

Greatham Parish Council
Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on
Monday 15th June 2020, 8pm (virtual meeting)

Present Cllr M Rodbert (Chair), Cllr A Cheesman, Cllr A Crick, Cllr O Rook

Also present 2 members of the public
Jane Ives, Clerk

20.22 Chair's Announcements: The Chair welcomed everyone to the first virtual meeting of the Parish Council under new legislation and reminded everyone about the Virtual Meeting Policy.

20.23 Apologies for Absence: None

20.24 Declarations of Interests: None

20.25 Planning Matters: The Chair noted the decisions made since the last Planning Committee meeting on Appendix 1. Cllr Rook advised that a party wall agreement is now in place at 5 Bakersfield and remedial works were taking place.

20.26 Chair's Report & Background to Planning Applications

The Chair provided introduced the amended planning application at 1 Hill View. He was pleased to note that Greatham Parish Council's comments had been noted by the EHDC Landscape Officer on the original application which stated that "the proposal does not conform with the policies contained in the SDNP Local Plan which aim to protect and enhance the landscape character of the South Downs National Park – I concur with paragraphs 1-3 of the Greatham Parish Council submission".

The Chair also advised that the Committee would be agreeing comments on the SDNPA Sustainable Construction Supplementary Document (SPD) following an amended draft being published.

20.27 Public Questions – The Chair adjourned the meeting for public questions but there were none

The meeting was reconvened.

20.28 It was **RESOLVED** to agree the following response to the planning application:

SDNP/19/05466/FUL 1 Hill View, Petersfield Road, Greatham GU33 6EY

Objection. Proposed: Cllr Rook. Seconded. Cllr Crick.

The detailed response is at Appendix 2.

20.29 SDNPA Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): It was **RESOLVED** to submit an amended response following the initial response by the Council. Councillors were generally supportive of the SPD but felt it could go further. The full response is at Appendix 3.

20.30 Date of next meeting – The Chair advised that the next Planning Committee meeting is on Monday 27th July 2020 subject to planning applications being received.

20.31 The Chair closed the meeting at 8.23pm.

Signed: **Chair**

Date:

Appendix 1: Planning Applications as at 09/06/20 (decisions made since last meeting in yellow)

Reference	Address	Proposal	Consultation Expiry Date	Determination Date	GPC Comments	Decision
SDNP/20/01023/HOUS	Lindisfarne, Longmoor Rd, Greatham GU33 6AG	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory	13/04/20	08/05/20	No objection	Approved
SDNP/20/01507/HOUS	Bower Cottage, Longmoor Rd, Greatham GU33 6AQ	New vehicular access, widen pedestrian kerb and single storey side extension	15/05/20	11/06/20	No objection	
SDNP/19/05338/HOUS	2 Bridge Cottages, Farnham Rd Liss GU33 6LA	Single storey rear extension & replacement garage	25/02/20	02/03/20	No objection	Approved
SDNP/19/05998/HOUS	1 The Mount, Petersfield Rd, Greatham GU33 6AU	Extension of existing detached double garage and new pitched roof to existing section of garage	21/01/20	10/02/20	No objection	Withdrawn
SDNP/19/05738/FUL	5 Bakers Field, Greatham GU33 6EX	Replacement dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling	20/01/20	13/02/20	Objection	Approved
SDNP/19/05466/FUL	1 Hill View, Petersfield Rd, Greatham, GU33 6EY	Demolition of single storey extension & build a detached dwelling	19/12/19	15/01/20	Objection	
SDNP/19/05505/HOUS	44 Sherwood Close, Liss, GU33 7BT	Single storey front & rear extension	19/12/19	14/01/20	No comments	Approved
SDNP/19/05132/HOUS	3 Bridge Cottages, Farnham Rd Liss GU33 6LA	Reconstruction of front porch following impact damage	19/12/19	14/01/20	No objection	Approved
SDNP/19/05129/FUL	Copse House, Church Lane, Greatham GU33 6HB	Replacement dwelling	03/12/19	30/12/19	No objection	Approved
SDNP/19/05310/FUL	18 & 20 Wolfmere Lane, Greatham, GU33 6AL	Retrospective application for change of use of land to residential gardens	04/12/19	04/12/19	No objection	Approved
SDNP/19/05464/TPO	Greatham Primary School, Petersfield Rd, Greatham GU33 6HA	Various tree works	13/12/19	10/01/20	No objection	Approved
SDNP/19/03287/FUL	Darley, 1 Longmoor Road, Greatham GU33 6AE	Pair of semi detached dwellings	30/08/19	27/09/19	Objection	Withdrawn
SDNP/19/02897/FUL	West Fork, Farnham Road, Liss GU33 6LA	Change of use to caravan storage	02/08/19	29/08/19	No objection.	Refused

