



## Buriton Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of Buriton Parish Council Planning Committee held on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2021 (6pm).

Present: Cllr Ashcroft, Cllr Johnston, Cllr Jones, Cllr Stevens.  
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, on this occasion, no members of the public had done so.

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 any discussions about the Greenway Lane housing site as she lived nearby. Cllr Johnston also declared an interest in any discussions about a potential Telecoms Mast in Kiln Lane as an alternative location might be possible on land in her ownership. Cllr Ashcroft declared an interest in any discussions about a potential Telecoms Mast in Kiln Lane as she lived nearby.

3. **Minutes of the last meeting** of 1<sup>st</sup> February 2021 were approved as an accurate record.

### 4. Update on current planning matters

**SDNP/20/01535/FUL:** operations and activities at Butser Hill Lime Works, GU31 5SP.

This application was considered at the SDNPA Planning Committee on 11th February and Cllr Jones spoke at the meeting on behalf of the Parish Council. The outcome has not been finally determined (although it will be approved with conditions) as there are a number of quite complex conditions to be worded in the final document. On balance the result seems favourable to the parish, including the following outcomes:

- all works to cease by the end of 2028 (instead of 2042) by which time it is to be completely re-landscaped
- the old Lime Kilns are to be retained, protected and enhanced – with interpretation boards to be funded by the applicant to explain the history etc
- potential improvements to safety on the nearby shared cycle / walking path
- better landscaping, biodiversity and recreation opportunities in the restoration scheme than originally proposed
- the Parish Council will be a member of a new Liaison Group which will exist until the end of the aftercare period, providing opportunities to influence more things over the next few years.

Initial .....

Sign & date final page

.....

**SDNP/20/04548/HOUS:** Garden shed, 2 Monks Walk, GU31 5RT. Application approved

**SDNP/20/05029/FUL:** Conversion of the Village Inn from Public House to Domestic Dwelling. Application in Progress. Some parishioners had asked about slow progress on this application. Enquiry to be sent to EHDC / SDNPA asking about anticipated decision date.

**SDNP/20/05562/HOUS and SDNP/20/05563/LIS:** Single storey rear extension and replacement front door and windows at 10 High Street, Buriton. Application in progress.

**SDNP/20/05702/HOUS and SDNP/20/05703/LIS:** Single storey extension to two sides at Rock Cottage, Sussex Road, Nursted, GU31 5RD. Application in progress.

**SDNP/20/05721/HOUS:** extension at Weston Farmhouse, GU32 3NN. Application in progress.

**SDNP/20/04443/PRE:** Pre-application consultation about ten residential dwellings on land at Greenway Lane, Buriton. The planners have given advice to the developers on this Pre Application and we now await the actual planning application. It was noted that there is still work to be done regarding achieving our aim of getting a footpath sited along the field edge on Greenway Lane. A first approach has been made to the landowner but this proposal has not been agreed to. Further work will be needed to attempt to get this into the planning conditions as it is seen as our best chance of solving the problem of pedestrians on this dangerous road. It was noted that only 2 of the 10 new houses will be affordable rental properties for local families. The planners were not convinced that the proposed layout gave the best design and so a different layout may be presented in the planning application. It was felt that another approach should be made to the landowner (before the final planning application is submitted) to check whether there might still be ways of getting the developers to provide more benefits for the community: particularly the path. She might still be able to influence their thinking and improve acceptability to parishioners. After discussions it was felt that the following points should be shared with the landowner to try to find some sort of compromise that might be acceptable:

- Ensure that the new path would only ever be a 'permissive' path (not a formal Right of Way) so that it could be withdrawn (or closed at times etc) if it was ever felt that there were problems
- Confirm that it would only be for walking, not cycling
- Only promote the route to villagers because the main need is for the safety of children walking to / from the roundabout to catch their buses etc (don't promote it as a path for visitors)
- Keep it narrow (1m or 1.5m) so that machinery can still cut the hedge from inside the fields
- Or, the community may be able to arrange for volunteers to cut the inside of the hedge
- Press the developers to pay the costs of fencing (and suitable surface materials): it was suspected that the costs would be a very small proportion of their total costs
- The Parish Council may be willing to contribute towards ongoing maintenance costs of the fence if that would make a difference
- The path could be trialled for a couple of years to see how it goes
- If necessary, just provide a path from the new houses to the sharp bend nearest the railway bridge (leaving people to walk on the road from there to / from the bridge – which is relatively straight and not so dangerous).

It was noted that similar examples (from Selborne, Isle of Wight and elsewhere) were mentioned where it would seem that any problems have been overcome (and safety for people walking along the roads improved).

**SDNP/21/00538/PRE:** Proposed Telecom Mast adjacent to Kiln Lane. Following discussions at the last committee meeting, a letter providing our comments had been submitted to SDNPA on this pre-application consultation. But the Parish Council had learnt, earlier in the day (22<sup>nd</sup> February), that the applicants had withdrawn their Pre-Application request to the Planners and would be continuing with a full application without receiving any feedback or advice from SDNPA. This was felt to be an unusual and disappointing approach by the applicants (EE).

