



Buriton Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of Buriton Parish Council Planning Committee held on Wednesday 11th November 2020 (6pm).

Present: Cllr Ashcroft, Cllr Johnston, Cllr Jones.

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 Government 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 had done so and would be invited to speak on items as requested.

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. Cllr Johnston declared an interest in the Pre-App consultation (SDNP/20/04443/PRE) as she lived nearby in Greenway Lane.

3. **Minutes of the last meeting** of 26th October 2020 were approved as an accurate record.

4. Update on current planning matters

SDNP/20/00994/REM - New House at Cobwebs, North Lane. Decision pending

SDNP/20/01535/FUL: *The extraction of 343,670 tonnes of chalk (156,214 cubic metres x 2.2 tonnes per cubic metre) and the importation of 1,149,000 tonnes (633,333 cubic metres x 1.8 tonnes per cubic metre) of clean inert waste/soils and clays and the importation of approximately 31,000 tonnes of top soil (21,000 cubic metres x 1.4 tonnes per cubic metre) with the continuation of ancillary recycling operations until 31st December 2028 at Butser Hill Lime Works, GU31 5SP.* An initial series of questions and answers between the Parish Council and the case officer had been exchanged followed by a formal submission of Parish Council comments and concerns in August. A response from the applicant had been considered at the meeting of 26th October and, as a result, another letter with points requiring further scrutiny had been sent to the case officer. A reply said: "due to the nature of the proposal (consolidating previously approved permissions and the revised restoration scheme) this would normally be determined under delegated powers. I have not received a formal request for this to be heard at planning committee at the moment but note on the further comments from Petra that there is reference that the planning committee would assess the new plans. Therefore, please could you advise if the Parish Council would like to make a formal request for this to be heard at planning committee?" This was discussed and agreed.

Initial

Sign & date final page

.....

SDNP/20/04434/TEL: Butser Hill Radio Station New duct down Butser Hill. Application in Progress

SDNP/20/03764/HOUS: Toads Alley South Lane Buriton Petersfield GU31 5RU Gazebo to the side of the house. Decision Pending

SDNP/20/03906/HOUS: The Old Rectory High Street Buriton Petersfield GU31 5RX New railings along South Lane. Application in Progress

SDNP/20/04119/ADV: TJ Butser Quarry – Erection of a sign at the entrance to Quarry. Application in Progress

Government White Paper on Planning: Following discussion at the meeting of 26th October the Clerk had sent a formal submission to Government.

Asset of Community Value: Village Inn. Updates had been received from the two separate people potentially interested in the Inn. One had said that he had not received a reply from the owners and felt he could not continue. The other had not been able to raise sufficient funding but remained interested in principle. There was no further information about the idea of a combination of community uses.

Monks Walk and Haven Barn: recent developments included:

- The Clerk had received email replies from the owners of Monks Walk North and Monks Walk South, both declining to pay the £125pa per household requested towards use of Parish Council land for refuse bin collection points. It was noted that Conditions attached to the grant of planning permission for the conversion of Monks Walk required agreement to be reached with the Parish Council on this matter (and the requirement that bins be put out and taken away in a timely manner because of the sensitive location). The reactions from both households was regretted as the annual budget shortfall would now have to be met by all parishioners. It was also unfortunate that the Covid-19 restrictions were preventing any informal meeting with the new residents. It was agreed that the Clerk should send a holding reply with a view to arranging an informal meeting with all parties once lockdown restrictions permit. No reply at all had been received from Mr Moore, owner of 'Haven Barn' (the old cartshed building).
- The deteriorating condition of the Haven Barn cartshed buildings (loss of more roof tiles with potential damage to ancient wooden beams inside) was noted and it was understood that St Mary's church may contact the EHDC Conservation Officer about this matter as the building is covered by the Listed Buildings regime. The Parish Council could also alert the estate agents currently selling the building about the potential that an 'Urgent Works Notice' could be served by the Planning Authority
- There had not yet been any approach by the Parish Council to the owners of Monks Walk South about the new hedge of non-native species (which could potentially grow very tall) which had been discussed at the last meeting. This seemed to be another unfortunate outcome of the planning proposals eventually approved by the South Downs National Park Authority.

