



Buriton Parish Council

Minutes of a meeting of Buriton Parish Council Planning Committee held in Buriton Village Hall at 6pm on Monday 15th November 2021.

Present: Cllr Johnston (Chair), Cllr Ashcroft, Cllr Jones, Cllr Stevens, Cllr Wheeler.
In attendance: 1 member of the public.

1. Cllr Johnston opened the meeting. It was noted that there were no apologies and that all committee members were present.

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. Cllrs Ashcroft and Johnston declared a potential pecuniary interest in the application for a potential Telecoms Mast in Kiln Lane and would therefore not take part in that discussion.

3. Updates on current planning matters

SDNP/21/00956/FUL: Construction and part retention of farm track access from Horsechestnut Farm onto the Causeway (B2070), Petersfield. Application in Progress – further information for consideration at this meeting

SDNP/21/02014/FUL: 10 residential houses at Greenway lane. Application in Progress

SDNP/21/01479/REM: Reserved matters pursuant to application SDNP/17/05563/OUT for one detached family dwelling High Banks, North Lane, Buriton, GU31 5RS. Application approved. It was noted that, in response to points made by the Parish Council, Conditions stated that: no external lighting shall be installed on the building or within the site unless agreed by the Planning Authority; that prior to the occupation of the dwelling a scheme of mitigation to minimise internal light spillage into the dark skies must be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority; that no development shall be carried out above ground floor slab level until a schedule of external materials finishes and samples to be used has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority; that the boundary hedge shall be retained unless otherwise agreed with the Planning Authority; that no extensions and alterations shall be carried out on the house without the prior written consent of the Planning Authority because further extension/alteration could result in an adverse effect upon adjacent properties; and that a bird box or bat box must be installed within the site (and permanently retained and maintained thereafter) in order to provide a gain in biodiversity. Climate responsible heating and cooling (e.g. heat pumps or solar panels) together with high levels of insulation had also been sought.

SDNP/21/03220/DCOND: Discharge of Conditions 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24 and 27 of Planning Approval SDNP/20/01535/FUL at Butser Hill Lime Works, Buriton, GU31 5BQ. Application still in progress.

SDNP/21/04250/HOUS: 1 Monks Walk. Replacement windows. Application approved

SDNP/21/03827/HOUS: detached outbuilding at 3 Monks Walk. Application in progress

Initial

Sign & date final page

Re-Charge One: it was noted that a marketing company (Four Communications) was hosting an on-line public webinar on 17 November to present plans for 60 lodges for overnight guests with three additional spaces suitable for cafes, bars, restaurants, car showroom, bike hire or sales and with charging bays for electric vehicles on land to the west of the Greenway Lane roundabout (between the main southbound A3 and its south-bound off slip-road leading to the roundabout).

4. Planning application for consideration at this meeting:

SDNP/21/00956/FUL: farm track and new access on to The Causeway at Horsechestnut Farm. The new information, including the ecology report, was noted but it was agreed that none of this changed the position of the Parish Council that the application should be refused and that the Council's submission of 15th April should still be taken into account. It was felt that the ecology report had revealed some very sensitive species (including dormice) and that some habitats, such as a pond, had already been destroyed/removed. The report also showed the importance of the continuous network of hedgerow along the Causeway. These points accentuated the need for this area (beyond the Settlement Policy Boundary for Petersfield) to be protected. In addition, the importance of Dark Night Skies in this narrow pinch-point location in the International Reserve, had recently been highlighted in a South Downs National Park Authority Webinar, in a BBC Radio Programme and by a bespoke Case Study document produced by the South Downs NPA.

SDNP/21/04851/HOUS and SDNP/21/04852/LIS: replacement of one roof light with a dormer window and installation of a new dormer windows at 8 the High Street.

It was noted that none of the proposed changes affected the front of the property or were visible from public spaces. It was agreed that comments would be submitted covering the following points: (1) Dark Night Skies: as Buriton lies within the SDNPA's International Dark Skies Reserve (and in a very sensitive location in the pinch point linking the major areas of the reserve) it is vital that any light spillage or pollution from new extensions or buildings is minimised. In particular the new shed should have no external lighting associated with it. It was felt that the replacement of the roof light with two small dormer windows was acceptable; (2) Biodiversity: there are no proposals to enhance biodiversity whereas it is now normal practice in Buriton for every new building to provide a 'net gain' by catering for bats, birds, bees and other pollinators; (3) Effects on neighbours: it is vital that comments or concerns raised by neighbours are taken into consideration when reviewing this application.

SDNP/21/05482/PA16: proposed Telecommunications Structure near to Kiln Lane.

It was noted that the Parish Council has received a number of emails from parishioners (and from Parish Councillors unable to attend this meeting) and that all points raised would be taken into account. Cllrs reconsidered points that had been made in relation to the previous application that had been refused earlier in the year (SDNP/21/00931/PA16) whilst confirming that they were not against improving technology. It was felt, however, that brief benefits for less than a third of train travellers passing swiftly through the parish should not outweigh adverse effects on the landscape setting of the village or effects (including mental health concerns) on parishioners. The new location was explicitly illustrated in the adopted Village Design Statement as an important location in one of the 'green fingers' of open space from which all development should be excluded. It was noted that residents working from home (or using the internet for social / leisure purposes) already had adequate data coverage via broadband connections which had enabled scores of households to work from home during the Covid lockdown periods and there did not seem to be any call from the community for the 'data uplift' (for EE users only) that the applicants were claiming would be delivered by this proposal. The maps of coverage included with the application indicated that very few houses in the village might benefit from the proposed mast – the maps showed that most residential areas would continue to have low indoor coverage. It was noted that, since the previous application had been refused, two other EE masts in the parish had been approved so that the stretch of railway line now potentially inconvenienced was relatively short and the cumulative adverse effects of masts in the local area should be taken into account when considering this extra one. It was also felt that some potential sites had still not been considered adequately and that the proposal was still not genuinely landscape-led: it was a relatively low cost site from a willing

Initial

Sign & date final page

landowner. Other landowners may, however, also be willing and, if necessary, because of the sensitivity of the area, the best way forward may be less than optimum coverage. It may not be possible for EE to deliver 100% coverage to every metre of the railway line without causing unacceptable (and unnecessary) permanent harm to the landscape and it was felt that the National Park Authority should recognise this point. Economic benefits would only be provided to travellers passing through the National Park – and, in practice, only to a small proportion of them. Cllrs felt that no wider benefits to the local community in Buriton were likely. At the end of a detailed discussion it was agreed that the Parish Council should object to the application drawing upon the points above, the response to the previous application, comments made by parishioners and concerns about the proposed location, siting and effects on the landscape; local amenity and quality of life; disregard of relevant planning policies, alternative site availability and other material considerations.

Councillors Ashcroft and Johnston re-joined the meeting.

5. Public comments on the above application

A representative of the Buriton Village Design Group explained that they were also considering the proposed Telecommunications Structure near to Kiln Lane and were likely to object for a wide range of reasons, including points made in the parish council's deliberations. If the cost of siting a mast elsewhere was significantly greater than at the proposed site, or if 100% coverage along the entire railway line was not currently possible without causing permanent harm to the landscape and the setting of the village, then so be it. A petition was gathering many objections to the proposal and few, if any, in support because the community was not seeking any changes to data accessibility with existing broadband connectivity being adequate.

6. The Committee's decisions on the above matters

The Committee confirmed that the Council had no objection to SDNP/21/04851/HOUS and SDNP/21/04852/LIS but would write to object to SDNP/21/00956/FUL and SDNP/21/05482/PA16.

7. Date of next meeting: as required

Meeting finished at 7.20pm