Initial .....

Sign & date final page

.....

It was noted that the Parish Council's submission to SDNPA (in response to the Pre-App) had included the following points amongst others:

- That we would like SDNPA officers to consider potential landscape effects very carefully as this proposal is in a sensitive location between the village and the nearby hanger woodland slopes
- That this location was proposed as a potential site for housing development in the early stages of the South Downs Local Plan but was not selected due to landscape considerations
- That the location is part of one the important 'green fingers' of open spaces identified in the Buriton Village Design Statement (adopted by SDNPA in August 2017)
- That the photographs / photo-montages provided by the applicants are very selective, with none from popular viewpoints such as the village hall or recreation ground
- That no views out from the Conservation Area have been provided
- That the Parish Council has only seen three photo-montages (numbered 1, 4 and 6). Clearly others must exist and the Parish Council feels that other views should be shared with the National Park Authority and Parish Council at Pre-App stage
- That in the absence of more information the Parish Council finds it difficult to gauge potential effects on the landscape and on the setting of the historic, spring-line village
- That the Parish Council also has concerns about the proximity of the structure to the village of Buriton: the whole of the village will be within 500 metres of the mast; the school, village hall, recreation ground and children's playground will be within 250 metres; and a number of houses will be within 150 metres.

It was also noted that another application, for another Telecoms Mast elsewhere in the parish, (SDNP/20/05618/FUL) was likely. This was thought to be in the New Barn area but details had been removed from the Planning Authority's website as the application was currently deemed to be invalid. It had been made valid by mistake and so the Parish Council had received a consultation request, but the Council will be consulted again when the application is valid.

It was also noted that the Clerk was making authorisation enquiries about a large shed / chalet in a garden at Marsh Mead and, following comments from parishioners, it was felt that similar enquiries should be made about the scale of the tower of scrapped vehicles and other materials at the scrapyard at the B2070/Greenway Lane roundabout which can set a very unsightly entrance to the village and to this part of the National Park.

It was also noted that Cllr Jones had received further correspondence from Mrs Williams at Faggs Farm, now reporting that the two 'no parking' signs which she had agreed with County Councillor Mocatta had disappeared. She concluded by saying: "Can we assume that the Parish Council will report to the police if the signs have been stolen?" Although not a planning matter, all Councillors felt that the Parish Council would normally report the disappearance of road signs to the Highway Authority (rather than to the Police). As this had already been done, councillors asked Cllr Jones to reply to Mrs Williams accordingly, with the suggestion that if she felt that this was a priority for Police attention during the on-going Covid pandemic then she could report the matter to them directly as a private individual. It was also noted that Cllr Bray had kindly offered to keep an eye open in hedges and field margins in case the signs had been thrown nearby. Replacement signs had been ordered by County Councillor Mocatta.

Cllr Stevens had produced a draft response to the **Hampshire Local Transport Plan** consultation which could now be finalised and submitted. It would point out that the generic questionnaire did not really enable the Parish Council to provide meaningful input although all the issues raised in the consultation are of vital importance and interconnected as is already laid out in the HCC Climate Emergency plan. Instead, a number of points would be made about (a) timing of the exercise (in the context of changes to travel and access brought about by the current pandemic; some of which might endure whilst others might not); (b) the vision for the exercise (surely HCC's Climate Emergency plan already sets the context for creating a future Transport vision?); and (c) the fact that issues affecting rural communities are likely to be very different to other places (even

Initial .....

Sign & date final page

.....

to small towns) and so it may be more productive for the County Council to consult separately for rural communities. Priorities such as (i) retaining (and enhancing) bus services; (ii) addressing issues which frustrate the creation of safe cycle / walking networks; (iii) finding viable alternatives to petrol and diesel vehicles in areas where electric vehicles may not be cost-effective solutions (because of longer distances travelled to employment / services and fewer opportunities for public charging points); and (iv) reducing social consequences of isolation and loneliness all need to be better considered.

**5. Matters for consideration at this meeting:**

**SDNP/21/00173/TCA:** *to fell 1 Ash and 1 Whitebeam at Toads Alley, South Lane, Buriton.*

Discussion on this matter was difficult as very few details were available. A request had been made to the Case Officer on 7<sup>th</sup> February and a reply received on 22<sup>nd</sup> saying that a number of photographs had just been received which would be put on the application site. At the time of the meeting, no further information was yet available. It was agreed that the Parish Council would comment as follows: it has been difficult to work out the actual location of these trees but the Council is content to take the advice of the experts in this case and has no objection to the application. However, the Parish Council asks that there should be replanting of suitable replacement (native species) trees in keeping with the local landscape at the appropriate time.