New matter too late for this Agenda: Cllr Jones reported that he had been contacted by Chris Cooper, owner of the Village Inn, earlier in the day and had been told that there would soon be a planning application for the Village Inn for a change of use to a single dwelling. In the short-medium term they would continue to provide accommodation for the homeless etc and he would be happy to discuss other ideas with anyone whilst the planning application progresses. Details of the planning application, once known would be considered at a future meeting.

5. Matters for consideration at this meeting:

Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – consultation by South Downs NPA.

There was general support for the principles of this draft SPD which tries to ensure that parking for new developments would not cause visual intrusion in the landscape or in the public realm. The assumption that garages are not often used to park cars was supported as was the suggestion that

Initial

Sign & date final page

.....

they should, therefore, only count as a third of a parking space. It was also felt that the larger garage size (7m x 3m) should be adopted to provide room for cycle parking rather than having separate, extra structures for cycles. Separate cycle parking facilities should however be provided for non-residential developments. There was some nervousness about any significant weighting to public transport provision in the on-line calculator tool. Simply having an occasional bus service (such as that currently available in Buriton) does not really mean that residents can manage without a car as the frequencies are low and the destinations very limited (only to/from Petersfield; nowhere else and with no coordination with other public transport services in Petersfield). Realistically there will be great reliance on private cars in rural villages like Buriton and the algorithm within the calculator should not ignore this: it must ensure that adequate car parking spaces are provided in all new developments as on-street parking is already problematic in many parts of the village.

SDNP/20/04252/HOUS – *Arbour to side of dwelling, Rock Cottage, Bones Lane*

There were no objections to this proposal but it was felt that the Planning Authority should pay particular regard to any comments from neighbours and, if approved, a Condition preventing external lighting (without further permission being sought) should be included due to the sensitive location in the International Dark Skies Reserve. It was noted that the Ecosystems Services had been completed by ticking every box with no explanatory wording included.

SDNP/20/04548/HOUS – *Garden shed at 2 Monks Walk, North Lane, GU31 5RT*

It was noted that this application for a garden shed was required because Conditions 16 and 17 of SDNP/18/02405/FUL removed normal Permitted Development Rights from all the Monks Walk properties. The garden areas are all outside the Settlement Policy Boundary for the village, recently adopted in the South Downs Local Plan. There were no objections to this proposal but it was felt that the Planning Authority should pay particular regard to any comments from neighbours and, if approved, a Condition preventing external lighting (without further permission being sought) should be included due to the sensitive location in the International Dark Skies Reserve. It was noted that the Ecosystems Services had been completed with a number of positive explanations.

SDNP/20/04443/PRE – *Pre-application consultation about ten residential dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping on land at Greenway Lane, Buriton (site approved in Local Plan)*

A message had been received from SDNPA on 3rd November for this matter to be discussed at this meeting, providing little/no opportunities for wider consultation or engagement on this Pre-application submission – although it was acknowledged that full consultation would be possible on any subsequent planning application. SDNPA had explained that “the scheme is at an early stage of preparation and so it is a good time to provide feedback.” The Pre-App details had been circulated to all Parish Councillors so that any comments could be fed into discussions at this Committee Meeting. At this stage SDNPA were primarily seeking feedback on the concept design in section 2.1 of the submission and had also requested that as the Local Plan states that ‘all suitable opportunities should be taken to create a new public footpath, parallel to Greenway Lane’ and as there did not appear to be any reference to this in the pre-application enquiry, that the Parish Council’s thoughts on this matter would be appreciated.