SDNP/19/02450/FUL	West Fork, Farnham Road, Liss GU33 6LA	Change of use of land to a caravan site & provision of 16 mobile holiday lodges	11/07/19	01/08/19	No objection	Refused
SDNP/19/02237/FUL	Fern Farm, Longmoor Road, Greatham GU33 6AW	Erection of four mobile home pitches, utility/day room building, replacement stables and associated hardstanding, following demolition of the existing buildings.	19/07/19	14/08/19	No objection	Approved
SDNP/19/01984/FUL	Longmoor Training Camp, French Road, Longmoor GU33 6EL	Change of Use of Existing Buildings from Military Storage depot to a flexible use comprising Film Studios/Storage and Distribution and offices with associated car parking and landscaping	04/07/19	08/08/19	Supports	
SDNP/18/06111/FUL	Liss Forest Nursery, Petersfield Road, Greatham GU33 6HA	Development of 46 dwellings (including affordable homes) and a shop, alterations to existing access onto Petersfield Road, hard and soft landscaping, drainage and all other associated development works	28/02/19	21/03/19	Objection	

Response to Amended Plans SDNP/19/05466/FUL

1 Hill View, Petersfield Road, Greatham GU33 6EY

15th June 2020

Greatham Parish Council considered the amended plans submitted on 21/04/20 and **OBJECTS** to the construction of a new detached dwelling on the site of 1 Hill View outlined in planning application SDNP/19/05466/FUL for the following reasons:

1. The application incorrectly states that the site lies within the settlement boundary of Greatham as defined in SDNPA Local Plan Policy SD25. The settlement boundary for Greatham changed on 2nd of July 2019 with the adoption of the SDNPA Local Plan and this site lies outside of it (Figure 1). Although permission has previously been granted to build on the site this is not a planning consideration in a new application particularly as a whole new set of planning policies have now become law across the National Park. The SDNPA Local Plan does not allocate this site for development.

“Development in the South Downs national park is a privilege, not a right” Tim Slaney, SDNPA Director of Planning.



Figure 1. Source: SDNPA policy map. Site ringed in red. Settlement boundary in black.

2. The settlement boundary exists to protect the character of the village and protect the green gaps characteristic of Greatham. Development in this location reduces the green gaps and is more in keeping with a ribbon development than a linear village. The settlement boundary exists to protect this character. The street scene from Petersfield Road would be significantly altered by this development.
3. The design of the proposed development is not in compliance with SDNPA Policy SD5 Design (below) and is not in keeping with the majority of other buildings found in Greatham. Policy SD5 states that development should “integrate with, respect and sympathetically complement the landscape character by ensuring development proposals are demonstrably informed by an assessment of the landscape context”. Greatham Parish Council would suggest that a landscape led approach has not been taken in this instance. Based on our discussions conducted with the SDNPA to date regarding a proposed development very close to 1 Hill View, this application is far less rigorous in its approach to SD5. A development here would also fail to protect the views from Petersfield Road to the open countryside beyond.

Strategic Policy SD5: Design

1. Development proposals will only be permitted where they adopt a landscaped approach and respect the local character, through sensitive and high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area. The following design principles should be adopted as appropriate:
 - a) Integrate with, respect and sympathetically complement the landscape character by ensuring development proposals are demonstrably informed by an assessment of the landscape context;
 - b) Achieve effective and high quality routes for people and wildlife, taking opportunities to connect GI;
 - c) Contribute to local distinctiveness and sense of place through its relationship to adjoining buildings, spaces and landscape features, including historic settlement pattern;
 - d) Create high-quality, clearly defined public and private spaces within the public realm;
 - e) Incorporate hard and soft landscape treatment which takes opportunities to connect to the wider landscape, enhances GI, and is consistent with local character;
 - f) Utilise architectural design which is appropriate and sympathetic to its setting in terms of height, massing, density, roof form, materials, night and day visibility, elevational and, where relevant, vernacular detailing;
 - g) Provide high quality, secure, accessible, and where possible, integrated storage for general and recycling waste, heating fuel, and transport related equipment;
 - h) Provide high quality outdoor amenity space appropriate to the needs of its occupiers or users;
 - i) Ensure development proposals are durable, sustainable and adaptable over time, and provide sufficient internal space to meet the needs of a range of users;
 - j) Give regard to improving safety and perceptions of safety, and be inclusive and accessible for all; and
 - k) Have regard to avoiding harmful impact upon, or from, any surrounding uses and amenities.

