, on behalf of Evolution Town Planning Ltd.
226. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-31), the updates and the public speaker comments and commented as follows:
- Whilst the principal of development had been established on the site how it was developed was the key concern. The scheme should be landscape led, the design did not suit the area and the buildings did not fit in with local built character.
 - The development did not seem to conserve or enhance the special qualities of the National Park and the proposed materials did not reflect the local vernacular.
 - The design and layout was an improvement on the extant permission in regard to the parking arrangements, but insufficient parking proposed.
 - NPPF now referenced beauty but concern as to whether the lodges would meet this.
 - How close to the end of their life were the pine trees?
 - Would gravel for the internal access route be suitable as there was the potential for it to migrate?
 - The reception building seemed rather large, was it multifunctional?
 - There was one allocated parking space per lodge, would that be sufficient?
 - Concern about the location of the spa building, notwithstanding the extant permission. Its roof pitch appeared steep and queried whether this would be suitable for a green roof.
 - The lodge roof tiles had been changed from slate to grey tiles. Had the angle of the roof pitches been considered?
 - With regards to SD23 and tourism, concern that the development would not contribute to the local economy because there was no safe pedestrian access into Droxford to access its shops and facilities.
 - The site was previously occupied by a hotel, did that have its own sewage system?
 - The river Meon was one of the five chalk streams throughout the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and was of extreme importance. The waste treatment plant in East Meon often overflowed.

- The proposed conditions did not stipulate that surface water and foul drainage be separate. For both foul and surface water drainage, the Authority should seek a higher standard of protection in regard to water quality than the minimum legal thresholds required (eg. Environment Agency Permitting), given the chalk stream habitat within a Protected Landscape.
- There could be the potential for a pollution incident from the package treatment plant, with the overflow into the river Meon. Further mitigation to minimise this risk should be considered. Could a septic tank be installed instead, or a reed bed between the treatment plant and the river?

227. Members were advised:

- The tree plan that accompanied the application showed the pine trees to be primarily of category C. The overall landscape strategy included broad mixed native planting across the site.
- Gravel would be used on the areas of the site which were level to avoid migration, and landscaping scheme, including surfacing materials, was conditioned.
- The reception building had a first floor which would accommodate two-bedroom staff accommodation. On the ground floor there would also be laundry facilities for guests, so it was a multi-functional building.
- There was one allocated parking space per lodge, with additional parking next to the spa for when guests checked in at reception. The car parking was dispersed across the site.
- The flat roofs around the spa roof would be used for green planting, there would be no green planting on the pitched elements of the roof.
- The roof pitches of the lodges would be sufficient for the proposed materials.
- There would be a site wide landscaping scheme with a wooded character around the lodges and grassland in between them and the River Meon. Once established, the landscaping would help to integrate the development into the landscape.
- Southern Water would not be responsible for foul drainage because a private package treatment plant was proposed. The package treatment plant would be privately owned and managed through the management company.
- Drainage was based on calculations on outflows and climate change, and there were no objections on technical aspects from any of the statutory consultees. An appropriate management plan for the SuDs and foul drainage was conditioned
- The previous hotel had a septic tank. The extant scheme had a more conventional soakaway scheme and involved pumping the foul waste up to a package treatment plant and drainage field further up into the site.
- The proposal for drainage and foul sewage had regard to the consultee specialists, and subject to relevant conditions in the report Officers believed it would be sufficient to address concerns.

228. It was proposed, and seconded, that the application be deferred over the issue of foul water treatment as well as concerns around landscape impact and design and the application be brought back to committee at a later date.

229. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1) That a decision on application SDNP/23/01722/FUL be deferred in order for further consideration of the means of foul water disposal, allowing the applicant the opportunity to address the concerns of the Committee. The deferral to also allow the applicant an opportunity to consider and address the committee concerns in relation to landscape impact and design of the lodges. The application be reported back to the Planning Committee at a later date for final determination.

230. Gary Marsh left the meeting at 1.52pm.

ITEM 9: SELBORNE VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT

231. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-32).

232. The following speakers addressed the committee in support.

- Minette Palmer, Selborne Village Design Statement (VDS) Steering Group.

233. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-32) and commented as follows:

- Was an excellent report and Members should approve the adoption.
- The Queens hotel was no longer a hotel and now housed the Jubilee Tap.
- Could officers develop a proposal to include VDS' in the Authority's design code once they were no longer supplementary planning documents (SPD)s.

234. Members were advised:

- There was an application for the site of the Queens hotel which was currently with the Planning Inspectorate after their original decision to allow an appeal against a refused planning application was quashed by judicial review.

235. **RESOLVED:** The committee approved the adoption of the Selborne Village Design Statement (SVDS) as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

ITEM 10: NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE

236. The Officer reminded Members of the report (PC23/24-33).

237. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC23/24-33) and commented as follows:

- What was the status of Neighbourhood Development Plans as they got older?
- Can a Parish Priority Statement (PPS) be updated after submission?

238. Members were advised:

- There was no requirement to review neighbourhood plans, but as situations changed and time progressed they could become less relevant and their relevance was considered when new applications were submitted.
- The PPS were the Authority's own informal pilot and they could be reviewed and updated as new information became available.

239. **RESOLVED:** The committee noted the progress to date on the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs) and Parish/Village Design Statements (P/VDS) across the South Downs National Park.

240. The Chair closed the meeting at 2.13pm

CHAIR

Signed: _____