Parish Councillors welcomed many positive aspects of the concept design including, in particular:

- The provision of at least four affordable homes in the proposals – and it is hoped that these would be rental properties for local people in perpetuity
- The provision of hedging with trees all around the site so as to provide a transition between the new housing and the countryside beyond but also between existing houses in Glebe Road and the new development so as to provide a soft setting and amenity protection for residents
- The arrangement of the new housing so that they do not ‘turn their backs’ on the countryside with no back gardens able to provide a cluttered appearance from any vantage points
- The extra green space at the site entrance
- The hedging with trees along the approaches to the village from the west. This is an edge-of-village location where the current housing layout presents a relatively hard edge to the surrounding countryside. These proposals grasp an opportunity to provide a soft, landscaped

Initial

Sign & date final page

.....

edge so as to provide an attractive approach from the north and west as well as an acceptable transition to the existing houses further east

- The Sustainable Drainage ditch proposals as these will be important in this area
- The rumble strip entrance into the new development.

There were also 2 important concerns about the proposals – and a number of other comments / queries:

1. The Local Plan (Policy SD62) specifies that the layout must not include opportunities to provide further vehicular access into adjacent fields. But the evolution of the design does not appear to adhere to this as access further north could be obtained in the vicinity of the houses numbered 7, 8, 9 and 10. In contrast, Option A (illustrated in Section 3.4 (Alternative Layouts) on the 13th page of the Pre-Application Submission made by Re-Format) would not allow any such future access into adjacent fields. It was, therefore, felt that some combination of Option A and the currently preferred scheme (which has other merits over Option A) should be produced before any proposals are submitted in a planning application
2. The Local Plan also states that “all suitable opportunities should be taken to create a new public footpath, parallel to Greenway Lane, between the site and the Greenway Lane railway bridge” and this is something which the Parish Council has always sought ever since the potential of allocating this site for new housing was first mooted. During the preparation of the Local Plan the Parish Council explained that such a path could be provided alongside Greenway Lane *“but just inside the agricultural fields (which are in the same ownership as the proposed development site) so that pedestrians and cyclists could be safely segregated from the busy traffic on this main access route into / out of the village. With a significant proportion of the new houses on this site likely to be affordable homes and with the likelihood that the local bus service will be axed before the end of the plan period in 2033, Buriton Parish Council can foresee the need for more people to be able to walk or cycle safely all the way along Greenway Lane to and from the main bus service at the Greenway Lane roundabout. With cooperation from the landowner and with CIL funding it should be possible to introduce this important safety and quality of life feature which may also help to minimise extra journeys by private car. A safe and segregated pedestrian and cycle route would also be useful for visitors to this attractive village in the National Park and may help to bring more business to our local pubs. This extra stipulation would accord with Policy SD19 (Transport and Accessibility).”* It is already the case that a number of school / college children have to walk along the full length of Greenway Lane as their buses do not come into the village. It was felt that this situation could be an accident waiting to happen (particularly, but not only, in dark mornings or late afternoons) and this development provides an opportunity to remove this risk for pedestrians and cyclists, rather than making it worse by adding extra traffic onto this lane.

Other comments and queries included:

- Can it be ensured that all the new buildings will be to the highest sustainability standards (including inbuilt renewable energy and insulation standards as well as grey water recycling etc) so that the properties are not only affordable to rent but also to live in? This site could be an exemplar for the National Park Authority in so many ways
- The amount of parking spaces within the development will be crucial as no other on-street parking is available in the vicinity: there are already parking problems in the nearby Glebe Road area and verge parking on Greenway Lane would be unacceptable / unsafe
- Also with regard to parking, garages are not often used to park cars these days and it would be unreliable to count each one as a suitable parking space – but where provided they should all be constructed to ensure that modern (wide) cars can fit into them
- There is only an occasional weekday bus service serving the village with only one destination (Petersfield) where there is no coordination with other public transport services. Realistically there will, therefore, be great reliance on private cars and so adequate car parking spaces for residents and visitors must be provided within the development as on-street parking is already problematic in many parts of the village

Initial Sign & date final page

.....