4. The application includes no details of how it will comply with SDNPA Core Policy SD2 or with the emerging Sustainable Construction SPD which will shortly become planning law within the SDNPA and should therefore be taken into consideration. It is essential that the environmental impact of structures built now, which may be in places for hundreds of years, is given the highest priority. Greatham Parish Council has a policy of objecting to applications on environmental grounds unless they detail exactly how they will comply with SDNPA Policy SD2 (Ecosystem Services) and SD48 (Climate Change and Sustainable Use Of Resources).
5. The application form lists "TBC" against all materials to be used. To ensure compliance with Policy SD5 we would expect all materials to be exactly defined before the application is considered. This would be consistent with the guidance given and approach taken by the SDNPA on other sites in Greatham, for example the Liss Forest Nursery Site (Policy SD71).

6. The detached dwelling is approximately a metre away from the boundary with Greatham Village Hall, the other side of which is the playground of the local nursery school (marked 'Track' on the proposed block plan). The playground is in use by babies and toddlers from 8.00am – 6pm five days a week. Whilst there is no fenestration shown in the West wall it is very likely that fenestration in the North elevation will provide a clear line of site into the playground creating a significant overlooking / loss of privacy issue. This issue would be exacerbated should future residents elect to install CCTV.
Additionally, the majority of the 10 metre length of the building is along the boundary with the Nursery School. The proposed dwelling would dramatically reduce the rural view of the Nursery School. We believe this would have a negative effect on the children using the playground and the Nursery School as a business.
7. No construction management plan appears to have been supplied and there is a clear issue of protecting public safety during the build and from any future works required to maintain the property. There is little space in the plans to place a scaffold on the Western elevation and there is a risk to users of the Village Hall, particularly children attending the nursery school, from falling objects, noise and dust.
8. A chimney stack is placed on the Western wall and emissions from that stack would likely affect the playground and users of the village hall.

Requested planning conditions

1. Ensure that the development complies with SD48 (Climate Change and Sustainable Use of Resources) in full.
2. Requirement of a construction management plan which appropriately safeguards users of the Village Hall during the construction phase, particularly children in the village nursery playground.
3. Hill View is substantially elevated above the level of Petersfield Road. Residents further down Petersfield Road have previously experienced flooding due to runoff from the road in very heavy rain. The proposed access road should have a planning condition applied for a permeable surface to avoid adding to the problem. SDNPA policy SD49 Flood Risk Management must be complied with.
4. Ensure that no fenestration can be installed on the Western elevation to prevent overlooking and to protect the privacy of the village nursery playground.
5. Ensure that the development complies with the Sustainable Construction SPD.

Notes

It is noted that section 25 of the application form states that, "nobody except the applicant was the owner of any part of the land to which the application relates". As of Dec 9th 2019 there is an ongoing boundary and access dispute with neighbours to the West of the proposed development.

Appendix 3: Response to SDNPA Sustainable Construction Supplementary Document Consultation

15/6/2020

Greatham Parish Council commends the SDNPA on the production of the Supplementary Planning Document which we view as a fantastic opportunity to improve the efficiency and sustainability of the built environment in the SDNP for decades to come. We have some general feedback to provide followed by comments on specific points.

(a) General observations

Once this document is adopted it is important that the SDNPA makes significant efforts to inform and guide the relevant local authorities dealing with applications within the boundaries of the SDNP. They will need to be fully aware of the new requirements and how they should be implemented in applications which are not called in by the SDNPA. Experience from the introduction of the SDNP local plan suggests that some local authorities are still not really aware of the legal requirements it imposes and continue to apply local authority plans instead.

In light of rapidly changing public opinion we feel that this document could go even further. It would be wonderful to be able to legitimately claim that the South Downs is the greenest of all national parks.

The SDNPA should be wary of lobbying during this consultation from those with finical interests in development within the SDNP. Because of the very long lifespan of buildings carbon emissions should be a primary concern with financial return a distant second.

(b) Specific points

Page 6 – table 1, EV charge points. GPC feel that this should be more prescriptive. Lack of charging points is a key issue in slowing the take-up of electric vehicles. For small residential and large residential “required” should be replaced with, “at least one per unit”. For minor non residential the requirement should be more ambitious i.e. 1 for every 5 spaces.

Page 7 – 2.1 currently reads:

“The requirement is for the energy efficiency of each home to result in the predicted carbon dioxide emissions to be at least 19% lower than that allowed by the current (2013) building regulations standard.”

Why specify the date of the building regs? GPC suggest removing the date so that the SDP does not refer back to old regs in the future and so that if building regs are tightened the requirement of the SDP will tighten as well.

Energy efficiency general: for most homes heating is the single biggest energy use. GPC would like to see mention of heating control systems as an energy efficiency measure. At its most basic a timer, central thermostat and thermostatic radiator valves but preferably smart heating with centrally connected radiator valves which can have individual schedules and be remotely controlled.

