



## Buriton Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of Buriton Parish Council Planning Committee held on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2020 (6pm).

Present: Cllr Ashcroft, Cllr Johnston, Cllr Jones, Cllr Marriott.

One member of the public.

Apologies: none.

1. Cllr Johnston opened the meeting and explained that, following Government restrictions prohibiting public meetings and gatherings (including those normally held by Parish Councils and other Local Authorities), Buriton Parish Council was adopting alternative ways of working in order to continue with business whilst upholding democratic principles and compliance with the public health guidance. Drawing upon opportunities provided in recent Regulations, this meeting was being held remotely and was allowing access by members of the public via the Zoom video-conferencing platform. Agendas had been posted on the community website and on the public noticeboard as normal and provided details of the contact phone number for anyone wishing to register an interest in joining the meeting. Cllr Johnston explained that one member of the public was joining the meeting. The Agenda had also provided a link to guidance about downloading and using Zoom.

2. **Declarations of interest:** Cllr Jones declared that as a Member of the South Downs National Park Authority, the Local Planning Authority for the area, he wished to make it clear that any views which he expressed at this meeting would be based on the information before him at this meeting and might change in the light of further information and/or debate at National Park 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 if it should come before the National Park for decision.

3. **Minutes of the last meeting** of 23<sup>rd</sup> April were approved as an accurate record.

### 4. Update on current planning matters

**SDNP/18/03797/DCND:** Butser Hill Lime Works Ltd, Butser Hill, Buriton, GU31 5SP. Mr Scammell at SDNPA had been contacted and had advised that the matter be left with English Heritage at this stage. It was noted there is now also a new application at this site (SDNP/20/01535/FUL) for consideration at a future meeting of the Committee for which an extension to the deadline for submission of comments had been negotiated: until mid-August.

**SDNP/20/00276/FUL & SDNP/20/00277/LIS** – Haven Barn, Monks Walk: Change of use from agricultural to residential; alteration of existing cart lodge and stables into a single dwelling. Decision pending but there was an opportunity for the Parish Council to submit comments elsewhere on this agenda.

**SDNP/20/00994/REM** - New House at Cobwebs, North Lane. Application in Progress

**SDNP/20/00980/HOUS & SDNP/20/00981/LIS** - Replace existing shed at Rock Cottage, Bones Lane. It was noted that, following the submission of an objection from the Parish Council, the application had been amended significantly (reducing the height and scale of the new building) and that these amended proposals had then been approved by EHDC. This was felt to be a very satisfactory outcome.

Initial .....

Sign & date final page .....

**SDNP/20/01226/TPO** - Reduce height of fir tree at Mille Failte, Bones Lane. Decision Pending

**SDNP/20/00850/FUL** - Change of use from agricultural Barn to dwelling for farm staff at Stanbridge Farm, Sussex Road. Application Approved.

## 5. Matters for consideration at this meeting:

**SDNP/20/00276/FUL & SDNP/20/00277/LIS:** Haven Barn, Monks Walk: Change of use from agricultural to residential; alteration of existing cart lodge and stables into a single dwelling.

A letter, dated 1<sup>st</sup> June, had been received from Stella New (SDNPA) inviting further comments from the Parish Council.

It was noted that, since the Council's objection at the beginning of March, a number of changes had been made to the application, including:

- Space for a second car parking space had been found
- Proposals for external lighting have been removed
- The drainage / sewerage arrangements have been completely changed
- Landscaping plans submitted in April now make it clear that the meadow area (which is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary) does not form part of the residential curtilage and, if approved, SDNPA will ensure that the parking of cars or the provision of any structures will be prevented.

Following discussion, it was agreed to make a further submission to SDNPA with comments on a number of issues including the following:

- Failure of the proposals to meet the important new Policy (SD9) of the new South Downs Local Plan to enhance biodiversity and ensure 'net-gains' from all developments
- A lack of clarity as to whether the tests specified by the County Ecologist (in relation to a potential breach of the EU Directive) had been met
- The proposals should be judged against all the policies of the new Local Plan whereas the 'principle of development' referred to by SDNPA through permission SDNP/18/02405/FUL and SDNP/18/02709/LIS were granted under the policies in the old Local Plan / Joint Core Strategy
- The space identified for the second parking space (after the parking arrangements approved under SDNP/19/01440/DCOND were not adhered to during the conveyancing process) now replaces a new tree that had been due to be planted there on an earlier Landscape Plan: again, contributing to a lack of biodiversity enhancements
- Disappointment that SDNPA appears to be happy to approve yet more roof lights in this area (which were not approved in the earlier applications: SDNP/18/02405/FUL) and new glazing on the southern wall. The cumulative effect of these proposals (and the precedents that they create for future proposals) could yet affect the wonderful dark skies in the area
- Concern that advice from Historic England about the potential rebuilding of walls is being overlooked by SDNPA and should, at least, be covered in Conditions (Historic England letter of 20<sup>th</sup> August 2018, relating to SDNP/18/02709/LIS and SDNP/18/02405/FUL as approved)
- Details of a construction management plan will be crucial – not only because of the proximity to other buildings which are now inhabited, but also because of damage that will inevitably be done by heavy vehicles travelling through the community car park
- It is still unclear who is expected to pay for damage done to the surface of the community car park, we are still unclear who is expected to pay to repair the damage once construction has been completed. Why should local parishioners have to pay any of these costs? The SDNPA should be asked to obtain a financial contribution from the developer for this matter as part of Conditions imposed
- An amended landscape plan (dated 7 May) proposes two new trees in the long thin strip of land south of the churchyard wall (as replacements for trees being lost elsewhere) but one of these appears as though it will fill a gap that gives a wonderful view of the church for anyone approaching from the footpaths, including the South Downs Way. This was felt to be a very

Initial .....

Sign & date final page .....

retrograde step and appears to be a hasty sop to plant a tree somewhere to try to tick the biodiversity box. This would be completely the wrong location

- Concern that these trees, as they grow and mature, are likely to damage the new water pipes and could also damage the ancient churchyard wall. These proposals for these trees in this vicinity should not be permitted

### **Assets of Community Value: the Five Bells and Village Inn**

It was noted that the ACV status of the Five Bells had lapsed recently (only lasting for five years) but that there appears to be no onus on anyone to inform Parish Councils about this situation. Liaison with EHDC had confirmed that communities can apply to re-new ACV status and this matter was now before the Committee for consideration. In the case of the Five Bells, ACV status would mean that if the owners (Hall & Woodhouse) ever wanted to sell the pub, the community would be given the opportunity to consider whether they wanted to make a bid for it or not. After discussion it was agreed that the opportunity should be taken to re-apply and to submit the necessary paperwork to EHDC. It was felt that this should be done in any case, but that the unprecedented circumstances of the current Coronavirus pandemic and the uncertainty of many businesses made it even more expedient to do so. The re-application could draw upon the original successful application but updated with more recent roles and activities based at the premises including the monthly 'drop-in' sessions for elderly and lonely residents (Mondays; 2.30-4pm) and the fact that meetings of the Fireworks Committee and Village Show Committee are also held there, in addition to more long-standing use by other groups and events. It was agreed that the Clerk should submit all the necessary details to EHDC as soon as possible.

With regard to the Village Inn, the Parish Council had recently been informed by EHDC of the owners' official "intention to sell" notification – something that they are required to do as the premises are registered as an Asset of Community Value. It was explained that this has been brought about because of a 'legal continuance process' in the situation where the property remains for sale following an earlier notification to sell. This new notification gives the Parish Council the opportunity to trigger a moratorium period during which the community could consider whether or not they wish to bid to buy the business. It was noted that this opportunity runs until 30<sup>th</sup> June. If the longer moratorium period were not triggered, the Village Inn could be sold to anyone from 1<sup>st</sup> July. If the longer moratorium period were to be triggered then the community would have until 20<sup>th</sup> November to consider making and submitting a bid. It was, however, noted that any bid made by the community need not necessarily be accepted by the owners. During discussion it was agreed that (i) the Council's aim should be to try to retain two viable pubs in the parish, complementing each other, and not lose either of them to property developers; (ii) that any decision on this matter should not inadvertently damage the viability of the community's other pub (the Five Bells); and that (iii) the Parish Council should not commit to any expenditure in any bid to buy the business. As in the preceding discussion about the Five Bells, it was felt that the unprecedented circumstances of the current Coronavirus pandemic and the uncertainty of many businesses should be taken into account, including whether circumstances might be different in November. After discussion it was agreed that on balance the opportunity should be taken to trigger the longer moratorium process so as to provide the community with the opportunity to make a bid. It was agreed that the Clerk should submit the necessary details to EHDC prior to the 30<sup>th</sup> June deadline.

### **6. Public comments on the above**

Comments were made by the public during the appropriate part of item 5 above.

### **7. The Committee's decisions on the above matters**

As above.

### **8. Date of next meeting: Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> June at 6pm**

Meeting finished at 7.20pm

Initial .....

Sign & date final page .....