- The highway junction with Greenway Lane should not be over-engineered with unnecessary visibility splays, intrusive urban kerbing, white lines or any road signs. Such clutter has largely been removed from the village in recent years as the result of a design study by Ben Hamilton-Baillie in 2008. The SDNPA document 'Roads in the South Downs' should be strictly followed
- There may be an opportunity to extend the 30mph speed limit further north-west – to include this new junction – with the addition of a new 'rumble strip' across Greenway Lane in a style similar to those already installed in a number of places around the village. The traffic speed data suggests that this would be beneficial
- The issue of the adequacy of water supplies to the village will be very important: historically there have often been problems with the adequacy of water pressure as the village is served by a single mains pipe which crosses the railway line at Greenway Lane. No adverse effects of lower pressure or reduced supplies should be experienced anywhere else in the parish due to this new development
- It is felt that the proposals could make a greater contribution to biodiversity – particularly as this parish has been selected as a pilot location (one of only six in Hampshire) to boost conditions for important pollinators
- Local knowledge suggests that there are snakes and badgers in nearby gardens so the ecological analysis may need further attention
- In some places in the Site Layout (Option 6) Diagram [*SDNP_20_04443_PRE-SITE_PLAN-1387396*] there are words saying "existing hedge" or "new hedge" but in many places the green edging to the site is un-labelled. It would be good to get confirmation / clarity about all the new hedging that will be provided (eg along the rear boundaries of existing properties in Glebe Road) so as to ensure suitable, native species rather than out-of-character *Leylandii* etc
- There are references to a group of *Leylandii* trees (in the north east corner of the site) and it could be a positive move to remove these trees and replace them with something more suitable for local biodiversity and visual appeal. It is unclear if this is being proposed
- There are some concerns about ornamental planting species illustrated on page 19 of the 'Lizard Design & Ecology' report – and some of the trees and shrubs listed on page 20. Whilst it is appreciated that residents can plant whatever they want in their front or back gardens, it would surely be better to start with the most appropriate native plants rather than planting and encouraging less appropriate species?
- The documents appear to omit any reference to Local Plan Policy SD2 (Ecosystem services) (eg. in Table 1 of the Nova Planning Pre-Application Statement) but surely this should be important and taken fully into account
- The documents appear to omit references to the Buriton Village Design Statement as an adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) eg in para 3.8 of the Nova Planning Pre-Application Statement)
- There appears to be insufficient reference to the Buriton Village Design Statement which incorporates a Local Landscape Character Assessment
- The Petersfield Road / Bolinge Hill Lane is not shown as a walking, cycling or riding route with other traffic only allowed for access only
- The documents suggest that Buriton is only in the 'buffer' zone of the Dark Night Skies Reserve but our understanding is that this area is a vital 'pinch-point' in the Core Zone.

Public comments on this item included support for many of the issues already discussed but added some extra issues:

- Strong support for the point about the importance of creating a new path for pedestrians and cyclists between the new housing site and the Greenway Lane railway bridge as all the land was owned by the same person – to improve safety for these vulnerable road users
- This new path could also provide new links and circular routes with the local Rights of Way network: linking Footpath 12 westwards to Footpath 11 (and, thereby, creating an attractive circular walk west of the village) and also linking the site to Footpath 12 and thence, eastwards, to the Shipwrights Way back to the village – creating a short circular walk north of the village
- Strong support for the point about potential problems with water pressure elsewhere in the community as there can often be problems at present

Initial Sign & date final page

- Similarly, the provision for waste water / sewerage must also have adequate capacity
- Will the Sustainable drainage proposals (SUDS) be adequate – particularly in the context of climate change, high water tables and experiences of flooding elsewhere in the village?
- With regard to Dark Night Skies, there should be no street lighting in the new development, no roof lights and permitted development rights should be removed to discourage the addition of roof-lights in the future.

It was felt that these points were very helpful and should be included in the Parish Council's feedback on the pre-application.

6. Public comments on the above: As noted under SDNP/20/04443/PRE above.

7. The Committee's decisions on the above matters: As above.

8. Date of next meeting: as / when required

Meeting finished at 7.20pm

DRAFT

Initial
.....

Sign & date final page