



Buriton Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of Buriton Parish Council Planning Committee held in Buriton Village Hall at 6pm on Monday 29th April 2019.

Present: Cllr Johnston (Chair), Cllr Ashcroft, Cllr Gardner, Cllr Jones.

Apologies: none

Four members of the public.

1. Cllr Johnston welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Declarations of interest: Cllr Jones declared that, as a Member of the South Downs National Park Planning Committee, he wished to make it clear that any views which he expressed at this meeting are based on the information before him at this meeting, and might change in the light of further information and/or debate at the National Park's Committee meetings; this is to make it clear that he is keeping an open mind on the issues and cannot therefore be found to have predetermined any matter when it comes before the National Park's Planning Committee for decision.

3. Minutes of last meeting on 18th March 2019 were approved as an accurate account and signed by the chairman.

4. Update on any key current planning matters

SDNP/18/01060/FUL: Ditcham Lane, Buriton, GU31 5RQ (Road improvements to existing track, including resurfacing, passing places, landscaping and wildlife enhancements): still in progress.

SDNP/18/02405/FUL & SDNP/18/02709/LIS: Proposed Conversion of Monks Walk and the Garage building to form 4 dwellings; use of Tithe Barn as ancillary accommodation (to serve Buriton Manor); associated parking and private amenity / garden space, Monks Walk, The Manor House, North Lane, Buriton, GU31 5RT. Application Approved. No further work allowed until conditions required to start work are met. Agreed that a letter should be sent to SDNPA noting that the Decision Letter had now been issued. The letter was sent and a reply received.

SDNP/18/03797/DCND Butser Hill Lime Works Ltd, Buriton, GU31 5SP. Application involved the potential demolition of lime kilns which, as previously noted, the Parish Council would like to save for potential future enjoyment when the site is restored. Parish Council representatives have met with Hampshire Buildings Preservation Trust (and Buriton Village Association) and subsequently with SDNPA officers. The HBPT will be following up this meeting with information for SDNPA. Application Determined... Split Decision with agreement not to demolish the Kilns. Cllr Jones has recently checked with HBPT that they are still intending to produce relevant evidence for SDNPA.

SDNP/18/03611/FUL: Stanbridge Farm, GU31 5RB: Change of use from Agricultural to mixed use with Seasonal Glamping, May to September. Decision pending

SDNP/18/06437/HOUS: Single storey rear 'wraparound extension' and extend to the rear of garage at 7 Heatherfield, Buriton, GU31 5RY Application Approved

Initial

Sign & date final page

SDNP/19/00520/MPO: Variation of Supplemental deed dated 10 April 2013 relating to application EHDC 31097/043 to discontinue the keeping of a log of HGV movements at Jacobs Yard, North Lane, GU31 5RR. Application Refused

SDNP/19/00731/LIS: minor variations to the consented refurbishment scheme at the Old Stable Block, The Old Rectory, Buriton. Application Approved

HCC Consideration of BOATs 19 and 47: HCC had recently refused the Parish Council's application for changes to the Definitive Map and the merits of an appeal were discussed. Deadline for appeal understood to be 16 May. It was agreed that an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate should be lodged to continue the Council's resolution on this matter.

5. Planning applications for consideration at this meeting:

SDNP/18/06531/FUL: temporary use of storage containers at Queen Elizabeth Country Park. Ratification of submission that Buriton Parish Council has no objection to this application.

SDNP/19/01440/DCOND: Discharge of Conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 21 and 22 on planning permission SDNP/18/02405/FUL, Monks Walk, North Lane, Buriton and
SDNP/19/01600/DCOND: Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 on SDNP/18/02709/LIS, Monks Walk, North Lane, Buriton

Each of the Conditions, for each of the applications, was considered in turn and comments included the following:

- Most conditions have not yet been met
- The application forms state that development has not started and that the development cannot be seen from a public footpath. Both of these statements are untrue
- Many Conditions were due to be agreed before development started – but much of the development has now been completed (and new dwellings are being marketed by Wilson Hill Estate Agents in Petersfield) even though Conditions have not been formally discharged. The Planning Authority has not attempted to halt this development
- At the time when the planning authority granted permission the community was assured that concerns could be controlled by conditions. This has not happened. The Parish Council agreed to assist the authority by helping to monitor developments but time and time again has been told that nothing can be done. The Council has lost any confidence that the planning authority will stand up to the developer and insist that work is carried out in accordance with Conditions

With regard to SDNP/19/01440/DCOND:

- Condition 3 (relating to hard and soft landscaping): the Condition stipulates a 10 year maintenance plan but only a 5 year maintenance schedule is available. This is clearly not acceptable. In addition, there needs to be clarity about how this landscaping will be cared for in the future – particularly those parts which are not within the curtilages of individual dwellings. How will this be controlled and by whom? Who will be responsible? Is there to be a residents' management committee? Who will organise this and ensure compliance? In addition the Parish Council feels that there should be more information about the one individual tree that is named: an Amelanchier. What sort of Amelanchier is proposed and is this a locally native / appropriate species? It ought to be.
- Condition 4 (relating to materials to be used for the hard and soft landscaping): all the hard landscaping appears to have been completed prior to any assessment by SDNPA officers. Appearance and porosity (for surface water drainage) should be very important factors in this sensitive location. No details of all the areas of hard surfacing have been provided
- Condition 5 (boundary treatments): all the hedging should be appropriate native species
- Condition 6 (bin storage and collection points): on-site bin storage appears to be within the parking area next to Monks Walk. Where will the cars be parked? All the designated parking spaces must be retained for that purpose. The bin collection point appears to be beyond the applicant's land ownership, outside the main gate to the Manor House and in front of the historic church. This is land owned by the Parish Council and no-one has yet sought any

Initial

Sign & date final page

permission for this use. Secondly, using that area will add bins from 5 new dwellings to those already in that area. Most weeks see collections of 2 bins per household (refuse + garden waste; recycling + glass) and so the proposals would bring another 10 bins outside the historic setting of the Church and Manor at a major visitor site with the pond and access to numerous footpaths for a day every week. In addition, there are questions about who would clear up any spillages or broken glass from this community area? This plan is completely unacceptable.

- Condition 7 (archaeological investigation): proposals for a watching brief have been submitted by Royston Clark. Is this sufficient? Should not the SDNP also play a part in this monitoring to ensure that it has actually taken place? A large trench has already been dug (reported to SDNPA on 29 and 30 January) and subsequently filled in. What were the archaeological find results recorded from this? If yet more work is needed for drainage purposes [see Condition 11 below] the importance of archaeology in this historic core of the community must be investigated thoroughly and more properly than in January.
- Condition 9 (Construction Management Plan): no development should have taken place until a CEMP plan was approved. A plan has now been submitted by Poles Apart which states that the proposed construction commencement date is "TBC". This is very interesting as the development of Monks Walk is all but complete. There is no mention of safety aspects of all the vehicles travelling through the community car park; and there is no mention of protecting the historic churchyard wall (already damaged once by contractors working on this development). We insist on safety through the pond car park and protection of the church wall. However, how will this be controlled and monitored? If development is being allowed by the planning authority regardless of these conditions being agreed, do we just await an accident or repeat damage to the churchyard wall? The whole situation would be laughable if it wasn't so serious. Work to convert the ancient cart-shed / garage buildings garage has yet to be undertaken and there must be a strict Management Plan in place for all that work
- Condition 11 (foul and surface water drainage): Noted that Southern Water is very unhappy with the foul water proposals as well as the surface water plans. The foul water arrangements are felt to be wholly unacceptable. The proposals appear to take the water through the existing pipes in the Manor Courtyard and out into pipework in North Lane. This cannot be allowed to happen as the current properties using the courtyard already have the system at capacity. Noted that in 2018 there was a leakage of effluent into North Lane with risks to public health. Object to this proposal in the strongest possible manner and insist that all relevant landowners must be consulted for any alternative scheme. The surface water arrangements are difficult to assess with the limited information given, but are also important given nearby water courses and the village pond. All surface water must be controlled on site and not allowed to drain into ditches, watercourses or the pond.
- Condition 21 (details of glazing, roof-lights etc): all glazing is due to be fitted with low transmittance glass as well as blackout blinds for the roof lights. The intention is to reduce light spillage 'from inside to outside' but the proposals indicate that they are designed to restrict / reduce light levels flowing 'from outside to inside'. The specified glass is clearly for low light transfer from outside to inside. This appears to be the wrong product. Appropriate glazing must be installed instead. In addition, the majority of the new roof-lights for these new dwellings were installed before the discussion at the SDNPA Planning Committee meeting in November which added these Conditions. It is, therefore, highly unlikely that any of these new roof lights will have the appropriate glass installed and every one should be checked thoroughly and replaced as necessary. Currently there are no blackout blinds in use on Monks Walk and lights are already being left on, filling the surrounding countryside with excess light. Who should be inspecting and monitoring these things? Also concerns about the large glazed doors to the north and south of Monks Walk which must also be fitted with low transmittance glass. This has not been specified in the submissions from the applicants. Also, of great importance, there is no mention of glazing on the old cart-shed garage building which must also be carefully controlled
- Condition 22 (ecological mitigation): There is an undated letter from AA Environmental Ltd. recommending bat boxes and also before works commence particularly at the garages, the buildings should be checked. Was this done in Monks Walk? Who will be monitoring this?
- Noted that whilst many of these comments relate to Monks Walk, they will probably all apply to