**SDNP/20/05110/HOUS:** *Garden shed and screening panels around oil storage unit and hot tub at Old Spot Cottage, North Lane, Buriton, GU31 5RT*

It was noted that this was a retrospective application and that the applicant had explained that the development had been in place for a number of years with some of it being put up by the previous owner. It was agreed that the Parish Council would have no objection to this application but would draw attention to a number of matters: (1) due to the sensitive location in the International Dark Skies Reserve, we would wish to see a Condition preventing external lighting (without further permission being sought) and also (2) more information about biodiversity and ecosystem services enhancements (as it is now normal in this parish to provide enhancements for bats, birds, bees and other pollinators). It was felt that the Parish Council should also put on record again the fact that (a) this is the third property on the ex Manor House Estate to apply for garden paraphernalia to be erected outside the settlement boundary and on agricultural designated land; (b) the Parish Council opposed the granting of planning permission for these properties and one of the arguments was the inevitable urbanisation of this important area, one of the green fingers reaching into the countryside, on the outskirts of the village; (c) when planning permission was granted the Parish Council was informed that all permitted development rights would be removed so that this issue could be controlled (but inevitably people living in these new homes require storage areas etc) and (d) the Parish Council had argued that the nearby cartshed / garages building (which is still unused) should have been made available to all these dwellings to provide adequate storage and minimise obtrusive clutter.

Councillor Ashcroft left the meeting.

**SDNPA Camping & Glamping Technical Advice Note Consultation:**

Councillors had a number of comments on this draft TAN which was felt to provide over-encouragement for camping without planning permission which could lead to a range of unintended consequences (such as littering, risks of fires etc.) There could also be 'creep' with noise, loud music, lighting, shops etc and it was not clear what controls would exist. Although the value of low-cost accommodation in the National Park could be appreciated (both for the visitors and for the local economy) it was felt that more balance was required in the document – particularly in the section relating to Sustainable Tourism. There were no suggestions in the document that any 'added value' should be obtained from Glamping or Camping Sites (such as the provision of new 'permissive paths' to supplement the local Rights of way network) and this would also be included in the Parish Council's response. The issue of car parking also needed greater consideration in the document as it could be very important to ensure adequate (and suitable) screening from public vantage points.

Initial .....

Sign & date final page

.....

**SDNPA Parking Supplementary Planning Document [Amended Draft] Consultation:**

It was noted that some attention had been given to comments made by the Parish Council on the initial draft but some concerns still remained. After discussion it was agreed that the Council would submit a number of comments including the following:

- Reiterate concerns about resultant on-street parking and the need for adequate visitor spaces
- Point out that paragraph 3.2 is weak on this issue by saying ‘as far as practicable’ (these words should be removed) and the final sentence should expect all applicants to understand the ‘supply (or lack of it)’ of current parking provision in the local area (as well as the demand) “as part of ensuring the scheme will avoid additional on street parking”
- Explain that the Council is not convinced that the calculator predicts an adequate number of spaces
- Note that the revised text (in para 5.1) says that the calculator is only a starting point: but it needs to go on to say that the number of spaces required will usually be more (not less) than that predicted. As explained in paras 3.12-3.13, proposals for lower parking provision will require robust evidence (so para 5.1 should reiterate that point)
- Confirm that the Council appreciates the importance of a landscape-led approach, but point out that this must not be used to accept lower numbers of parking spaces than are really required as this would, in practice, only result in cars being parked in inappropriate places (on roadside verges etc) and being visually intrusive in the landscape
- Point out that the last sentence of para 3.4 (and parts of para 3.5) seems to suggest that lower numbers of parking spaces would be acceptable but these sentences should be deleted
- Highlight that the real solution to this issue is that if it is not possible to accommodate adequate parking spaces for the numbers of dwellings being proposed (without adverse effects on the landscape etc), then it is the number of dwellings that is wrong and that should be reduced. Developers will often try to squeeze one extra dwelling into a site to increase profit margins – but this should not be at the price of having excess cars parked in inappropriate places ...
- Dispute the suggestion in para 5.4 that results from the parking calculator could be ‘rounded down’ as this must not happen: the answer of ‘part of a car’ (from the calculator) will, in practice, mean a full car – and adequate spaces must, therefore, be provided
- Point out that we still have concerns that extra structures [resulting in visual clutter in rural settings] may be required for cycle parking in residential developments (instead of combining storage space into garages or car ports). This does not seem to be addressed in this revised SPD. There does not seem to be anything in Section 6 about this matter. It may be necessary (useful) for larger garage sizes to be stipulated in paragraph 5.7 to encourage this approach
- Similarly, in paragraph 6.3, there is no mention of ‘design’ amongst the list of ‘other matters’ (only security, the type of parking provision, location, layout and access)
- There should be greater emphasis on the need for permeable surfaces for all parking places.

It was also noted that Buriton does not appear in the drop-down menu of Wards even though the correct Ward Name is “Buriton & East Meon”. It was felt that it would be helpful if this was changed to reflect the real name of the Ward.

**6. Public comments on the above:** None.

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

**8. Date of next meeting:** as / when required. It was confirmed that, subject to the timescales and deadlines, the Council may wish to arrange special meetings to consider any forthcoming planning applications for the new houses on Greenway Lane and / or Telecoms masts in the parish so that members of the public could have adequate opportunities to comment.

Meeting finished at 7.20pm

Initial .....

Sign & date final page

.....