Energy efficiency general: GPC would welcome the inclusion of waste water heat recovery as an energy efficiency measure in this section. The shower is one of the highest energy users in any home and WWHR systems can recover over 60% of the heat otherwise flushed down the drain. WWHR is very easy to fit at build time but harder to retrofit. It is basically maintenance free and likely to last as long as the building. WWHR is already recognised as a way to improve SAP score.

<https://powerpipehr.co.uk/>

On-site low carbon energy

Page 11 – 2.24 current reads:

“If there are legitimate, fully evidenced and agreed technical or physical design reasons why the 20% reduction figure is not feasible in full in any particular case, this will be considered pragmatically by the Authority.”

GPC consider that this is too lenient and is open to exploitation by developers. Could 2.24 be deleted entirely? To further encourage efforts to comply with the requirement could a further levee similar to CIL be enforced on schemes which fail to comply?

Page 11 – section 2.29: The power density of panels is already a bit ahead of the maths in the report taking a SunEdison SE-R345BZC-4y panel as an example: this panel has a rated output of 345 watts and a surface area of a little under 2 m² meaning a little over a kilowatt can be generated from a little under 6m². It may be worth updating the maths as panels will doubtless increase further in efficiency.

Page 16 - 2.51 currently reads:

“Small scale wind generation attached to buildings is unlikely to be acceptable from a visual point of view in the National Park in most cases and is associated with potential structural damage risks to those buildings. Free standing wind turbines are also problematic due to their likely significant visual impact in the National Park and are unlikely to be supported for this reason.”

Whilst GPC accept and support all efforts to preserve the natural beauty of the national park this has to be offset against the pressing need to decarbonise and the fact that onshore wind is one of the most cost effective forms of electricity generation. We would welcome a softening of this section such as:

“Small scale wind generation attached to buildings may be problematic from a visual point of view in the National Park and may be associated with potential structural damage risks to buildings. Free standing wind turbines are also problematic due to their likely significant visual impact. Each case will be carefully assessed on its visual merits.”

Onsite low carbon energy general: with the gradual carbon reduction of electricity generation from the grid and the requirements of this SDP for local generation GPC would welcome more in this section to highlight where fossil fuels are actually consumed. We would suggest that developers consider whether the houses they are building actually require connection to the gas grid at all.

Passive design

Page 18 - 2.54 currently reads:

“The requirement is for at least 10% of all dwellings to be passive house certified.”

In view of the likelihood that these buildings will be around for 100 years+ and the energy efficiency issue with existing housing stock, GPC feel that this lacks ambition and that the target should be increased to at least 30%

Page 18 section 2.57 states:

“Minor non-residential development (between 2 and 9 homes) will be encouraged to follow passive design principles to reduce both heating and cooling demands.”

This sentence is confusing: it effectively states that homes are to be considered non-residential.

In general the Passive Design section does not address the small residential and single dwelling development categories. GPC believe that single developments should also, *“be encouraged to follow passive design principles to reduce both heating and cooling demands.”*

Electric vehicles

Page 19 – section 2.59. 2.59 currently contradicts 2.62. GPC believe that the availability of charging sockets drives the uptake of electric vehicles and that these are hugely important. 2.62 and 2.63 should change to say that all multi residential developments should be provided with at least one electric charging point per residence. It may be worth separating residential and non-residential in this section.

Water consumption

Page 20 - 2.68 currently reads:

“Further water efficiency measures beyond this including grey water recycling and rain water harvesting will be encouraged.”

GPC believe that rainwater harvesting in particular should be required. This could be as simple as the provision of a waterbutt but would ideally include rainwater flush for toilets as a minimum. This is simple to do, helps water efficiency and reduces run off which in turn reduces flood risk.

Adaption to climate change

Page 25 – 2.94 point B. Also mention rain water harvesting as a means to reduce the effects of storm water runoff.

Sustainable transport

Page 31 – section 3.15 point B currently reads

“EV Charge Points for all residential units, visitor spaces and at least 1 charge point for every 5 car spaces in non-residential development The charge points must have a minimum power rating output of 7kW, be fitted with a universal socket that can charge all types of electric vehicle currently on the market and meet relevant safety and accessibility requirements.”

This does not appear to square with the requirement for 1 in 10 spaces for minor non-residential development (listed in table 1). GPC support the 1 in 5 requirement and suggest table 1 should be amended.

Page 31 – section 3.15 supplemental suggestion. GPC would like to see a point H added to 3.15 which requires all small residential and large residential developments to provide secure cycle storage. This could be centralised or a cycle accessible shed on each plot.

Sustainable water

Page 32 – section 3.18 currently reads

“The requirement is for all homes to have a predicted mains water consumption figure of less than 90 litres/person/day.”

This does not square with 2.65 which specifies 110 l/person/day. GPC supports the 90 litre requirement.