Initial

Sign & date final page

the future development of the cart-shed garages building as well and it will be important for extra details to be submitted prior to Discharge of Conditions for that building.

- Also noted that there are no details of the cycle parking required by Condition 20 which has to be resolved before any dwellings are occupied.
- Overall feeling that the Parish Council is extremely unhappy with these proposed discharge of conditions. At the SDNPA committee meeting where the developments were given permission the Parish was assured that all concerns could be addressed by conditions. It is quite clear that is not the case. It appears as though it is impossible for planning officers to keep abreast of the number of conditions attached to the development and the result will be harm to a beautiful part of the National Park.

With regard to SDNP/19/01600/DCOND:

- Same general concerns as for SDNP/19/01440/DCOND plus
- Condition 3 (internal construction): The statement that this does not apply to Monks Walk is ludicrous. The Building has now been subdivided into 3 dwellings from the single dwelling that it used to be. The development is all but finished. How can the internal construction work not be relevant?
- Condition 7 (glazing screens, external joinery, roof lights, chimney vents and flues): the submissions just refer to drawings. These do not show low transmittance glass. There do not appear to be any flues shown but these appear on the building? These flues originally were silver. They were subsequently painted black. Now they are black with paint peeling off to reveal the silver once again.
- Conditions 8 and 9: (low transmittance glass, Conservation Style roof lights and blackout blinds): As with Condition 21 of SDNP/19/01440/DCOND, the wrong specification / wrong Pilkington product is being proposed. The chosen product is designed to reduce light flow 'from outside to inside'. What is required here is a reduction of light spillage from 'inside to outside'. All the glazing must be replaced with the correct product. Other points made in connection with Condition 21 also apply here – including concerns about the large glazed doors on Monks Walk and the glazed wall of the cart-shed garages building
- In summary, Buriton Parish Council does not accept that the conditions have been fully met.

In the circumstances it was agreed that letters about these concerns should also be sent to the estate agents currently marketing the new dwellings, to East Hampshire's Land Charges Team, to the Southern Water Company, the Drainage Authority and the Environment Agency.

6. Public comments on the above application

Mr A Grant expressed concern at the proposals with a particular focus on the inadequacy of the drainage / sewerage system and said that others living in the Manor Courtyard area shared his concerns. He said that, in addition, professional advice had indicated that the existing pumping station was likely to fail. He was also concerned that the area just outside his drawing room was to become the site from where all the refuse bins would be collected. He felt that the large refuse trucks should, instead, drive through the car park (reversing if necessary) and round the corner of the churchyard wall to the Monks Walk buildings and collect all refuse from there.

Mr S Weston was also particularly concerned about the sewerage proposals, fearing that using the existing pipework, as being proposed, would cause problems as had happened, without any extra demand, in 2018. He felt that Southern Water should be engaged in the discussions again to obtain a clear understanding of who would ultimately be responsible if the system was to fail.

Mr J Jones thanked the Parish Councillors for all their hard work on this matter going back over a number of years. He agreed with all the strong points that had been made during the Committee's discussions and added that it appeared as though two of the dwellings in Monks Walk had now been sold, subject to contract. He also felt that refuse vehicles should not drive through the community car park not only because of safety concerns but because of inevitable damage to the surface of the car park and because EHDC have a kerbside policy, collecting bins from the edge of the adopted highway and should not drive along un-adopted routes.

Initial

Sign & date final page

Cllr D Jones also felt that the Parish Council would not support any proposal to route refuse vehicles through the community car park because of safety risks and other factors. Other Parish Councillors agreed stating that it was not for the local community to try to devise any alternative arrangements; that was a matter for the developer to resolve.

The Chairman encouraged those present to submit their views in writing so that they could all be taken into account.

7. The Committee's decisions on the above applications

As above.

8. Date of next meeting

Next meeting scheduled for Monday 20th May.

Meeting finished 6.45pm

DRAFT